



# American Journal of Development Studies (AJDS)

ISSN: 2837-6676 (ONLINE)

VOLUME 4 ISSUE 1 (2026)

PUBLISHED BY  
E-PALLI PUBLISHERS, DELAWARE, USA

## Investigating the Development, Implementation, and Adjustment of Individualized Education Programs for Students with Special Educational Needs

Sherif Gerguis<sup>1\*</sup>, Cecilia Elena De Los Reyes<sup>1</sup>, Niña Rozanne De Los Reyes<sup>1</sup>, Raymond Espina<sup>1</sup>, Marjorie Añero<sup>1</sup>

### Article Information

**Received:** July 29, 2025

**Accepted:** September 01, 2025

**Published:** January 14, 2026

### Keywords

*General and Special Education Teachers, Inclusion, Individualized Education Plan, Students with Special Educational Needs, Phenomenological Inquiry*

### ABSTRACT

This research explored the development, implementation, and adjustment of IEPs for students with SEN by the Special and General education teachers at Prince George's County Public Schools, Prince George's County, Maryland, United States of America (USA) during the school year 2023-2024. This is a phenomenological inquiry into the experiences of 15 purposively selected participants who completed a researcher-designed semi-structured questionnaire containing five open-ended questions. Data gathered were subjected to thematic analysis, interpretation and in-depth discussion. Findings showed participants' experiences in developing Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs) in collaboration with the parents and other stakeholders were: 1) Collaborative Engagement and Communication Challenges; 2) Value of Multidisciplinary Input; and 3) Need for Relationship Building and Trust. Their experiences in the implementation of IEPs were: 1) Resource Constraints and Adaptability; 2) Positive Impact on Student Learning; and 3) Differentiated Instruction and Flexibility. Their adjustments while implementing the IEPs were: 1) Continuous Monitoring and Adaptive Modifications; 2) Use of Assistive Technology; and 3) Individualized Support and Scaffolding. The participants' encountered challenges in implementing and adjusting IEPs for students with SEN were: 1) Lack of Resources and Administrative Support; 2) Managing Diverse Student Needs; and 3) Inconsistent Stakeholder Engagement. The interventions that participants formulated to resolve those challenges encountered in implementing and adjusting IEPs were: 1) Enhanced Collaboration and Communication Strategies; 2) Professional Development and Training; and 3) Leveraging Community and Peer Support. It is deduced that schools must prioritize teacher training, resource provision, stakeholder participation, and teamwork

### INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary educational environment, special education is essential for promoting fairness and inclusivity by catering to the varied requirements of students with special educational needs (SEN). The Individualized Education Program (IEP) is a formal document designed to tailor educational services to students with disabilities (Thomas, 2024). The IEP establishes specific objectives tailored to a child's strengths and challenges, while also delineating the specialized teaching, accommodations, and support services necessary for the learner's success in the general education environment (Xu & Kuti, 2024). Internationally, IEPs are acknowledged as fundamental to inclusive education. In nations including the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia, the Individualized Education Program (IEP) is legally required and formulated cooperatively by a multidisciplinary team. This includes special education instructors, general education instructors, parents, school psychologists, and, when applicable, the students. In these systems, the development and implementation of an IEP are characterized by systematic collaboration, regular evaluation, and collective responsibility, governed by legal and ethical standards under frameworks such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in the U.S. or the SEN Code of Practice in the UK.

In the Philippines, the Department of Education

(DepEd) has embraced analogous concepts, formalizing inclusive education through crucial policies such as DepEd Order No. 72, s. 2009, and DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2019, which require the implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for all learners with disabilities. Nonetheless, despite congruence with international norms, discrepancies in execution persist. The Philippine Statistics Authority (2022) reports that over five million school-aged children in the Philippines have some sort of impairment, but only a small percentage receive specialized services or formal Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). As of 2023, fewer than 30% of public schools across the US had dedicated special education programs, and an even smaller proportion have qualified professionals to develop and execute effective Individualized Education Programs (Lieberman *et al.*, 2024). The IEP is optimally formed through cooperative discourse among educators, parents, and specialists. This collaborative process must guarantee that educational objectives are pragmatic, significant, and developmentally suitable. Nonetheless, educators frequently encounter obstacles pertaining to communication failures, ambiguous job expectations, logistical limitations, and insufficient training. These concerns substantially impact the quality of IEPs, particularly in resource-limited educational settings (Robinson, 2025).

Internationally, optimal methodologies in IEP formulation

<sup>1</sup> Cebu Technological University, Philippines

\* Corresponding author's e-mail: [gerguissheiff@gmail.com](mailto:gerguissheiff@gmail.com)

prioritize data-informed strategies, family-focused cooperation, and professional learning networks. Digital IEP systems and online applications are progressively utilized to enhance scheduling, documentation, and progress monitoring. However, in underdeveloped nations, constraints in digital infrastructure, substantial class sizes, and administrative challenges persist in obstructing the complete realization of these methodologies (Gordon, 2025). In the Philippines, although digital transformation is being implemented in specific places, the majority of Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) remain handwritten, and numerous meetings are conducted without established norms or standardized documentation. Furthermore, the responsibilities of special education teachers and general education instructors are not always well-defined in practice (ud Din, 2025). Special education teachers frequently have proficiency in adapting curriculum and managing behavior; yet, they may not have adequate time or resources to oversee all pupils on their caseloads. Conversely, general education teachers are required to apply adjustments but may feel inadequately prepared or uneducated on the student's particular learning requirements (Byrd & Alexander, 2020). This disconnection may lead to a discrepancy between IEP objectives and classroom methodologies, ultimately affecting student outcomes. The minimal involvement of parents in the IEP process exacerbates these difficulties. Although parents are officially acknowledged as equal stakeholders, many express feelings of exclusion or inadequacy in their ability to engage actively (Johnson, 2024). Factors include financial status, insufficient comprehension of technical terminology, and occupational limitations contribute to this marginalization. As a result, the student's home experiences may not consistently be incorporated into the educational planning process (Gorski, 2017). Notwithstanding these obstacles, educators exhibit resilience and adaptation in their efforts to address the varied requirements of learners. Numerous individuals depend on peer collaboration, affordable assistive technologies, and adaptable pedagogical approaches to address resource deficiencies (Mahmood *et al.*, 2025). Nonetheless, these individual endeavors often lack consistency and recognition, highlighting the need for more systematic and sustainable support frameworks. Existing research predominantly emphasizes IEP compliance or outcomes, while insufficiently addressing the lived realities of special education instructors, particularly in under-resourced environments. It is essential to have a deeper insight into how these educators manage the complexities of IEP formulation and execution, especially in partnership with general education teachers and parents. Their observations can provide essential assistance for refining IEP processes, augmenting communication, and fostering student achievement. This study examines the experiences of special education instructors in the development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), focusing on collaboration

with general education teachers and parents. It aims to identify the communication methods, implementation challenges, and adaptive strategies employed in real-world settings. This study hopes to influence educational policy, teacher training programs, and inclusive education practices, ensuring that IEPs are compliant, meaningful, actionable, and truly responsive to the needs of learners with disabilities.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The formulation and execution of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for children with Special Educational Needs (SEN) are based on both theoretical and empirical frameworks. This research is fundamentally based on three key theories: Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory, Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory, and Bruner's Constructivist Theory, which together delineate the collaborative, contextual, and individualized aspects of special education. Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory emphasizes the significance of social interaction in cognitive development. Learning transpires through dialogue and collaboration with more informed individuals teachers, parents, or peers corresponding closely with the collaborative development of IEPs. Vygotsky's notion of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) underscores the necessity of customizing teaching to align with a child's potential, which is the fundamental aim of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) (Tzuriel & Tzuriel, 2021; Lundgren, 2023). During IEP meetings, stakeholders connect a student's autonomous capabilities with their potential accomplishments when provided with suitable help.

Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory posits that a child's development is shaped by interconnected systems: the microsystem (e.g., school, family), mesosystem (interactions among these), and broader social structures (macrosystem) (Lin, 2017). In the execution of an IEP, it is crucial to consider both immediate classroom dynamics and overarching environmental elements, including school policies, cultural norms, and support systems. Effective IEPs comprehensively consider students' circumstances across various situations. Bruner's Constructivist Theory (1968) adds a pragmatic dimension by asserting that learning is an active process in which pupils construct knowledge based on prior experiences. IEPs are dynamic documents that facilitate discovery learning, differentiation, and student agency. Engaging students in goal-setting cultivates ownership and drive, which is particularly essential for neurodiverse learners (Judd, 2024). This view is reinforced by Mohammed and Agyemang (2025), who found that inclusive pedagogies require teachers to create dynamic, collaborative, and culturally responsive learning environments principles that directly resonate with constructivist and sociocultural foundations of IEPs. These beliefs are substantiated by legislative frameworks, including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 2004), which requires the provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education

(FAPE) via tailored programming. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA, 1990) enhances inclusive education by preventing discrimination, providing accessibility, and aligning with Bronfenbrenner's macrosystem framework. Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA, 2015) underscores evidence-based instruction and equitable access, highlighting the significance of IEPs in closing achievement disparities.

Empirical research substantiates the imperative of collaborative IEP formulation. Yales (2016) and McCoy *et al.* (2020) discovered that collaborative planning between special and general education instructors, supplemented by parental involvement, leads to more effective, student-centered strategies. Educators regard IEP collaboration as a form of professional development that enhances their understanding of inclusive teaching (Simon, 2017). Nonetheless, literature also exposes urgent challenges. Educators frequently encounter obstacles including insufficient time, restricted resources, and erratic assistance (Akinyi & Ezekiel, 2015; Love *et al.*, 2020). These impede the alignment of IEP objectives with classroom reality, resulting in diminished instructional quality and adverse student outcomes (AL-Kahtani, 2015). Rashid and Wong (2023) highlight deficiencies in teachers' evaluation knowledge and motivation, which directly impact IEP faithfulness.

In response to these issues, various remedies have been suggested. Professional development is crucial for providing educators with the legal, instructional, and technical skills required for IEP implementation (Senay & Sari, 2017; Valliere, 2023). Collaborative strategies, including co-teaching and organized team meetings, foster collective accountability and efficacy (Bethea, 2021; Elser, 2017). Technology improves IEP processes by enabling real-time updates, communication, and progress tracking (Siyam, 2018; Bates *et al.*, 2023). Digital platforms, such as adaptive learning tools and learning analytics, are essential for monitoring progress and modifying objectives based on real-time data (Athanatou, 2023; Layng, 2023). These innovations correspond with constructivist and ecological frameworks by individualizing support and adapting to the student's surroundings.

Empirical evidence from both international and local research reflects analogous problems. Olew-Nyunya (2018) and Allam & Martin (2021) observed that educational institutions frequently lack adequate instructional resources, stakeholder backing, and administrative coherence, leading to disjointed execution. Research from Indonesia (Asri *et al.*, 2022) and China (Fu *et al.*, 2018) similarly underscores systemic deficiencies, such as cultural dissonance, parental apathy, and inadequately prepared educators. Notwithstanding these challenges, focused teacher preparation and inclusive policy reforms have demonstrated encouraging outcomes in alleviating such barriers. Ultimately, engaging children in the IEP process, as illustrated by Adams (2022), can enhance outcomes, underscoring the significance of student voice and active participation an embodiment of

both Vygotsky's and Bruner's theories. The amalgamation of sociocultural, ecological, and constructivist theories supported by empirical evidence and legal requirements asserts that the IEP process must be collaborative, contextually informed, and adaptively sensitive to student needs. By overcoming implementation obstacles and advocating for evidence-based approaches, schools can cultivate inclusive education systems that are equitable and effective. Hence, this study is crafted to answer the following questions: 1. What are the participants' experiences in developing Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs) in collaboration with the parents and other stakeholders? 2. What experiences do the participants have in the implementation of IEPs? 3. What are the adjustments made by the participants while implementing the IEPs? 4. What challenges do the participants encounter in implementing and adjusting IEPs for students with SEN? And 5. What interventions have the participants formulated to resolve those challenges encountered in implementing and adjusting IEPs?

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study utilized a qualitative phenomenological methodology to investigate the lived experiences of general and special education instructors engaged in the development and execution of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for children with special educational needs (SEN). This strategy was chosen to obtain comprehensive insights into participants' opinions, obstacles, and strategies employed in IEP creation and modification. Ten educators were chosen by purposive sample due to their direct engagement in the IEP process. Data collection was performed via semi-structured interviews utilizing an instrument developed by the researcher, comprising five open-ended and five closed-ended questions. Participants willingly completed informed consent forms, and interviews were performed in person to promote comprehensive and thoughtful responses. The data collection procedure comprised three phases: initial coordination and authorization from school administration, the execution of interview sessions, and subsequent data organization. Thematic analysis was utilized to analyze the transcribed data. In accordance with Braun *et al.* (2022) six-step methodology, the researcher acquainted themselves with the data, developed preliminary codes, recognized emergent themes, reviewed and polished these themes, and ultimately delivered a coherent story that encapsulated participants' shared experiences. This investigation provided an enhanced comprehension of the collaborative practices, challenges, and successful strategies employed in IEP implementation. The findings were contextualized with pertinent literature to improve interpretation. The study's methodological rigor established the reliability and depth of the findings, providing vital insights into inclusive education and promoting more responsive, collaborative, and effective IEP processes in educational environments.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Participants' Experiences in Developing Individualized Educational Plans in Collaboration with the Parents and Other Stakeholders

### Theme 1: Collaborative Engagement and Communication Challenges

Team Collaborative engagement is central to the successful development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for learners with special educational needs (SEN). When teachers, parents, and other stakeholders work together, students benefit from diverse insights and targeted support. Participants in the study consistently emphasized the value of this collaboration, *yet also* highlighted communication-related difficulties that impede the process. For instance, several teachers noted issues such as stakeholder confusion, mismatched expectations, and limited understanding of the IEP process. As one teacher remarked, "Some parents hesitate to participate fully because they don't understand their rights or the IEP's purpose" (P12). Another noted, "Communication gaps are a common issue, especially when multiple people are involved with varying perspectives" (P8). These challenges can slow down or derail the IEP development, limiting its effectiveness and the learner's potential progress. Other educators emphasized the need for clearer role definitions and consistent dialogue: "We should ensure everyone understands their roles... more clarity and transparency are needed in our communication with stakeholders" (P10). These reflections echo the findings of Shore (2025), who argue that strong collaboration in special education hinges on transparency and shared understanding. Garbolino (2024) similarly stress the importance of structured communication frameworks to keep IEP teams aligned and student-centered. In the absence of these systems, initiatives become disjointed and impede responsiveness to student requirements. To ensure the efficacy of IEPs, educational institutions must cultivate trust, maintain continuous communication, and provide instruction for stakeholders. When these features are established, collaborative planning can thrive, yielding IEPs that are more integrated, actionable, and attuned to the child's distinct learning context. Enhancing these behaviors guarantees that all stakeholders, particularly general and special education instructors, are equipped to collaborate for improved outcomes for SEN learners.

### Theme 2: Value of Multidisciplinary Input

A recurring insight from participants was the essential role of multidisciplinary collaboration in developing effective Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for students with special educational needs (SEN). Teachers emphasized that input from professionals such as psychologists, therapists, social workers, and specialists creates a more holistic, student-centered plan. As one participant noted, "Working with many experts enables us to view the child as a whole, not just their academic

record" (P4). Others highlighted the benefit of aligning therapeutic and academic goals through coordination with speech and occupational therapists (P7), while social workers' involvement provided valuable context about home environments (P3). The integration of diverse skills addresses students' academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional requirements. Khan (2024) confirms that interdisciplinary collaboration improves the quality of educational planning and fosters student engagement. LaFrance *et al.* (2019) underscore that collaborative endeavors result in more uniform and efficacious therapies. Consequently, employing a multidisciplinary approach guarantees that IEPs are thorough, pragmatic, and attuned to each student's growth.

### Theme 3: Relationship Building and Trust

Trust emerged as a vital component in developing effective Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for students with special educational needs (SEN). Participants emphasized that building rapport among teachers, parents, and other stakeholders leads to more meaningful engagement: "Any successful IEP process is based on trust... Without it, teachers and parents may not feel free to express their actual worries or recommendations" (P2); "When parents trust that we are genuinely invested... they are more open and cooperative" (P6). Others noted that strong relationships create a safe space for sharing concerns, aligning goals, and responding flexibly to student needs (P5, P8, P12). Trust among professionals, too, "guarantees we cooperate easily without questioning each other's efforts" (P9). This aligns with Rahim (2025) and Badriyah *et al.* (2024), who argue that trust fosters collaborative problem-solving, reduces conflict, and ensures cohesive implementation. Ultimately, a foundation of trust supports shared accountability and strengthens the responsiveness of IEPs to student needs academically, socially, and emotionally.

## Participants' Experiences in the Implementation of Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs)

### Theme 1: Resource Constraints and Adaptability

Teachers implementing Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for students with special educational needs (SEN) face persistent resource challenges that hinder effective delivery. Participants cited limited instructional materials, lack of administrative support, and time constraints: "We have to make our own or locate substitute resources" (P1); "There's never enough time to fully implement the IEP goals" (P4); and "We often lack the support or tools to apply strategies even if we have an IEP" (P12). Despite these barriers, teachers adapt creatively modifying lessons, sourcing materials independently, and balancing general curriculum demands with specific accommodations. These findings corroborate Rashid and Wong's (2023) assertion that resource limitations affect IEP efficacy. Ologu (2020) and Park (2021) assert that the lack of assistive technologies and trained staff constrains the effectiveness of

IEPs. To achieve sustainable implementation, schools must guarantee equitable resource distribution, offer continuous teacher training, and establish systemic support to properly address the intricate needs of SEN learners.

### **Theme 2: Positive Impact on Student Learning**

Teachers emphasized that well-implemented IEPs positively influence academic and social growth among students with special educational needs (SEN). According to participants, customized strategies and consistent support lead to gains in confidence, participation, and learning outcomes: “Even those who struggled improved when we applied IEPs creatively” (P2); “Tailored lessons boosted confidence and class engagement” (P3); “Some students exceeded expectations through consistent IEP application” (P5); and “IEPs focused on interests make learning more engaging” (P9). These views resonate with Ametefe (2019) and Choi *et al.* (2020), who assert that personalized and creative methodologies promote comprehensive student development. Participants observed enhancements in conduct, peer interactions, and emotional development when IEPs were adjusted responsively. Liu and Wachira (2022) assert that tailored instruction and assistive technologies enhance the efficacy of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). These findings underscore the necessity of equipping educators with resources, autonomy, and professional development opportunities to innovatively modify IEPs, ensuring they stay pertinent, significant, and effective for each student’s educational experience.

### **Theme 3: Differentiated Instruction and Flexibility**

Participants underscored that differentiated instruction and teaching flexibility are essential in effectively implementing Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for students with special educational needs (SEN). By tailoring strategies to students’ learning styles visual, auditory, kinesthetic and modifying lessons in real-time, educators foster engagement and success: “We always adjust our teaching plans it’s active” (P1); “Sometimes we simplify tasks or use visuals” (P4); “We adapt daily to keep students progressing” (P5); and “Multiple approaches help students access content” (P8). These findings accord with the assertions of Ismajli and Imami-Morina (2018) and Landsman and Lewis (2023), who contend that differentiation fosters inclusiveness and enhances outcomes when educators are provided with sufficient training, resources, and planning time. Participants underscored that continual adaption is essential for meeting varied demands and tempo. These insights indicate that schools must offer professional development, assistive technologies, and adaptable curricular materials to enable instructors to implement differentiated instruction, thereby promoting equitable, student-centered learning environments for all students with special educational needs (SEN).

## **Participants’ Adjustments while Implementing the Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs)**

### **Theme 1: Continuous Monitoring and Adaptive Modifications**

Participants emphasized that ongoing monitoring and timely modifications are essential in delivering effective Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for students with special educational needs (SEN). Regular assessment and immediate adaptation allow the IEP to evolve with the learner: “We regularly check if goals are met or need adjusting” (P3); “Real-time changes are often necessary” (P4); and “Monitoring reveals needs not obvious at the start” (P6). Teachers highlighted the importance of flexibility in modifying goals, methods, and services based on student feedback and performance (P7, P9, P12). These results concur with Bryant *et al.* (2019) and Lynch (2024), who emphasize that data-driven adaptive modifications substantially enhance IEP efficacy. This indicates that educational institutions must to allocate resources towards digital assessment instruments and cultivate a culture of adaptability, guaranteeing that IEPs remain fluid. Enabling educators to implement informed, data-driven modifications ensures that IEPs correspond with kids’ present strengths and difficulties, fostering continuous academic and developmental advancement.

### **Theme 2: Use of Assistive Technology**

Teachers emphasized that assistive technology plays a pivotal role in implementing Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for students with special educational needs (SEN). These tools help overcome learning barriers and enhance participation: “Speech-to-text software lets students independently express their ideas” (P2); “reading apps help students with reading difficulties stay on pace” (P4); and “digital tools engage learners beyond traditional methods” (P5). Others noted improved engagement through adaptive devices like specialized keyboards (P7) and visual aids, interactive platforms, and mind-mapping tools (P9, P12). These technologies not only support academics but also foster communication and social skills, especially for students on the autism spectrum (P13). McNicholl *et al.* (2021) and Parlatore (2022) assert that assistive technologies improve IEP efficacy, diminish accessibility disparities, and foster inclusiveness. This necessitates that educational institutions allocate resources for teacher training, supply sufficient software and hardware, and deliver ongoing technical assistance. Through deliberate integration, assistive technology enables students with special educational needs to study autonomously, enhance self-assurance, and excel in inclusive educational settings, guaranteeing equitable access to educational opportunities for everyone.

### **Theme 3: Individualized Support and Scaffolding**

Providing individualized support and scaffolding was identified as a vital strategy in effectively implementing Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for students

with special educational needs (SEN). Teachers highlighted practices such as one-on-one instruction, tailored behavior interventions, and scaffolded tasks: “We break concepts into manageable parts during one-on-one sessions” (P1); “scaffolding with simpler tasks builds student confidence” (P3); and “visual timetables or positive reinforcement help manage behaviors” (P6). Others stressed modifications outside class time and guided instruction (P7, P8), while ongoing feedback and data-informed strategies ensure goals remain targeted and achievable (P10, P11). Personalized support also fosters trust, which encourages student engagement (P14). These findings complement the assertions of Bernard *et al.* (2019), who contend that organized support enhances comprehension, confidence, and the attainment of IEP goals. Ulfa (2020) asserts that scaffolding facilitates the transition of learners from dependence to autonomy. To maintain such support, educational institutions must offer sufficient training, behavioral management resources, and staff. Emphasizing this method facilitates inclusive and significant learning trajectories for students with special educational needs.

**Participants’ Encountered Challenges in Implementing and Adjusting IEPs for Students With SEN**

**Theme 1: Lack of Resources and Administrative Support**  
 A significant challenge revealed during the implementation and adjustment of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for students with special educational needs (SEN) was the persistent lack of resources and administrative support. Participants described facing barriers such as inadequate access to specialized personnel, insufficient instructional materials, and limited funding. These constraints not only diminish the quality of instruction but also place undue pressure on teachers to meet diverse student needs with limited tools. Teachers shared: “We often improvise due to a lack of materials, which compromises instruction quality” (P1); “The absence of specialized staff makes targeted interventions difficult” (P2); and “Funding gaps delay access to critical adaptive tools” (P5, P8). Others noted how inconsistent administrative backing leaves teachers to advocate for their needs alone (P7, P14). These findings support Omar (2018), who underscored the significance of leadership and financial backing in maintaining IEP implementation. Mason-Williams *et al.* (2020) emphasized the significance of administrative systems in reducing teacher workload and facilitating inclusive practices. Consequently, prioritizing financial resources, personnel, and adaptive leadership is essential for the efficient and equitable implementation of IEPs in educational environments.

**Theme 2: Managing Diverse Student Needs**

Managing the diverse needs of students emerged as a considerable challenge in implementing and adjusting Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) in inclusive classrooms. Participants highlighted the difficulty of

addressing multiple IEP goals within a single setting, especially when these needs conflicted or required contrasting instructional strategies. Teachers described the daily struggle to deliver individualized support while maintaining classroom cohesion. Teachers shared insights such as: “One student needs silence to focus, while another thrives with interaction” (P1), “Juggling varying disabilities and learning styles is mentally and emotionally draining” (P3), and “Preparing multiple lesson versions is time-consuming” (P7). These accounts reflect the strain placed on educators as they attempt to offer equitable support to all learners simultaneously. Love and Horn (2021) highlight that this intricacy is a prevalent issue in inclusive classrooms. Ismajli and Imami-Morina (2018) contend that although differentiated education is crucial, its effective implementation relies on sufficient time, planning, and resources. This suggests that educational institutions have to decrease student-to-teacher ratios, augment support personnel, and offer training in differentiated instruction to enable educators to adeptly address diverse needs in inclusive environments.

**Theme 3: Inconsistent Stakeholder Engagement**

Inconsistent stakeholder engagement emerged as a critical barrier to the effective implementation and revision of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for students with special educational needs (SEN). Participants emphasized that irregular communication and collaboration from parents, specialists, and administrators hindered the process of aligning IEPs with students’ evolving needs. This inconsistency disrupts the collaborative nature of IEP planning, delays interventions, and limits the delivery of tailored support. Teachers noted: “Parent absences during meetings make decision-making difficult” (P2), “Breakdowns in communication delay critical changes” (P3), and “The absence of specialists prevents effective coordination” (P5). Others shared how varying levels of parental involvement led to unequal input (P7), and frequent staff changes interrupted continuity (P10). Lack of agreement among stakeholders and missing follow-through weakened the application of IEPs (P11, P14). Snell-Rood *et al.* (2020) assert that continuous, proactive collaboration is crucial for the effectiveness of IEPs. Hollingworth *et al.* (2018) underscore that robust communication frameworks facilitate coherent IEP execution. Schools should therefore implement regular meeting schedules, designate case coordinators, and offer stakeholder training to enhance engagement and accountability, ensuring that IEPs are responsive and oriented on students.

**Participants’ Formulated Interventions to Resolve the Challenges Encountered in Implementing and Adjusting IEPs**

**Theme 1: Enhanced Collaboration and Communication Strategies**

Enhanced collaboration and communication strategies emerged as a key intervention in improving the

implementation and revision of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for students with special educational needs (SEN). Participants emphasized that maintaining open and frequent communication with parents, support staff, and other stakeholders fosters stronger alignment and shared accountability in meeting student needs. Teachers noted: “Regular meetings help align support strategies with parents” (P1), “Digital tools facilitate ongoing input and updates” (P3), and “Weekly summary emails keep everyone informed of progress and changes” (P5). Others found that brief stakeholder check-ins enhanced responsiveness (P7), while structured plans promoted consistent engagement (P9). Video calls were useful for remote participation (P11), and open communication built stronger collaboration and reduced misconceptions (P12, P14). Maggin *et al.* (2020) assert that effective communication among all stakeholders is essential for the success of IEPs. Siegel (2020) asserts that ongoing updates elucidate roles and reduce ambiguity. Educational institutions must provide educators with training in communication tools and procedures, establish regular feedback mechanisms, and appoint key contact individuals to enhance collaborative and responsive IEP environments.

### Theme 2: Professional Development and Training

Professional development and training emerged as essential interventions for addressing the challenges teachers face when implementing and modifying Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for students with special educational needs (SEN). Participants highlighted that targeted training enhanced their competence in differentiated instruction, behavior management, and assistive technology integration. Teachers shared, “Seminars on differentiated instruction gave us new approaches for varied student needs” (P2), while others emphasized that behavior management training “helped maintain a positive learning environment” (P3). Training on assistive tools “opened new ways to support engagement” (P6), and requests for IEP-specific sessions “provided practical strategies” (P8). Continuous learning kept them updated on best practices (P9), improved digital proficiency (P10), strengthened stakeholder collaboration (P13), and boosted their confidence in navigating classroom challenges (P14). Howe *et al.* (2018) assert that providing educators with continuous professional development improves special education results. Schools should prioritize consistent, focused training particularly in instructional differentiation, assistive technologies, and collaboration to cultivate a culture of growth. Such efforts empower educators and immediately enhance the efficacy, inclusivity, and adaptability of IEP implementation (Hammond & Moore, 2018).

### Theme 3: Leveraging Community and Peer Support

Leveraging community and peer support emerged as a pivotal intervention in enhancing the implementation and adjustment of Individualized Education Programs

(IEPs) for students with special educational needs (SEN). Participants emphasized that engaging with peer networks, support groups, and local organizations enabled them to share effective strategies, resources, and practical solutions. These connections fostered mutual learning and professional confidence. Teachers noted, “Peer networks help us exchange effective techniques from similar cases” (P1), while others valued support groups for offering guidance on common IEP challenges (P4). Community partnerships also provided “training sessions and extra support services” (P5, P7), including access to speech therapy and counseling (P12). Informal discussions and structured peer learning “refined methods and sparked creative solutions” (P14). These observations reinforce the findings of Lanning (2022) and McLoughlin *et al.* (2018) that collaborative environments and professional learning communities empower educators, mitigate isolation, and foster ongoing development. Schools ought to create consistent cooperation opportunities, mentorship initiatives, and alliances with area SEN organizations to enhance IEP execution. Establishing a culture grounded in peer and community support fosters a more responsive and successful educational experience for students with special educational needs.

### CONCLUSION

This study highlights the multifaceted nature of developing, implementing, and modifying Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for students with special educational needs (SEN). Participants found that while inclusive education is well-intentioned, its success depends on how schools foster cooperation, adaptability, and institutional support. Collaboration was key to IEP success. Communication issues, imprecise role definitions, and inconsistent stakeholder involvement sometimes hampered collaboration. Matching goals and co-owning execution required trust and meaningful ties between teachers, parents, and specialists. Teachers must adapt to changing demands despite limited time, resources, and administrative support. Teachers were innovative and devoted when designing lessons, monitoring progress, using assistive technology, and differentiating instruction. Individual efforts require institutional backing. Teachers gained confidence, improved instruction, and adapted to changing student profiles through professional development. Peer and community networks helped instructors share best practices and access services, reducing professional isolation and enhancing creativity. Not documentation or compliance, but a culture of support, shared accountability, and ongoing learning makes an IEP effective. Schools must prioritize teacher training, resource provision, stakeholder participation, and teamwork. They transform rigid mandates into flexible tools for SEN pupils’ unique needs. A well-implemented IEP shows a school’s dedication to equity, inclusiveness, and the belief that every child deserves a customized education.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, K. (2022). *Effects of actively involving students with IEPs in the progress monitoring process*. Northwestern College.
- Akinyi, L., & Ezekiel, J. O. (2015). *Challenges facing implementation of inclusive education in public secondary schools in Rongo Sub-County, Migori County, Kenya*.
- Al-Kahtani, M. A. (2015). *The individual education plan (IEP) process for students with intellectual disabilities in Saudi Arabia: Challenges and solutions* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Lincoln.
- Allam, F. C., & Martin, M. M. (2021). Issues and challenges in special education: A qualitative analysis from teacher's perspective. *Southeast Asia Early Childhood Journal*, 10(1), 37–49.
- Ametefe, R. K. (2019). *Teachers' experiences in teaching learners with special educational needs in public schools: A case of selected schools in Afadzato South District, Ghana* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Education, Winneba.
- Athanatou, M. (2023). *A data driven decision making plan based on DigCompOrg areas for improvement in a primary school in Greece*.
- Badriyah, N., Sulaeman, M. M., Wibowo, S. N., & Anggapratama, R. (2024). The role of constructive conflict management in fostering team collaboration and innovation: A perspective of transformational leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Administration and Management (ADMAN)*, 2(1), 402–408.
- Bates, J., Finlay, J., & O'Connor Bones, U. (2023). "Education cannot cease": The experiences of parents of primary age children (age 4–11) in Northern Ireland during school closures due to COVID-19. *Educational Review*, 75(4), 657–679.
- Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Schmid, R. F., Waddington, D. I., & Pickup, D. I. (2019). Twenty-first century adaptive teaching and individualized learning operationalized as specific blends of student-centered instructional events: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(1–2), e1056.
- Bethea, V. T. (2021). *Teachers' descriptions of collaboration in designing and evaluating individualized education program services* (Doctoral dissertation). Grand Canyon University.
- Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Hayfield, N. (2022). 'A starting point for your journey, not a map': Nikki Hayfield in conversation with Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke about thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 19(2), 424–445.
- Bryant, D. P., Bryant, B. R., & Smith, D. D. (2019). *Teaching students with special needs in inclusive classrooms*. Sage Publications.
- Byrd, D. R., & Alexander, M. (2020). Investigating special education teachers' knowledge and skills: Preparing general teacher preparation for professional development. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 4(2), 72–82.
- Choi, J. H., McCart, A. B., & Sailor, W. (2020). Achievement of students with IEPs and associated relationships with an inclusive MTSS framework. *The Journal of Special Education*, 54(3), 157–168.
- Elser, C. (2017). *The power of team in IEP meetings*.
- Garbolino, J. (2024). *Centering students in the IEP process: Perspectives of students and parents* (Doctoral dissertation). Georgian Court University.
- Gordon, E. (2025). *Rising tides lift all boats: Significant disproportionate identification of Latine students in the eligibility category of specific learning disability*.
- Gorski, P. C. (2017). *Reaching and teaching students in poverty: Strategies for erasing the opportunity gap*. Teachers College Press.
- Hammond, L., & Moore, W. M. (2018). Teachers taking up explicit instruction: The impact of a professional development and directive instructional coaching model. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(7), 110–133. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n7.7>
- Hollingworth, L., Olsen, D., Asikin-Garmager, A., & Winn, K. M. (2018). Initiating conversations and opening doors: How principals establish a positive building culture to sustain school improvement efforts. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(6), 1014–1034. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217717278>
- Howe, K. R., Boelé, A. L., & Miramontes, O. B. (2018). *The ethics of special education*. Teachers College Press.
- Ismajli, H., & Imami-Morina, I. (2018). Differentiated instruction: Understanding and applying interactive strategies to meet the needs of all the students. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(3), 207–218.
- Johnson, J. L. (2024). *Lack of parental involvement in special education: Knocking down the barriers*.
- Judd, D. M. (2024). *A school environment meeting the needs of the complex neurodiverse student* (Doctoral dissertation). Dallas Baptist University.
- Khan, A. (2024). Assessing the impact of interdisciplinary education on student engagement and achievement. *Frontiers in Interdisciplinary Educational Methodology*, 1(2), 44–50.
- LaFrance, D. L., Weiss, M. J., Kazemi, E., Gerenser, J., & Dobres, J. (2019). Multidisciplinary teaming: Enhancing collaboration through increased understanding. *Behavior Analysis in Practice*, 12(3), 709–726.
- Landsman, J., & Lewis, C. W. (Eds.). (2023). *White teachers/diverse classrooms: Creating inclusive schools, building on students' diversity, and providing true educational equity*. Taylor & Francis.
- Lanning, J. W. (2022). *Encouraging trust, collaboration, and best practices for co-teachers through a professional learning community*. Trident University International.
- Layng, E. (2023). *Digital journeys: A narrative inquiry into the experiences of third-grade through fifth-grade general education teachers implementing instructional technology in Northern California*.
- Lieberman, L. J., Houston-Wilson, C., & Grenier, M. (2024). *Strategies for inclusion: Physical education for everyone*.

- Human Kinetics.
- Lin, K. L. (2017). *Exploring children's lived experience of resilience in public preschools in Taiwan: The lens of Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory*. Griffith University.
- Liu, X., & Wachira, P. (Eds.). (2022). *Technology-supported interventions for students with special needs in the 21st century*. IGI Global.
- Love, A. M., Findley, J. A., Ruble, L. A., & McGrew, J. H. (2020). Teacher self-efficacy for teaching students with autism spectrum disorder: Associations with stress, teacher engagement, and student IEP outcomes following COMPASS consultation. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 35*(1), 47–54.
- Love, H. R., & Horn, E. (2021). Definition, context, quality: Current issues in research examining high-quality inclusive education. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 40*(4), 204–216.
- Lundgren, A. (2023). *The zone of proximal development and content area instruction for middle school English language learner students: A phenomenological study*.
- Lynch, D. (2024). *Exploring a tailored approach for coordinated early intervening services (Ceis) designed to address struggling general education students targeted for special education*.
- Maggin, D. M., Hughes, M. T., Passmore, A., Kumm, S., & Scaletta, M. (2020). School administrators' perspectives on special education teacher leadership. *Journal of Special Education Leadership, 33*(2), 82–94.
- Mahmood, A., Huang, X., & Rehman, N. (2025). The role of teachers and administrators in supporting the adaptation of students with special needs in mainstream high schools. *Quality Education for All, 2*(1), 35–54.
- Mason-Williams, L., Bettini, E., Peyton, D., Harvey, A., Rosenberg, M., & Sindelar, P. T. (2020). Rethinking shortages in special education: Making good on the promise of an equal opportunity for students with disabilities. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 43*(1), 45–62.
- McCoy, S., Shevlin, M., & Rose, R. (2020). Secondary school transition for students with special educational needs in Ireland. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 35*(2), 154–170.
- McLoughlin, C., Patel, K. D., O'Callaghan, T., & Reeves, S. (2018). The use of virtual communities of practice to improve interprofessional collaboration and education: Findings from an integrated review. *Journal of Interprofessional Care, 32*(2), 136–142.
- McNicholl, A., Casey, H., Desmond, D., & Gallagher, P. (2021). The impact of assistive technology use for students with disabilities in higher education: A systematic review. *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology, 16*(2), 130–143.
- Mohammed, A. S., & Agyemang, S. (2025). Inclusive pedagogies in environmental education and life-long learning: Teachers' sense-making perspectives. *American Journal of Education and Technology, 4*(2), 65–75.
- Olewe-Nyunya, A. (2018). *Evaluation of development and implementation of individualized educational program by teachers of learners with intellectual disabilities in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties, Kenya*. Kenyatta University.
- Olugu, F. (2020). Availability and utilization of assistive technology devices for improved teaching and learning among students with learning disabilities in Ohafia, Abia State. *African Journal of Education and Technology, 10*(2), 55–64.
- Omar, S. R. (2018). Implementation of inclusive education programme for special education need students with learning disabilities in Malaysia. *BITARA International Journal of Civilizational Studies and Human Sciences, 1*(4), 85–95.
- Park, R. (2021). *The A-to-Zs of IEPs: A brief glossary of special education for paraprofessionals*.
- Parlatore, V. L. (2022). *Inclusive or exclusive? Students' perceptions on how teachers and peers treat special educational needs students in general education classrooms*. University of Toronto.
- Philippine Statistics Authority. (2022, October 26). *Functional difficulty in the Philippines: Household population five years old and over* (2020 census of population and housing).
- Rahim, R. (2025). Building cohesive teams: Strategies for collaboration and trust. *Journal of Social Science and Management Studies, 1*(1), 1–9.
- 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). *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 22*(1), 15–34.
- Robinson, P. (2025). *Addressing assistive technology training needs for special education paraprofessionals in school districts in a south-central state*. Walden University.
- Salanguit, M. B., Santillan, M. D. C., Gregorio Jr., E. R., Estrada, C. A. M., Shibuya, F., Nishio, A., & Kobayashi, J. (2024). School health policies and their implementation during the COVID-19 pandemic in the Philippines. *Tropical Medicine and Health, 52*(1), 98.
- Şenay İlik, Ş., & Sarı, 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), 1507–1532.
- Shore, D. W. (2025). *Understanding the barriers to effective collaboration in special education programming*.
- Siegel, L. M. (2020). *The complete IEP guide: How to advocate for your special ed child*. Nolo.
- Simon, B. D. (2017). *Successful collaboration between general education and special education teachers: A case study*. Northcentral University.
- Siyam, N. (2018). *Special education teachers' perceptions on using technology for communication practices*.
- Snell-Rood, C., Ruble, L., Kleinert, H., McGrew, J. H., Adams, M., Rodgers, A., ... & Yu, Y. (2020). Stakeholder perspectives on transition planning, implementation, and outcomes for students with

- autism spectrum disorder. *Autism*, 24(5), 1164–1176.
- Thomas, B. (2024). Fostering general education teachers' awareness on inclusive education for students with special educational needs: A review study. *New Era International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Researches*, 9(24), 54–61.
- Tzuriel, D. (2021). The socio-cultural theory of Vygotsky: Mediated learning and cognitive modifiability. *Learning and Development*, 53, 53–66.
- ud Din, M. N. (2025). Individualized education programs (IEPs): Policy, practice, and progress. *ASSAJ*, 3(2), 242–259.
- Ulfa, M. (2020). *Examining teachers' role in motivating students' learning* (Doctoral dissertation). UIN Ar-Raniry.
- Valliere, J. M. (2023). *Integrating technological pedagogical content knowledge in special education preparation: A case study of teacher candidates*. Florida Gulf Coast University.
- Xu, Y., & Kuti, L. (2024). Accommodating students with exceptional needs by aligning classroom assessment with IEP goals. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 28(8), 1474–1487.
- Yales, J. (2016). *Creating and maintaining collaborative working relationships: Understanding parent perspectives of collaboration during individualized education program (IEP) meetings*.