

Documentation as a Management Mechanism for Individual Learning: A Case Study at Sekolah Alam Depok

Miranti¹, Abdul Rahman A. Ghani^{2*}

^{1,2*}Educational Administration Study Program University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka, Jakarta, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO:

ABSTRACT

*Correspondence Author:
rahman.ghani@uhamka.ac.id

Keyword:

Documentation
Management; Educational
Management; Inclusive
Education; Individualized
Learning Program; Special
Needs Center

Individualized learning requires schools to translate assessment information into coordinated plans, shared responsibilities, and follow-up actions. In Indonesian inclusive education, Program Pembelajaran Individual (PPI) provides a context-specific framework for organizing individualized learning. However, how PPI documentation is managed as an institutional information resource warrants further examination. This study examined the management of Individualized Learning Program (ILP) documentation as an education-management mechanism within the Special Needs Center (SNC) of Sekolah Alam Depok, Indonesia. A focused thematic analysis was conducted using qualitative data collected through semi-structured interviews, observations, and document analysis involving 13 participants: one school principal, one SNC coordinator, two SNC facilitators, three shadow teachers, and six parents. Data credibility was strengthened through triangulation across sources and techniques, comparison of interview accounts with observational and documentary evidence, and an audit trail of coding decisions. The findings indicate that PPI documentation contained information about learners' baseline abilities, individualized learning targets, strategies, responsible implementers, current abilities, and follow-up activities. The records provided a reference for planning, coordination, and monitoring individualized learning. However, although relevant information had been documented, the records were not yet systematically organized within an institutional repository that could be accessed for ongoing review and follow-up. Parents emphasized the importance of having their children's PPI documents and developmental records organized in an accessible folder to facilitate the review of progress and identification of further support needs. The study highlights the importance of managing PPI documentation as a structured institutional information resource to support coordination, monitoring, continuity, and informed decisions about individualized learning in inclusive education.

Abstrak

Pembelajaran individual mengharuskan sekolah menerjemahkan informasi hasil asesmen ke dalam rencana yang terkoordinasi, pembagian tanggung jawab yang jelas, dan tindak

Kata kunci:

Manajemen Dokumentasi;
Manajemen Pendidikan;
Pendidikan Inklusif;
Program Pembelajaran
Individual; Special Needs
Center

lanjut yang terarah. Dalam konteks pendidikan inklusif di Indonesia, Program Pembelajaran Individual (PPI) menyediakan kerangka kontekstual untuk mengorganisasi pembelajaran individual. Namun, pengelolaan dokumentasi PPI sebagai sumber informasi kelembagaan masih perlu dikaji lebih lanjut. Penelitian ini mengkaji pengelolaan dokumentasi Program Pembelajaran Individual (PPI) sebagai mekanisme manajemen pendidikan di Special Needs Center (SNC), Sekolah Alam Depok, Indonesia. Penelitian menggunakan analisis tematik terfokus dengan data kualitatif yang dikumpulkan melalui wawancara semi-terstruktur, observasi, dan analisis dokumen. Penelitian ini melibatkan 13 partisipan, yaitu satu kepala sekolah, satu koordinator SNC, dua fasilitator SNC, tiga guru pendamping (shadow teachers), dan enam orang tua. Kredibilitas data diperkuat melalui triangulasi sumber dan teknik, perbandingan informasi hasil wawancara dengan bukti observasi dan dokumentasi, serta penyusunan jejak audit atas keputusan pengodean data. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa dokumentasi PPI memuat informasi mengenai kemampuan awal peserta didik, target pembelajaran individual, strategi pembelajaran, pihak yang bertanggung jawab, kemampuan terkini, dan kegiatan tindak lanjut. Catatan tersebut menjadi acuan dalam perencanaan, koordinasi, dan pemantauan pembelajaran individual. Namun, meskipun informasi yang relevan telah didokumentasikan, catatan tersebut belum diorganisasi secara sistematis dalam suatu repositori kelembagaan yang dapat diakses untuk keperluan peninjauan dan tindak lanjut secara berkelanjutan. Orang tua menekankan pentingnya pengorganisasian dokumen PPI dan catatan perkembangan anak dalam folder yang mudah diakses, sehingga perkembangan anak dapat ditinjau dan kebutuhan dukungan lebih lanjut dapat diidentifikasi. Penelitian ini menegaskan pentingnya pengelolaan dokumentasi PPI sebagai sumber informasi kelembagaan yang terstruktur untuk mendukung koordinasi, pemantauan, kesinambungan layanan, dan pengambilan keputusan yang tepat dalam pembelajaran individual di lingkungan pendidikan inklusif.

How to Cite:

Miranti, M., & Ghani, AR.A., (2026). Documentation as a Management Mechanism for Individual Learning: A Case Study at Sekolah Alam Depok *Paedagogia: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(2), 399-422. <https://doi.org/10.24239/pdg.Vol15.Iss2.1493>

INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education requires schools to organize learning around learner diversity rather than treating individual differences as exceptions to a standard service structure. The challenge is particularly visible when students with special educational needs require adjustments in learning objectives, strategies, media, pacing, communication, or support. In such settings, inclusion is not achieved simply by placing students in the same educational environment. It also requires an organizational capacity to identify individual needs, translate those needs into

workable plans, coordinate the people responsible for implementation, and maintain information about progress over time. Recent research on inclusive education management in Indonesian schools shows that school-level structures, teacher collaboration, leadership, and the organization of support are important to sustaining inclusive practices.¹ These organizational dimensions make the management of individualized learning a relevant issue within education management.

In Indonesia, the Program Pembelajaran Individual (PPI) provides a context-specific mechanism for planning learning for students with special educational needs. The Ministry of Education's 2021 guide describes PPI as a planning resource that can be used in special schools and inclusive schools to help teachers formulate individualized learning according to learners' characteristics and needs.² In this article, the term Individualized Learning Program (ILP) is used as the English rendering of Program Pembelajaran Individual (PPI). The term does not claim that the Indonesian PPI is identical to the Individualized Education Program (IEP) used in other educational and legal systems. Rather, ILP is used to communicate the learning-program dimension of PPI while retaining the Indonesian program as the empirical object of the study.

A central feature of an individualized program is that assessment information should be converted into educational decisions. A useful program therefore needs more than a list of activities. It needs information about the learner's current abilities, priorities, intended targets, strategies or media, people responsible for implementation, and follow-up actions. The Indonesian PPI guide was developed precisely because teachers need practical support in designing individualized learning for students with special educational needs.³ Earlier scholarship on individualized programs similarly emphasizes the connection between assessment, goals, services, implementation, and review.⁴ From an education-management perspective, this means that the program is also an information structure: it gives different actors a shared reference for deciding what should be done, by whom, and on what basis.

Documentation becomes important at this point. When individualized plans are distributed across teachers, special education personnel, facilitators, administrators, and families, information must travel across roles and across time.

¹ R Husain dan H Hermanto, "Managing inclusive education in a primary school at UNG Laboratory Elementary School," *Journal of Educational Sciences* 10, no. 2 (2026): 2520–31, <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.2.p.2520-2531>; F A Yusuf dan L E W Fajari, "Empowering inclusive education: Management practices in pilot elementary schools for inclusion," *Educational Process: International Journal* 15 (2025): e2025098, <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.15.98>.

² F Arriani et al., *Panduan Penyusunan Program Pembelajaran Individual (PPI)* (Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi, 2021).

³ Arriani et al.

⁴ W H Blackwell dan Z S Rossetti, "The development of individualized education programs: Where have we been and where should we go now?," *SAGE Open* 4, no. 2 (2014): 1–15, <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014530411>.

Documentation can preserve decisions made during planning, make responsibilities visible, provide a basis for checking progress, and support communication when a student's needs or strategies change. Recent research on pedagogical documentation in inclusive settings found that systematic observation and documentation can influence educators' teaching practices and their efforts to individualize learning for children with disabilities.⁵ Research on IEP development has likewise identified data-driven documentation and transparent communication as important elements of professional-family interaction.⁶ Documentation therefore has a managerial function in addition to its administrative function.

The management problem is not merely whether a document exists. A school may possess individualized plans while still lacking a coherent documentation system. Documents can be created at one point in time but not consistently updated; information may be available to one educator but not easily accessible to other stakeholders; responsibilities may be understood informally without being recorded; and progress information may remain dispersed across separate notes or reports. Such conditions create a distinction between documentation as an artifact and documentation as a management mechanism. The latter requires routines for creating, using, reviewing, communicating, and updating information.

This distinction is consistent with findings from research on individualized programs. Studies have documented the role of individualized programs in inclusive learning, differentiated instruction, and learner support.⁷ Research has also identified challenges related to teacher competence, collaboration, and the practical implementation of individualized plans.⁸ International work has further shown that IEP quality can vary in the extent to which identified needs are translated into corresponding goals and planning

⁵ D M Sills-Busio, "Early educators' perspective and experience using pedagogical documentation to support individualizing for children with disabilities in inclusive settings," *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education* 43, no. 2 (2022): 265–90, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10901027.2021.1895383>.

⁶ K H Yeager et al., "Parent perceptions of interactions with professionals that improve individualized education program development," *Journal of the American Academy of Special Education Professionals* 19, no. 1 (2024): 154–68, <https://doi.org/10.64546/jaasep.545>.

⁷ H Hibana, "Individual learning program as implementation of inclusive education in Integrated PAUD Mutiara Yogyakarta," *QALAMUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, dan Agama* 15, no. 1 (2023): 155–66, <https://doi.org/10.37680/qalamuna.v15i1.2338>; A Mardiana et al., "Implementasi program pembelajaran individual siswa tunagrahita kelas inklusi," *SITTAH: Journal of Primary Education* 1, no. 2 (2020): 203–17, <https://doi.org/10.30762/sittah.v1i2.2491>.

⁸ İ Kozikoğlu dan E N Albayrak, "Teachers' attitudes and the challenges they experience concerning individualized education program (IEP): A mixed method study," *Participatory Educational Research* 9, no. 1 (2022): 98–115, <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.22.6.9.1>.

content.⁹ These studies make clear that individualized programs are organizationally consequential, but much of the literature remains focused on implementation, instructional practice, program quality, or outcomes rather than on the management of documentation as a specific organizational mechanism.

The management perspective is especially relevant because individualized learning is inherently distributed. A student may be supported by a special education teacher, classroom teacher, facilitator, school leader, psychologist or therapist, and family. Interdisciplinary collaboration requires participants to share professional responsibilities and coordinate instructional decisions.¹⁰ School administrators also have a role in supporting teams, documenting processes, and monitoring individualized program activities.¹¹ In inclusive schools, collaboration is similarly linked to the capacity of teachers and other actors to connect their work around individual learners. Consequently, documentation can be understood as an organizational infrastructure that makes distributed work more visible and more continuous.

Previous studies in Indonesia have examined inclusive education management and the implementation of individualized learning programs from complementary perspectives. Yusuf and Fajari (2025) investigated inclusive education management across two pilot elementary schools, covering areas such as curriculum, student affairs, financing, personnel, community relations, facilities, and special services. Their study provides a broad account of school-level management practices, with documentation serving as one of the data collection methods.¹² Similarly, Husain and Hermanto (2026) examined how planning, organizing, implementation, and supervision were carried out in an inclusive primary school, highlighting student needs identification, collaborative role allocation, adaptive learning, and parental involvement.¹³ At the program level, Hibana (2023) explored the implementation of the Individual Learning Program (PPI) in an integrated early childhood education setting, identifying planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up as key components and emphasizing parental participation. Together, these studies contribute to understanding the management of inclusive education and the implementation of individualized learning. However, their primary analytical focus is on school

⁹ J A Findley, L A Ruble, dan J H McGrew, "Individualized education program quality for transition age students with autism," *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders* 91 (2022): 101900, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2021.101900>.

¹⁰ S Dillon et al., "Improving special education service delivery through interdisciplinary collaboration," *TEACHING Exceptional Children* 54, no. 1 (2021): 36–43, <https://doi.org/10.1177/00400599211029671>.

¹¹ K Strunk, A R Hinkle, dan M L Thurlow, "Supporting IEP team decisions," *Journal of Special Education Leadership* 35, no. 2 (2022): 73–85.

¹² Yusuf dan Fajari, "Empowering inclusive education: Management practices in pilot elementary schools for inclusion."

¹³ Husain dan Hermanto, "Managing inclusive education in a primary school at UNG Laboratory Elementary School."

management practices or PPI implementation, rather than on how information recorded in PPI documents is systematically organized and managed as an institutional resource.¹⁴ The present study addresses this more specific issue by examining PPI documentation management at the Special Needs Center (SNC) of Sekolah Alam Depok, Indonesia. Unlike studies that primarily analyze school-wide management functions or the stages of PPI implementation, this study focuses on the information contained in PPI records and the organizational arrangements through which that information can support planning, coordination, monitoring, and continuity of support. Using semi-structured interviews with 13 participants—one school principal, one SNC coordinator, two SNC facilitators, three shadow teachers, and six parents—alongside observations and document analysis, the study distinguishes between the presence of relevant information in individual records and the systematic organization of those records within an accessible institutional repository. The findings show that key information about learners' abilities, learning targets, strategies, responsibilities, and follow-up activities had been documented, while systematic storage and organization remained a challenge. This study therefore contributes an institution-level perspective on PPI documentation management, identifying the organization and accessibility of documented information as practical concerns for strengthening coordination and ongoing review of learners' individual support needs.

The Special Needs Center (SNC) at Sekolah Alam Depok provides a relevant case for examining this question. The SNC operates as a support unit within an inclusive school environment and involves multiple actors in individualized services. In the underlying qualitative study, assessment information was used to identify individual needs, and PPI-related records included baseline abilities, learning targets, learning media or strategies, responsible implementers, current abilities, and follow-up activities. The empirical material also showed that individualized activities involved school personnel and parents and that progress was monitored through practice and follow-up. At the same time, the documentation system was described as available but not yet fully organized or systematized. This combination is analytically important: it allows documentation to be examined not as a missing component, but as an existing practice that has not yet been fully institutionalized.

The analytical focus can be represented as a management cycle: assessment information is translated into PPI documentation; documentation makes roles and responsibilities visible; shared documentation supports stakeholder coordination; recorded current abilities and follow-up activities

¹⁴ Hibana, "Individual learning program as implementation of inclusive education in Integrated PAUD Mutiara Yogyakarta"; G Faza dan R Fitrika, "Implementation of IEP (Individualized Educational Program) program in Indonesia: Literature analysis and implications for inclusive education," *Journal of Education Research* 5, no. 4 (2024): 5762–67, <https://doi.org/10.37985/jer.v5i4.1875>.

support monitoring; review of information provides a basis for adjusting the program; and revised information returns to the planning process. The cycle is not presented as a prescriptive model tested statistically. Rather, it is an interpretive framework developed from the empirical evidence to explain how documentation functions within individualized learning management.

Based on this focus, the study addresses three questions: (1) How is Individualized Learning Program documentation managed within inclusive education services? (2) How does PPI documentation support coordination and continuity among educational stakeholders? and (3) What management challenges affect the sustainability of PPI documentation in inclusive education services? The objective is to describe and interpret the managerial role of individualized learning documentation and to identify organizational conditions that influence its continuity. The article contributes a focused management perspective by positioning documentation not merely as administrative evidence, but as an information mechanism connecting planning, coordination, monitoring, communication, and program adjustment.

METHODS

This study employed a qualitative approach using focused secondary analysis of selected data from an existing qualitative research dataset. The data originated from a study of Individualized Education Program (IEP), known in Indonesia as Program Pembelajaran Individual (PPI), implementation at the Special Needs Center (SNC) of Sekolah Alam Depok, Indonesia, previously reported by Miranti, Ghani, and Al Jufri (2026). Rather than reusing the entire original dataset, this article re-examined selected interview transcripts, observation records, and PPI-related documents to address distinct research questions concerning the management of PPI documentation. This approach enabled the existing qualitative evidence to be examined from a documentation-management perspective without presenting it as newly collected data.

Sekolah Alam Depok was purposively selected because it has a relatively comprehensive support structure for students with special educational needs. Its services include a psychologist, facilitators with educational backgrounds in special education, a dedicated SNC, school-based classroom learning, and trained shadow teachers. Although the shadow teachers are not necessarily therapists or graduates of special education programs, they receive training to support students' individualized learning needs. The school also collaborates with Binar Harmoni, a therapy service provider located on the school premises, to which students requiring therapy are referred. The coexistence of psychological assessment, specialized educational support, classroom-based assistance, and therapy services makes the site relevant for examining how information about students' needs is documented and managed across assessment, individualized planning, educational support, and stakeholder coordination.

The researcher was directly involved in the original qualitative data-collection process and served as the primary instrument in conducting interviews, observing individualized learning practices, and reviewing relevant documents. For the present study, the researcher re-examined selected portions of the existing dataset, focusing specifically on PPI documentation management. Because the researcher was familiar with the research setting and had participated in the original data collection, reflexivity was important in distinguishing interpretations grounded in the available evidence from assumptions based on prior familiarity with the site. The analysis therefore focused on the content of the selected interviews, observation records, and documents, with interpretations compared across available sources where relevant. Claims were limited to the evidence contained in the selected dataset.

Participants in the original study were selected purposively based on their direct involvement in, or knowledge of, individualized educational services and related coordination at Sekolah Alam Depok. The original sample comprised 13 participants: one school principal, one SNC coordinator, two SNC facilitators, three shadow teachers, and six parents of students with special educational needs.

For the present focused secondary analysis, data from 12 participants across four categories were re-examined: one SNC coordinator, two SNC facilitators, three shadow teachers, and six parents. Data from the school principal were not included in the present analysis. These four groups were relevant to the research questions because they provided perspectives on the coordination, implementation, individualized support, and family communication associated with PPI documentation. Data selection was guided by their relevance to documentation management, particularly the preparation and use of individualized plans, coordination among stakeholders, monitoring of student progress, and communication with families. Thus, the analytical sample was defined by the relevance of the available data to the present research questions rather than by an intention to reproduce the full scope of the original study.

Three types of qualitative sources were used: semi-structured interview transcripts, observation records, and relevant documents. The interviews explored how individualized learning was planned, how responsibilities were distributed, how stakeholders communicated, how progress was monitored, and how documentation was used or maintained. Questions addressed the SNC coordinator's role in coordinating services, facilitators' and shadow teachers' experiences of implementing and monitoring individualized activities, and parents' involvement in supporting learning and receiving information about their children's progress. The interview data were examined not only to identify participants' accounts of documentation but also to understand the management processes associated with it.

Observation records focused primarily on students' learning activities, including individualized learning tasks, adult guidance, the use of available learning media, student participation, and monitoring during activities. These

observations provided contextual information about how individualized support was implemented in practice. However, the observations were not designed to directly examine whether PPI documents were consulted during instructional planning or classroom activities. The reported practice of sharing daily updates through a Telegram group provided context regarding routine communication among relevant stakeholders. Nevertheless, the transmission of a report was not treated as direct evidence that each shadow teacher had read or actively consulted a PPI document during learning activities. Accordingly, observation records were used to contextualize individualized support, while claims about documentation management were grounded in the relevant interview and documentary evidence.

Document analysis focused on available PPI documents, psychological assessment information, other student assessment information, and child development records included in the selected dataset. These materials were examined based on their relevance to the management of individualized learning information. The analysis focused on how information about students' assessed needs was connected to individualized learning targets, learning strategies or media, responsible implementers, records of current abilities, and follow-up activities at school and at home. Particular attention was given to whether the available records provided traceable links between assessment information, individualized planning, progress monitoring, and follow-up. The documents were treated as qualitative evidence of documentation practices rather than as instruments for scoring program quality.

The number and date range of the documents had not been systematically recorded; therefore, these details could not be specified precisely. The analysis was consequently limited to the available documents and the information they contained. No claims were made that the reviewed materials represented the complete documentation history of every student or the entirety of the school's PPI records across multiple academic years.

The analysis followed a focused thematic procedure directed specifically at PPI documentation management. First, the researcher repeatedly reviewed the selected interview transcripts, observation records, and relevant documents to identify information related to documentation practices. Second, initial codes were assigned to relevant data segments, including assessment-to-plan translation, target setting, identification of responsible implementers, coordination, progress recording, follow-up, communication, review, and system limitations. Third, related codes were grouped into broader categories. Fourth, the categories were compared across the available interview, observation, and documentary sources to identify convergence and divergence. Fifth, the categories were organized into an interpretive account of documentation management.

This process produced four themes: documentation as a planning instrument; documentation as a coordination mechanism; documentation for monitoring and continuity; and institutional challenges in documentation management. The analysis focused on how PPI information was recorded,

organized, communicated, and maintained, rather than evaluating overall program implementation through the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) framework. Observation records were used to contextualize individualized learning practices, while interpretations concerning documentation management were based on relevant interview accounts and documentary evidence.

Credibility was supported through comparison across the available data sources and techniques. Interview accounts were not treated as sufficient on their own; where relevant, they were compared with observation records and documentary evidence. For example, accounts concerning assigned responsibilities were considered alongside the identification of responsible implementers in PPI documents, while descriptions of monitoring were examined in relation to records of students' current abilities and follow-up activities. Because the available sources differed in their direct relevance to documentation management, the analysis distinguished contextual observations of learning activities from evidence specifically concerning the organization and use of documents.

An audit trail was maintained to document the analytical decisions made during the focused secondary analysis. The researcher repeatedly reviewed the selected materials, coded data segments related to PPI documentation management, and grouped related codes into categories and themes. Reasons for coding decisions and changes made during the development of codes and categories were recorded in written analytical notes. The researcher also maintained analytical memos and prepared a table linking each theme to relevant data excerpts or empirical sources. These records made it possible to trace how initial data segments were interpreted, grouped into categories, and developed into the final themes. This procedure supported the transparency and dependability of the analysis by documenting the connection between the selected qualitative evidence and the interpretations presented in this article.

All selected interview transcripts, observation records, and PPI-related documents used in the present article were available and were re-examined by the researcher. However, the analysis remained limited to selected materials from the original dataset. Information not captured in those materials could not be independently reconstructed, and the selected records did not necessarily represent the complete documentation history of every student. These limitations were considered when interpreting documentation practices, stakeholder coordination, and the longer-term organization of student records. Accordingly, the findings describe patterns identifiable in the selected dataset rather than providing a comprehensive audit of all PPI documentation maintained by the school.

The relationship between this article and the previous publication is explicitly acknowledged. Miranti, Ghani, and Al Jufri (2026) examined PPI implementation at the same site using the CIPP evaluation framework. In contrast, the present article focuses on the management of PPI documentation as

an organizational and informational process. Its analytical contribution concerns how information about students' assessed needs, learning targets, responsible implementers, current abilities, progress, and follow-up is recorded, communicated, and maintained. The selected data were re-examined using documentation-focused thematic coding rather than being organized around the CIPP framework. Thus, this article develops a distinct analytical account from a partially overlapping dataset without presenting the data as a new, independent empirical study. Its conclusions remain bounded by the selected materials available for reanalysis.

RESULT

The focused analysis of selected interview recapitulations, observation records, and PPI-related documents identified four themes: (1) documentation-informed planning, (2) coordination among people involved in individualized learning, (3) monitoring through observation and reference to previous evaluations, and (4) the continuing challenge of systematizing records. The themes are presented below with direct interview evidence. Because this was a focused secondary analysis, the findings are limited to the available selected materials rather than the entire original dataset.

Table 1. Themes, empirical evidence, and bounded interpretation.

Theme	Empirical evidence in the available materials	Finding supported by the evidence
Planning	Coordinator described parent interviews followed by psychological assessment, with results used to identify learning needs and formulate the PPI. PPI-related records and assessment/development information were included in the document review.	Planning was described as linking family information and assessment to individualized learning decisions.
Coordination	Facilitator described scheduled coordination; a shadow teacher described seeking guidance from the facilitator and communicating with facilitators and therapists.	Coordination occurred through scheduled meetings and ongoing role-based communication; the evidence does not establish that every interaction was documented in a shared system.
Monitoring	A shadow teacher described observing the child during play and using previous results as a reference. Interview recapulation	Observation and reference to earlier evaluation were reported, and digital file storage was reported. This does not by itself

	states that shadow teachers and facilitators stored implementation documents as PDF files.	establish a fully integrated longitudinal archive.
Systematization	Coordinator stated that written documents existed but had not yet been organized systematically and were still being improved.	The central challenge was not the absence of documentation, but its incomplete systematization.

Documentation as a planning instrument

Interview evidence indicates that planning was described as a sequence linking information from families, psychological assessment, and individualized learning decisions. The SNC coordinator explained: “First, we interview the parents, then the school psychologist conducts a structured assessment. We use the assessment results as a reference for identifying the child’s learning needs, and then these are written into the IEP/PPI” (SNC coordinator, interview recapitulation; translated by the authors). This account describes how assessment information was intended to inform planning; it does not, by itself, demonstrate that every assessment recommendation was consistently transferred into each PPI record.

The reviewed materials for this focused analysis included PPI-related records, psychological assessment information, other student assessment information, and child-development records. The available documentation was described as containing information about baseline abilities, learning targets, strategies or media, responsible implementers, current abilities, and follow-up activities. These elements provide a documentary basis for linking a learner’s starting point with planned support and subsequent review. The present analysis does not quantify the completeness of every record or establish that the same fields were consistently completed for all students.

The coordinator also described the role of parents in discussing the plan: “We ask parents to come to school to discuss the child’s IEP with me and the psychologist. There, we explain the child’s IEP to the parents” (SNC coordinator, interview recapitulation; translated by the authors). A parent’s response to whether they were involved in the evaluation was: “Of course, I was involved” (parent, interview recapitulation; translated by the authors). Together, these accounts support the finding that family involvement was reported as part of the planning and review process. They do not establish that every family participated in the same way or at every stage. Taken together, the interview and document evidence suggests that PPI planning was understood as a process that connects information about the child with individualized learning decisions. The management significance lies in the intended connection between assessment, targets, strategies, and follow-up.

The management value of this process can be seen in the relationship among three types of information: where the learner is, where the learner is expected to move, and what actions are assigned to support that movement. Baseline information describes the starting point. Learning targets define the intended direction. Strategies, media, responsible persons, and follow-up activities provide the operational bridge between the two.¹⁵ Documentation therefore creates a common reference that can be used by people who may not have participated in the original assessment. This is particularly important in inclusive settings, where individualized support is distributed across several roles.

This interpretation also corresponds with research showing that individualized programs should connect identified needs with meaningful goals. Findley et al. found variation in the quality of IEP content, including cases in which identified areas of need were not consistently connected to corresponding goals.¹⁶ Although the present study does not assess the quality of goals statistically, the case evidence demonstrates why the connection among baseline information, targets, strategies, and current abilities matters organizationally. When these elements are recorded together, educators can see the logic of the plan and use the same information when deciding what to do next.

The planning function also has implications for accountability. In individualized learning, accountability should not be reduced to asking whether a teacher completed an activity. The more useful question is whether the activity is connected to an identified need and intended target. A document that records the responsible implementer makes this relationship more visible. It enables the school to trace who is expected to support a particular activity and how that activity relates to the learner's plan. In this sense, PPI documentation creates informational accountability without turning individualized learning into a purely bureaucratic process.

The evidence also indicates that the planning process was not isolated from families. Parents were among the stakeholders involved in individualized services, and follow-up activities could extend into the home. This reinforces the importance of documenting information in a form that can support shared understanding across school and home. Yeager et al. found that parents' perceptions of effective IEP development included proactive communication and data-driven documentation. The present case is compatible with that finding, although the empirical focus is different: rather than examining parents' perceptions as a separate outcome, the analysis shows how documentation can provide a concrete reference for shared planning.¹⁷

¹⁵ C R Aulia dan H Hermanto, "Co-teaching level of regular teachers and special supervisory teachers in elementary schools providing inclusive education in Padang City," *Journal of Educational Sciences* 10, no. 3 (2026): 383–91, <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.3.p.383-391>.

¹⁶ Findley, Ruble, dan McGrew, "Individualized education program quality for transition age students with autism."

¹⁷ Yeager et al., "Parent perceptions of interactions with professionals that improve individualized education program development."

Documentation and coordination among actors

The interview materials describe coordination among the SNC facilitator, shadow teachers, psychologist, therapists, and parents. One SNC facilitator explained the schedule: “For the SNC division, coordination is on Monday. All divisions coordinate with the foundation supervisor every Thursday” (SNC facilitator, interview recapitulation; translated by the authors). This account provides evidence of scheduled coordination, although it does not show that all decisions made during these meetings were recorded in a shared documentation system.

A shadow teacher described the facilitator’s role in guiding individualized learning: “For each learning program, the reference remains the facilitator. I ask the facilitator for time after snack time to conduct individual learning” (shadow teacher, interview recapitulation; translated by the authors). The same interview recapitulation records that communication took place among the facilitator, shadow teacher, and therapist, and that therapists could provide suggestions about learning media. These accounts indicate role-based consultation around learning activities.

Communication with parents was also described as regular but adapted to family preferences. A shadow teacher stated: “Communication takes place every day, with consistent updates, focusing on emotional and social development. The communication arrangement depends on what the parents request; some need a daily report and others do not” (shadow teacher, interview recapitulation; translated by the authors). This is evidence of reported communication practice, not proof that each daily update was stored in or linked to the formal PPI documentation.

The evidence therefore supports a bounded finding: coordination was reported through scheduled meetings and ongoing communication among relevant actors. PPI documentation may provide a common reference for that coordination, but the available materials do not establish that all coordination activities were consistently captured in one integrated record

The distribution of responsibilities documented in the PPI also illustrates the organizational character of individualized learning. When a document identifies responsible implementers, the program moves from a general intention to a set of role-linked actions. This does not mean that responsibilities become rigid. Individualized learning often requires educators to adapt strategies according to the student's response.¹⁸ However, a baseline allocation of responsibility makes adaptation easier to coordinate because participants can see who is expected to act, who needs to communicate, and where follow-up belongs.

The finding is supported by research on interdisciplinary collaboration in special education. Dillon et al. emphasized that effective individualized service

¹⁸ M Fathinnaufal dan B Pamungkas, “Implementation of inclusive education at Sangkulirang Elementary School 006 East Kutai,” *Journal of Educational Sciences* 9, no. 5 (2025): 4608–19, <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.5.p.4608-4619>.

delivery depends on professionals sharing responsibilities and collaborating around instructional design.¹⁹ Collaboration therefore requires more than goodwill; it requires structures that allow professional knowledge to be connected. PPI documentation can be one such structure because it places different contributions within a common learning plan.

The same issue appears in school-level inclusive education management. Yusuf and Fajari showed that inclusive education management involves organizational practices rather than isolated classroom techniques.²⁰ Husain and Hermanto similarly examined inclusive education as a management issue at school level.²¹ The present study narrows that broader management discussion to the informational infrastructure of individualized learning. Rather than asking whether the school has inclusive policies in general, it asks how information about one learner is organized so that several actors can coordinate their work.

The coordination function is particularly relevant to the relationship between school and home. The reviewed documentation included follow up activities included follow up activities at school and at home. The parent interview provided a complementary perspective on communication and follow-up related to the child's individualized learning program (PPI). The parent described communication with the school positively, stating that communication between the school and parents was "very good" (translated by the authors). The parent also confirmed being involved in the evaluation of the child's PPI. Regarding development at home, the parent reported progress in self-care skills when the child was given clear instructions (translated by the authors). These accounts indicate that parent involvement and communication were part of the service experience and that the parent observed changes in the child's daily functioning. However, the available interview data do not establish in detail how specific PPI information was communicated, how the parent interpreted individual learning targets, or whether particular home activities were explicitly agreed upon with the school. Therefore, the findings support the presence of parent-school communication and reported home-based progress, but do not establish a systematic process for transferring PPI targets into home-based follow-up.

This indicates that the individualized program could extend beyond the immediate classroom. From a management perspective, such continuity requires shared information. Parents need to know what is being practiced and why; educators need to understand what is reinforced outside school; and the school needs a way to connect observations from different environments.

¹⁹ Dillon et al., "Improving special education service delivery through interdisciplinary collaboration."

²⁰ Yusuf dan Fajari, "Empowering inclusive education: Management practices in pilot elementary schools for inclusion."

²¹ Husain dan Hermanto, "Managing inclusive education in a primary school at UNG Laboratory Elementary School."

Documentation cannot solve all communication problems, but it can provide a stable reference around which communication occurs.

This interpretation also clarifies why documentation should not be equated with paperwork. Paperwork becomes a burden when records are created without being used. Documentation becomes a management mechanism when the information recorded is actively used to coordinate action. The case demonstrates the potential for such use because the document contained operational information rather than only descriptive student profiles. It included targets, strategies, responsible implementers, current abilities, and follow-up activities. The management challenge is therefore to preserve this functional character while improving consistency and systematization.

Documentation for monitoring and continuity

The interview evidence indicates that monitoring included observation during activities and reference to previous evaluations. A shadow teacher explained: "Observation takes place while playing; gradually, I move farther away to monitor" (shadow teacher, interview recapitulation; translated by the authors). The same interview recapitulation records that the shadow teacher used earlier results as a reference and considered the child's previous developmental aspects when reviewing progress. These statements support the finding that observation and prior evaluation informed reported monitoring practices.

The interview recapitulation also states that implementation documents were stored by shadow teachers and facilitators as PDF files (shadow teacher, interview recapitulation; translated by the authors). This supports a limited claim about digital file storage. It does not establish whether the files were centrally archived, consistently named, routinely updated, or linked into a longitudinal record that could be followed from one school year to the next.

The coordinator's account clarifies the distinction between the existence of records and systematic management. The coordinator stated: "Written documents exist, but they have not yet been organized or systematized; we are still improving them" (SNC coordinator, interview recapitulation; translated by the authors). This is the clearest direct evidence of a systematization challenge. Accordingly, the finding is not that PPI documentation was absent, but that records and monitoring practices existed while the organization of documentation remained a work in progress.

These data suggest that observation and previous evaluation results were used as references in monitoring, while the continuity of records across time was not established as a fully integrated system. Research on pedagogical documentation supports this understanding. Sills-Busio found that documentation involving observation, analysis, and interpretation influenced educators' approaches to individualization and inclusion. Although that study was situated in early childhood settings and used a different form of documentation, the shared principle is that recorded evidence can shape subsequent educational

decisions.²² The present case shows a similar mechanism through PPI-related records: current abilities and follow-up information provide a basis for continuing or adjusting learning activities.

The monitoring function also relates to the quality of individualized programs. Findley et al. demonstrated that the content of IEPs can reveal gaps between identified needs and planned goals.²³ A management system that routinely reviews current abilities against planned targets can make such gaps more visible. Again, the present study does not claim that the SNC's PPI documentation was evaluated against a standardized quality index. The finding is narrower: the available documentation already contained the kinds of information that can support review, but the overall documentation system was not yet fully systematic.

The continuity issue becomes particularly important when individualized services involve several educators or when personnel change. If information remains in the memory of one facilitator or in scattered records, continuity is fragile. If key information is maintained in a shared and updated PPI record, the organization has a stronger basis for maintaining service consistency. This is one reason documentation should be understood as part of institutional capacity rather than merely individual teacher practice..

Challenges in systematizing documentation

The main challenge identified in the selected evidence was the gap between having written records and organizing them systematically. The coordinator's statement that documents existed but were "not yet organized or systematized" directly supports this finding. The interview recapulation also indicates that new shadow teachers received initial preparation: the coordinator reported that a new shadow teacher could receive training for approximately one month and that difficulties were discussed with the psychologist. A facilitator similarly reported that newly joined staff received training before undertaking their roles. These accounts show that initial preparation was reported; they do not establish the content, duration, or effectiveness of ongoing professional development across all staff.

The evidence points to a practical management issue: existing documentation and coordination practices had not yet been fully converted into a systematic documentation routine. The selected materials do not provide a complete inventory of records, a documented retention schedule, or a year-by-year archive audit. Claims about these specific system features should therefore be presented as potential areas for improvement rather than as observed deficiencies.

²² E Iryani, A Hufad, dan I Rusdiyani, "Efektivitas model pembelajaran inklusif terintegrasi model pembelajaran diferensiasi pada sekolah dasar inklusi," *Research and Development Journal of Education* 9, no. 2 (2023): 968–78, <https://doi.org/10.30998/rdje.v9i2.19505>.

²³ Findley, Ruble, dan McGrew, "Individualized education program quality for transition age students with autism."

Overall, the results indicate four linked features: assessment-informed planning was described by the coordinator; coordination was reported through scheduled meetings and role-based communication; monitoring was described through observation and reference to earlier evaluations; and the coordinator explicitly acknowledged that written records were not yet systematically organized. These findings provide the empirical basis for the management interpretation developed in the Discussion.

DISCUSSION

The findings distinguish operational documentation practices from a fully institutionalized documentation system. The interview evidence indicates that staff described assessment-informed planning, scheduled coordination, observation, and reference to previous evaluations. The coordinator's acknowledgment that written documents were not yet systematically organized, however, shows that the existence of records should not be equated with a fully integrated information-management system.

The first contribution of this focused analysis is to identify documentation as a link between assessment information and individualized learning decisions. The coordinator described a sequence beginning with interviews with parents, followed by psychological assessment, and then the use of assessment results to identify learning needs and formulate the PPI. The reviewed PPI-related materials also contained information associated with baseline abilities, targets, strategies or media, responsible implementers, current abilities, and follow-up. Together, these sources suggest that documentation can make the planning rationale visible. The available data do not establish that all records consistently connected every identified need with a corresponding target, so the claim should remain at the level of the reported process and the information present in reviewed materials.

The second contribution concerns coordination. Participants described scheduled SNC coordination and ongoing consultation between shadow teachers and facilitators, as well as communication involving therapists and parents. These accounts show that coordination was part of reported practice. They do not demonstrate that a single shared document captured all decisions, nor that every informal communication was entered into the PPI. Consequently, PPI documentation is best interpreted here as a potential coordinating reference whose institutional value depends on whether decisions and updates are recorded and made accessible to the relevant people. Educators who know a student well may compensate for incomplete records through memory, informal communication, and direct observation. However, a system should not rely entirely on such personal knowledge.²⁴ Institutional continuity is stronger when

²⁴ M Miranti, A R A Ghani, dan H Al Jufri, "Evaluation of Individualized Education Program implementation in Special Needs Center services at Sekolah Alam Depok," *Journal of Educational Sciences* 10, no. 9 (2026): 719–34, <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.9.p.719-734>.

essential information can survive staff transitions and remain understandable to other stakeholders.

The third contribution concerns monitoring and continuity. A shadow teacher described observing the child during play and using previous evaluation results as a reference. The interview recapulation also indicated that documents were stored as PDF files. These findings demonstrate reported monitoring practices and digital storage, but they do not establish a centralized, longitudinal archive or consistent review across school years. This distinction is important: digital storage is not necessarily equivalent to systematic information management. A record contributes to continuity only when it can be retrieved, interpreted, updated, and connected to later decisions. Kozikoğlu and Albayra identified challenges experienced by teachers in relation to IEPs, including issues that can affect practical implementation.²⁵ This suggests that documentation competence is part of broader professional competence in individualized education.

The fourth contribution is the distinction between practice capacity and system capacity. Practice capacity is reflected in participants' descriptions of planning, consultation, observation, and communication. System capacity concerns whether these practices are supported by shared procedures for creating, updating, storing, reviewing, and communicating records. The coordinator's statement that documents were available but not yet systematic suggests that system capacity was still developing. This is a bounded interpretation of one case, not a conclusion about inclusive schools generally.

For education managers, the implication is to strengthen the connection among existing records and practices rather than simply requiring more paperwork. Potential steps include agreeing on a minimum set of fields for each PPI, clarifying who updates each field, specifying when progress is reviewed, and establishing a consistent method for storing and retrieving revised records. These are recommendations derived from the findings, not practices that this analysis claims were already fully implemented.

The management cycle proposed from the case can be expressed as: assessment information → PPI planning → role allocation and coordination → observation and progress recording → review of documented information → adjustment of learning targets and strategies. This cycle is an analytical interpretation of the evidence, not a validated model. Its value is to make explicit the information links that managers may wish to strengthen.

The study has limitations. It is a focused secondary analysis of selected interview recapitulations, observation records, and PPI-related documents from one inclusive-school case. The selected interview materials represented an SNC coordinator, two facilitators, three shadow teachers, and six parents; the principal was not included in this focused reanalysis. The observations concerned

²⁵ Kozikoğlu dan Albayrak, "Teachers' attitudes and the challenges they experience concerning individualized education program (IEP): A mixed method study."

children's learning activities and should not be treated as direct observation that shadow teachers consulted PPI documents during every activity. The available materials also do not establish a complete document count or a systematic year-by-year archive. The findings should therefore be understood as case-specific and bounded by the evidence available.

Despite these limitations, the analysis highlights a management issue that can be examined in further studies: how schools move from the existence of individualized learning records to shared and sustainable documentation routines. Multi-site research could examine how responsibilities for updating records are allocated, how review schedules are implemented, and whether digital systems improve retrieval and continuity without imposing unnecessary administrative burdens.

The reviewed PPI included follow-up activities at school and at home, which provides a foundation for continuity. Yet school-home coordination requires communication practices that make information understandable and usable by families. Yeager et al. showed that parents value transparent communication and data-driven documentation in individualized program development.²⁶ In the present setting, strengthening documentation could therefore involve clarifying which information should be communicated to parents, how progress is recorded, and how parent observations can feed back into subsequent planning.

The contribution of this interpretation is to shift attention from documentation as a static administrative artifact to documentation as a process of organizational information management. This is particularly relevant to education management because the core problem in individualized learning is not only instructional differentiation. It is also the coordination of people, information, decisions, and time.

The interpretation is consistent with the broader literature on inclusive education management but adds a narrower level of analysis. Yusuf and Fajari²⁷ and Husain and Hermanto²⁸ address school-level management of inclusive education. Dillon et al. highlight interdisciplinary collaboration in individualized service delivery.²⁹ Yeager et al. emphasize communication and data-driven documentation in IEP development.³⁰ Sills-Busio demonstrates the role of documentation in supporting individualization. The present study brings these

²⁶ Yeager et al., "Parent perceptions of interactions with professionals that improve individualized education program development.

²⁷ Yusuf dan Fajari, "Empowering inclusive education: Management practices in pilot elementary schools for inclusion."

²⁸ Husain dan Hermanto, "Managing inclusive education in a primary school at UNG Laboratory Elementary School."

²⁹ Dillon et al., "Improving special education service delivery through interdisciplinary collaboration."

³⁰ Yeager et al., "Parent perceptions of interactions with professionals that improve individualized education program development.

concerns together around a specific Indonesian mechanism: PPI documentation.³¹

The case also illustrates an important distinction between practice capacity and system capacity. Practice capacity refers to what educators are able to do in daily work: assess needs, adapt activities, guide students, communicate with families, and monitor progress. System capacity refers to whether the organization has structures that make those practices consistent, shareable, reviewable, and sustainable. The evidence suggests that practice capacity was already visible, while system capacity for documentation was still developing. This explains how individualized services can function in practice while documentation remains an area for institutional strengthening.

This distinction has practical implications for education managers. Improving PPI documentation should not be approached as simply adding administrative requirements. Instead, managers can treat documentation as part of the school's coordination infrastructure. A manageable system could establish a core PPI record, clarify responsibility for updating each section, schedule review points, create a simple procedure for communicating changes, and ensure that relevant school-home follow-up is recorded. Such arrangements can reduce dependence on informal memory while preserving the flexibility of individualized learning.

The findings also suggest that management improvement should proceed incrementally. Because the school already had functional PPI-related records and practices, the priority is not to replace the existing system entirely. It is to connect existing pieces more consistently. For example, baseline assessment can be explicitly linked to targets; each target can be linked to a responsible implementer and strategy; current ability can be recorded using the same reference point; and follow-up can be linked to the next review. This creates traceability across the management cycle.

The case further shows why documentation quality should be understood relationally. A record is useful not because it contains many fields, but because its information is connected and used. A short record that clearly identifies the learner's current ability, target, strategy, responsible person, and next action may be more useful for coordination than a long form that is rarely reviewed. Therefore, the management principle emerging from the case is functional completeness rather than administrative volume.

Finally, the study contributes a caution concerning institutionalization. When documentation depends heavily on individual initiative, improvements can be uneven and difficult to sustain. Institutionalization does not mean eliminating professional judgment. Rather, it means creating enough shared structure that professional judgment is documented, communicated, and available to the team. In inclusive education, where learner needs are diverse and support is distributed,

³¹ Sills-Busio, "Early educators' perspective and experience using pedagogical documentation to support individualizing for children with disabilities in inclusive settings."

this balance between professional flexibility and organizational consistency is essential.

The central implication is that education management for individualized learning should pay attention to information flows as carefully as it pays attention to human resources and instructional practices. When PPI documentation is created, shared, reviewed, and updated as part of an integrated cycle, it can support institutional memory, clarify responsibilities, strengthen school-home coordination, and make individualized learning more sustainable. The challenge is therefore not to document more, but to manage essential information more coherently.

CONCLUSION

This study contributes to education management research by offering a case-based perspective on Individualized Learning Program (PPI) documentation as a link between individualized learning planning and organizational coordination in inclusive education. The findings indicate that PPI documentation can connect assessment information, learning targets, strategies, assigned responsibilities, progress monitoring, and follow-up activities. However, the case at the Special Needs Center of Sekolah Alam Depok also reveals a distinction between the availability of useful records and the establishment of a systematic documentation process. Although documentation and coordination practices were present, the overall system had not yet been fully organized and institutionalized. Based on these findings, the study proposes an interpretive management cycle linking assessment information, PPI planning, role allocation and coordination, progress monitoring, documentation review, and subsequent adjustments to learning plans. This cycle represents an analytical interpretation derived from a single case study; it is not a validated model and should not be assumed to be directly generalizable to inclusive schools. Its contribution lies in highlighting how documentation may connect instructional decisions with organizational processes and in identifying the management arrangements needed to strengthen that connection. Practically, education managers may consider establishing a manageable core structure for PPI documentation, clarifying responsibilities for updating records, scheduling regular reviews, and connecting school-home follow-up activities. These recommendations should be adapted to each school's organizational capacity and context. Further research involving multiple inclusive-school settings is needed to examine the applicability of the proposed interpretive cycle and to investigate how documentation practices can be developed into systematic, accessible, and sustainable organizational routines.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges Prof. Dr. Abdul Rahman A. Ghani, M.Pd., for his valuable guidance, thoughtful insights, constructive comments, and unwavering support throughout the research process. His expertise and academic

direction have significantly contributed to refining the conceptual framework and enhancing the overall quality of this study. The author also sincerely appreciates the support and assistance provided by all individuals and institutions involved in this research. Their encouragement, contributions, and cooperation, both directly and indirectly, have been essential to the completion of this study.

REFERENCES

- Arriani, F, F Hidayah, F Pramesti, E Adawiyah, S Wibowo, R Widiyanti, C Tulalessy, dan F Herawati. *Panduan Penyusunan Program Pembelajaran Individual (PPI)*. Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi, 2021.
- Aulia, C R, dan H Hermanto. "Co-teaching level of regular teachers and special supervisory teachers in elementary schools providing inclusive education in Padang City." *Journal of Educational Sciences* 10, no. 3 (2026): 383–91. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.3.p.383-391>.
- Blackwell, W H, dan Z S Rossetti. "The development of individualized education programs: Where have we been and where should we go now?" *SAGE Open* 4, no. 2 (2014): 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014530411>.
- Dillon, S, E Armstrong, L Goudy, H Reynolds, dan S Scurry. "Improving special education service delivery through interdisciplinary collaboration." *TEACHING Exceptional Children* 54, no. 1 (2021): 36–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00400599211029671>.
- Fathinnaufal, M, dan B Pamungkas. "Implementation of inclusive education at Sangkulirang Elementary School 006 East Kutai." *Journal of Educational Sciences* 9, no. 5 (2025): 4608–19. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.5.p.4608-4619>.
- Faza, G, dan R Fitrika. "Implementation of IEP (Individualized Educational Program) program in Indonesia: Literature analysis and implications for inclusive education." *Journal of Education Research* 5, no. 4 (2024): 5762–67. <https://doi.org/10.37985/jer.v5i4.1875>.
- Findley, J A, L A Ruble, dan J H McGrew. "Individualized education program quality for transition age students with autism." *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders* 91 (2022): 101900. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2021.101900>.
- Hibana, H. "Individual learning program as implementation of inclusive education in Integrated PAUD Mutiara Yogyakarta." *QALAMUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, dan Agama* 15, no. 1 (2023): 155–66. <https://doi.org/10.37680/qalamuna.v15i1.2338>.
- Husain, R, dan H Hermanto. "Managing inclusive education in a primary school at UNG Laboratory Elementary School." *Journal of Educational Sciences* 10, no. 2 (2026): 2520–31. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.2.p.2520-2531>.

- Iryani, E, A Hufad, dan I Rusdiyani. "Efektivitas model pembelajaran inklusif terintegrasi model pembelajaran diferensiasi pada sekolah dasar inklusi." *Research and Development Journal of Education* 9, no. 2 (2023): 968–78. <https://doi.org/10.30998/rdje.v9i2.19505>.
- Kozikoğlu, İ, dan E N Albayrak. "Teachers' attitudes and the challenges they experience concerning individualized education program (IEP): A mixed method study." *Participatory Educational Research* 9, no. 1 (2022): 98–115. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.22.6.9.1>.
- Mardiana, A, I Muzakki, S Sunaiyah, dan F Ifriqia. "Implementasi program pembelajaran individual siswa tunagrahita kelas inklusi." *SITTAH: Journal of Primary Education* 1, no. 2 (2020): 203–17. <https://doi.org/10.30762/sittah.v1i2.2491>.
- Miranti, M, A R A Ghani, dan H Al Jufri. "Evaluation of Individualized Education Program implementation in Special Needs Center services at Sekolah Alam Depok." *Journal of Educational Sciences* 10, no. 9 (2026): 719–34. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.9.p.719-734>.
- Sills-Busio, D M. "Early educators' perspective and experience using pedagogical documentation to support individualizing for children with disabilities in inclusive settings." *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education* 43, no. 2 (2022): 265–90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10901027.2021.1895383>.
- Strunk, K, A R Hinkle, dan M L Thurlow. "Supporting IEP team decisions." *Journal of Special Education Leadership* 35, no. 2 (2022): 73–85.
- Yeager, K H, M E Deardorff, B Choiseul-Praslin, W R Mitchell, C Tennell, dan B Beasley. "Parent perceptions of interactions with professionals that improve individualized education program development." *Journal of the American Academy of Special Education Professionals* 19, no. 1 (2024): 154–68. <https://doi.org/10.64546/jaasep.545>.
- Yusuf, F A, dan L E W Fajari. "Empowering inclusive education: Management practices in pilot elementary schools for inclusion." *Educational Process: International Journal* 15 (2025): e2025098. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.15.98>.