Šejla Bjelopoljak, PhD, Associate Professor
University of Bihać
Faculty of Education
bjelopoljaksejla@hotmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7731-2633

ASSESSING THE QUALITY OF TEACHERS' WORK WITH AN EMPHASIS ON INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Abstract: *The specificity of work in regular classes is certainly emphasized by the competencies of teachers to respond to the challenges of individualization of teaching and to provide an individual plan of progress in the educational process, depending on the planned support to the child. Teachers are often dissatisfied due to high expectations of themselves or the system, and there is no empirically based feedback on the quality of their work. In practice, there are also arguments at the expense of poor-quality work that teachers attach more importance to teaching content at the expense of the most important factor in the educational process - students. However, what if these facts do not apply to teachers who are child-oriented? Namely, the aim of the paper was to examine the quality of teachers' work in the process of creating individualized educational programs taking into account the challenges, working with students of different ages in the classroom and subject teaching. The results confirm that the teachers individualize educational programs in cases of support due to the developmental difficulties of children and that there is no statistically significant difference in work depending on the age of the children. This category of teachers is homogeneous. The results also confirm that it is unjustified to talk about the orientation to educational areas and only then to the student. Only 2.3% of teachers are impressed by the areas of socialization, literacy, mathematics and school skills when designing individualized educational programs. At the same time, this way of working speaks in favor of the teacher as the role model by which we can achieve the quality of upbringing and education for every child.*

Keywords: *adaptations, education, individualization, individual programs*

INTRODUCTION

The development of individualized educational programs is one of the phases of planning educational work, and it occurs when we realize that children do not have to learn everything on the same day and at the same time. In regard to the terminology used to name support programs of this type for students, it was noticed that the synonyms in question are only used by different but interdisciplinary related experts (pedagogues, psychologists, educational rehabilitators, teachers, etc.). The analysis of the content of the prominent abbreviations "IEP and IAP" observes the following: (1) individualized educational programs (IEP) include all components of the teaching process to match the knowledge, skills and abilities of students with planned achievable goals and activities that can be further enriched by adapting requirements and individualized procedures (Stančić & Ivančić, 2008; Kobetić, 2015). (2) The term individualized education program (IEP) is a "statement of a set of educational goals for students that are individual and contains a description of support services that students will achieve to achieve their education goals" (Kartika et al., 2018, p.1; Wilson et al., 2005, p. 2). (3) The Individual Adapted Program (IAP) is a major part of individual education planning and student progress monitoring and is a written document prepared for a specific student that specifies the learning goals to be achieved during the set period through teaching strategies, resources and support systems necessary to achieve these goals (Livazović,

2021). Each of these terms is essentially a metaphor for supporting a child's cognitive, psychomotor, and affective development, with an emphasis on adapting to the child's learning environment. In explaining the cognitive domain, it includes remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating and creating from the lowest to the highest levels of thinking; the psychomotor domain includes physical movement, coordination and performance of motor skills (from the simplest to the most complex behaviors: perception, readiness, guided response, automated response, complex operation, adaptation and creation; and the affective domain includes the way we deal with emotional aspects such as feelings, values, appreciation, enthusiasm, motivation, and attitudes (as cited in Krathwohl, 2002; Krathwohl et al., 1973).

Guided by the phrase that language shapes thought and then action, the paper uses the term individualized educational program - IEP. There are several reasons: it is applied in educational institutions, it draws attention to educational procedures, and not only to educational content that needs to be adjusted, the prefix - educational, indicates not only the content but also the relevant part of interaction and communication between adult and child the educational process is individualized. Backe (2015) points out that IEP is a didactic tool and that future research should pay more attention to how teachers and other professionals involved use didactic knowledge related to the work of IEP. Some researchers consider the quality of IEP to be a legal issue: Runde (2013) points out that limited or improper use of IEP violates the legal individual rights of students, and Kvam (2013) points out that IEP is a tool for ensuring the quality of personalized education.

Related to this is the realization that no two children are equal, which is why it is necessary to think about the individualization of teaching, which by its characteristics respects the individual characteristics, way, pace of learning and progress of the child. In addition, with the principle of differentiation of content, methods, activities... we adapt teaching (partially or completely) providing the child with personal space for development by focusing on creating space and supporting proximal development of the child (potential level in accordance with goals) in which it is clearly assessed current level of progress (Vigotski, 1986, as cited in Brajković, 2021). In principle, this means a pedagogical approach in creating a learning environment in which children have the opportunity to gain self-esteem, control and confidence in trying out new skills, without undue pressure or slowing down/accelerating the child's development.

Although different methods of IEP development are used in practice, they essentially correspond to the strategy of "nine ways of adaptation" (more in Deschenes et al., 1994; Hodžić, 2017; Kobetić, 2015). The application is simple and refers to all the procedures that teachers use to help the child achieve the set outcomes by adjusting: the amount of content, time required to complete the task, level of help/support, way of presenting content, difficulty of tasks, ways of expressing knowledge, level of participation class activities, a substitute goal if it differs from the goal set by the teaching unit and a substitute curriculum if the curriculum is used in connection with the curriculum that is more in line with the child's developmental abilities.

Livazović et al. (2021) additionally pay attention to the quality of planning the necessary adjustments and that it is basically: 1. Perceptual - the application of targeted, simple, clear, interesting teaching aids without unnecessary details. 2. Cognitive - the scope of summarizing texts, simplifying the content, adapting schematics, the way of transmitting content. 3. Spoken - expressiveness, intelligibility, pleasant intensity, appropriate speed of speech. 4. Interactive - creating a positive attitude, praise, motivation, appropriate involvement in the work, and individualization refers to 5. Development of independence - gradual provision of help and support in independent work of students. 6. Working time - in principle, extended (dyslexia, dysgraphia). 7. Method of work - individual assignment of tasks, use of tasks of different difficulty. 8. Manner of testing knowledge - how the test is performed, at what intervals, how many tasks. 9. Student activities in the classroom - planning more frequent changes of activities, participation in various forms of work (group, work in small groups).

Certainly, approaches and ways of expressing support may be different depending on the education strategy applied contextually in a given educational system. Nordahl and Overland (1997, p. 75) state that the Individual Education Plan should list important issues and principles related to individual needs of students and readiness to learn and should, based on the goals and decisions of the national curriculum, contain specific instructions covering the overall educational

situation students to such an extent that the plan is transparent for the critical examination of others and at the same time possible in practice. This implies that the essence of IEP development should answer some of the questions: why the program is developed and implemented, whether the actions and development of the program mean a response to the needs of the child, whether the educational outcomes are in synthesis with the educational goals and needs of the child, whether the achieved educational outcomes are clear information about progress the child, who is given such information, as understood by the child, parent and involved teachers, etc. This way of working could be a prerequisite for support and guidance at the right time of the child's development, which would certainly reduce the pressure of meeting expectations (teachers and children) and provide more enjoyment and fun in learning and teaching. Additionally, a quality partnership of all participants in the educational process would be based on objective and complete information on the development of learning and teaching as a clear guide in further planning and programming of the educational process and supporting the child's progress.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Problem/subject of research

Individualization of teaching and general planning of content that requires adaptation implies didactic-methodological and pedagogical-psychological competencies of teachers to meet these requirements. The OECD (2005) states that the notion of competencies does not only mean knowledge and skills. It also includes the ability to respond to complex demands by using and mobilizing psychological resources (including skills and attitudes) in a particular context based on an understanding of shared values. If we apply the mentioned conceptual framework of competencies (and a whole series is needed) to the practical example of a teacher in the classroom, it would mean that he can know the teaching contents but have difficulties transmitting and adapting the necessary information to students; can know the teaching contents and have developed skills in the process of transmitting information to students, but that the process does not follow his belief in the meaning of educational results or that his behavior does not support what was said, etc. Research conducted by Bjelopoljak and Midžić (2021) confirmed that in practice, the traditional way of working of teachers through a closed type of curriculum dominates even when it is not institutionally provided in favor of the lack of teaching competencies - such work is focused on teaching content, memorization and reproduction, thus putting the needs of students in the background. Previously, the results of the PISA test from 2018 speak in favor of the gap in achievement between students in general education and in vocational programs and the facts about the functional (ill) literacy of students (OECD, 2019). In this regard, in the absence of teacher competencies, the fear is justified that the teachers in the assessment of student support, and even during the development of IEP, may be more focused on teaching content, neglecting the needs of the child. It is also necessary to take into account the challenges faced by teachers, which can be generalized in the stages of IEP development. Kartika, Suminar, Hendriani (2018), in their research, point to the need to clarify the problems and limitations faced by teachers at each stage of IEP implementation. The recommendations state that it is necessary to contextually revise laws and educational policies when auditing the quality of education, reduce administrative requirements for teachers in the process of IEP development and support teaching competencies, especially in the case of more meaningful and functional use of appropriate technology. In this regard, the result is that teachers of IEP paperwork point out that it takes away 10% of their working time, which is why they perceive it as a burden but also indicators that in cases of lack of necessary competencies considered synonymous with just another administrative task whereby the process of applying IEP loses its meaning.

However, in practice, there are exceptions: teachers who follow different competencies in terms of competencies related to the application of individualized educational programs. The very way of planning and programming it is marked by the nature of the work in which we inevitably focus on the student starting from the initial assessment of the necessary support in which the abilities, the pace of the child's progress and the necessary support resources are learned (Livazović et al., 2021). In balancing the teaching content and the needs of the child, questions can

be helpful: "What is most important in the teaching unit in relation to which I want the child to understand, apply..." (whether teaching goals and educational outcomes are related to needs asking questions), how the child can achieve the intended outcomes, what needs to be ensured. Asking questions of this type can help the teacher to essentially connect the teaching content and the specific child ("establish a dialog"), thus balancing between teaching goals - related to the teaching content and educational outcomes - directly oriented to the child (as cited in Bjelopoljak & Midžić, 2021, p. 9). The paper is oriented toward examining the attitude of teachers toward the quality of individualized educational programs, taking into account the challenges they face, such as working with students of different ages, classrooms and subject teaching.

The aim of the research

Examine the quality of teachers' work in the process of developing individualized educational programs for children with regard to work in classroom and subject teaching.

Research tasks

➢ Examine teachers' perceptions of the importance of IEP with regard to the cognitive, psychomotor and affective domains in the fields of education (literacy, numeracy, school skills and socialization).
➢ Determine the priority order of IEP-s with regard to the cognitive, psychomotor and affective domains in the fields of education (literacy, numeracy, school skills and socialization).
➢ Examine the contribution of domains in educational areas to the orientation of teachers to teaching content in the development of IEP.
➢ Examine whether the focus of teachers' recommendations on improving the quality of support is administrative and logistical requirements or are child-oriented.

The main hypothesis

It is assumed that the teachers focused on the development of individualized educational programs starts from the needs of the child.

Auxiliary hypotheses

H1 Teachers believe that the development of IEP should be more focused on the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective domains in educational areas (literacy, mathematics, school skills and socialization).
H2 There is no statistically significant difference in the application of individualized educational programs for the areas of literacy, numeracy, socialization and school skills with regard to the work of teachers in class and/or subject teaching.
H3 Domains of educational areas determine the teacher's orientation to the teaching content when creating IEP.
H4 The teachers who make IEP-s have a child in the focus of improving their work.

Method of work

The implementation of empirical research was marked by a qualitative–quantitative paradigm. The first, through a descriptive method and theoretical analysis of content, served to understand the individualized way of working and the process of creating IEP in relation to the educational outcomes and needs of students. For the quantitative, he served the process of judging teachers' attitudes, and an e-Instrument for assessing child support was created to develop individualized educational programs (IEP). The initial calibration on a sample of 30 respondents

reached an internal agreement for the reliability of the Instrument on all subscales, so that in the second measurement on 88 subjects the Cronbach's alpha coefficient on the socialization subscale was 0.82, on the literacy subscale 0.93, on the mathematics subscale 0.89 and on the school skills subscale. Each of the listed dimensions of the subscale was assessed by a four-point agreement: if the offered statements refer to a specific child, you choose the answer 1 - yes; answer 2 you choose if the child can perform the described behavior with help (requires adult intervention); answer 3 you choose if the child cannot in any way do what is described in the statement. Answer 4 is chosen if you do not have information or do not process the area. Considering that the sample was random, the answer under 4 was predicted due to the possibility that the teacher had no experience in drafting the IEP, and he used the instrument. The introductory part of the instrument is based on providing data on the characteristics of the sample, then instructions on the use of statements, and the last part on the open type of giving opinions on improving the current process of individualized work based on combination with a questionnaire. Respondents' responses were analyzed using imported Excel instrument data in IBM SPSS Statistics 21, thus eliminating the possibility of data entry errors. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the characteristics of the sample and suggestions for improving the individualized mode of operation, and after determining the normality of the distribution on all subscales, the procedures of parametric statistics were determined. The arithmetic mean and standard deviation (M, s) were measured in the direction of concluding the theoretical range of teachers' attitudes on the application of IEP in classroom and subject teaching and for the relationship of teachers to the quality of IEP multiple regression analysis. The research is empirical, transversal in nature and includes a random sample of teachers employed in primary schools in the 2021 school year (teachers, professional associates, assistants), which is applied by the IEP. The statistical minimum determines the threshold of 66 respondents based on the independent variables used in the research, and when processing the data, the maximum number of respondents is N = 85.

The characteristics of the sample are described in Table 1.

Table 1

Structure of the teachers' sample

Teachers	Sample characteristics	*f (frequency)*	*% (percentage)*
Gender	Men	12	14.2
	Female	73	85.8
Work in primary school	Class teachers	62	71.6
	Subject teachers	23	28.4
I work on individualized educational programs for:	I grade	10	11.1
	II grade	9	10.0
	III grade	23	25.6
	IV grade	12	13.3
	V grade	8	8.9
	VI grade	8	8.9
	VII grade	6	6.7
	VIII grade	7	7.8
	IX grade	2	2.2

The sample included primary school level of education, teachers who create IEP: 62 (71.6%) teachers in classroom teaching and 23 (28.4%) in subject teaching. The sample was represented by more women (85.8%) than men (14.2%).

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF ACHIEVED RESULTS

Teachers' perception of the importance of IEP according to the domains of educational areas

Table 2

Orientation of teachers in the development of individualized educational programs

Respondents	N	Theoretical range	*Arithmetic mean (M)*	*Standard deviation (s)*	*Assessment of teachers*
Assessment of the expressed support of the teachers in order to socialize the child	88	18-31 32-45 46-59 60-72	35.92	8.61	2
Assessment of the expressed support of the teachers in order to educate the child	88	17-29 30-42 43-55 56-68	30.81	7.14	2
Assessment of the support shown to the child by the teachers in order to acquire mathematical skills	88	15-25.99 26.99-37.99 38.99-48.99 49.99-60	28.34	8.12	2
Assessment of the expressed support of the teachers in order to develop skills	88	15-25.99 26.99-37.99 38.99-48.99 49.99-60	34.88	6.86	2

Based on the theoretical range of scores, we can conclude that all subscales have a relatively high and uniform level of scattering. The highest average values were registered on the socialization subscale ($M_o = 27$, $M = 35.92$, $s = 8.61$), followed by skills ($M_o = 22.5$, $M = 34.88$, $s = 6.86$), literacy ($M_o = 25.5$, $M = 30.81$, $s = 7.14$) and development of mathematical skills ($M_o = 22.5$, $M = 28.34$, $s = 8.12$). It was noted that the IEP-s of the research sample were designed for children who could do activities within the area only with the help of a teacher (a child can do the described behavior with help, requires adult intervention). According to the obtained data, teachers indicate that they perceive the development of IEP as important in the following domains in educational areas: 1. affective (socialization), 2. psychomotor (school skills) and 3. cognitive (literacy and numeracy). Certainly, this hierarchy of IEP importance can be declarative, i.e., that

teachers consider it more desirable to support the child with behavioral difficulties than when they occur in understanding the content, and it is possible that they perceive this order differently depending on the age of children, i.e., if they work with younger or older age, in class or subject teaching. In accordance with the obtained results, we conclude that the first hypothesis is rejected because it is assumed that "teachers believe that the development of IEP should be more focused on the cognitive, psychomotor, and then affective domain in educational areas (literacy, mathematics, school skills and socialization).

Representation of IEP in the work of teachers according to educational areas

The implications present in practice that we pay more attention to some educational areas depending on the work with younger or older children will be shown below in Table 3. The obtained *t* values previously tested by the Leven test are shown. Justification of the application of the *t test* is found for the field of literacy ($p = .150$), skills ($p = .145$), and socialization ($p = .067$), and for the field of mathematics, an alternative was used since $p = .021$, $p < .05$.

Table 3

Development of individualized educational programs in class and subject teaching

	Groups	N	M	S	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Literacy support	Class	62	35.758	8.0035	-.480	83	.633
	Subject teaching	23	36.783	10.5398	-.423	31.892	.675
Mathematics support	Class	62	31.306	6.3364	.750	83	.455
	Subject teaching	23	30.000	8.9747	.641	30.513	.526
Skill support	Class	62	28.774	7.5822	.670	83	.505
	Subject teaching	23	27.435	9.6617	.600	32.587	.553
Literacy support	Class	62	35.048	7.0069	.360	83	.720
	Subject teaching	23	34.435	6.9271	.362	39.802	.719

The obtained values show that "there is no statistically significant difference in the work of teachers with regard to work in class and/or subject teaching" and that in practice they represent more IEP-s according to the order presented in Table 4.

Table 4

IEP representation order

	Class teaching	Subject teaching

Literacy support	35.758	36.783
Support socialization	35.048	34.435
Mathematics support	31.306	30.000
Skill support	28.774	27.435

If we take into account that by testing the first hypothesis, we found that teachers perceive it to be more important to give importance to the affective, psychomotor, and only then cognitive domains in educational areas for which IEP-ss are developed, the second hypothesis revealed that in practice they do not work in accordance with their own perception. This work is characterized by the following order: 1. Cognitive domain, 2. Affective domain, 3. Psychomotor. These results need to be considered: does this mean that teachers are more focused on the cognitive and affective domains and put skills in the background, or did the children for whom they developed IEP-s have more difficulty in intellectual functioning than physical ones? The first implication could mean that the teacher will pay more attention to targeted activities in relation to skills (for example, if he is in class, doing more mother tongue or math classes, thus taking classes for physical and health education) or a sample indicates that they create IEP-s in this order because they have more students in need of support due to intellectual disabilities, speech, etc., compared to, for example, diagnoses of cerebral palsy, scoliosis, etc. What is even more important for the answers - no statistically significant difference was found with younger and older students (class/subject) and that we have the same order of representation of the IEP in our work in class and subject teaching. In accordance with the obtained results, the second hypothesis is accepted because no statistically significant difference was found in the application of the IEP for the areas of literacy, mathematics, socialization and school skills with regard to the work of teachers in class and/or subject teaching.

Teacher orientation of the child and educational areas

The third task examines the contribution of domains in educational areas to the orientation of teachers to teaching content in the development of the IEP. The intention was to examine the implication of whether the quality of support will be reduced if the teacher is focused on the teaching content, as well as the cognitive domain of the educational field (e.g., mathematics and literacy). Will choosing support mean more importance to the content or the child, and how much of that impact? In this case, all four variables significantly intercorrelate with each other but also with the variable of attendance in class and subject teaching. Based on the correlation model of the matrix, the confirmed values of IEP tolerance within educational areas are as follows: for literacy VIF = 1,966, mathematics, VIF = 1,983, school skills VIF = 2,106, socialization VIF = 1,501. The obtained values are not below the tolerance level of 0.10 or above the VIF value, 10 which speaks in favor of accepting the assumption that the multicollinearity values are not disturbed and all four are included in the regression model.

Table 5

Coefficients of linear correlation between focus on educational areas and classroom/subject teaching

IEP	N
Literacy	.53
Mathematics	-.82
School skills	-.073
Socialization	-.039

Table 6

Average values and standard deviations for scales of educational areas

Scale	M	Σ
IEP literacy	35.92	8.61
IEP mathematics	30.81	7.14
IEP-school skills	28.34	8.12
IEP-socialization	34.88	6.86

Note. M – arithmetic mean; σ - standard deviation

Taking into account that multicollinear diagnostics did not register significant cases of violation of multicollinearity conditions, we take into account that the highest average values refer to IEP-s for literacy (M = 35.92), socialization (M = 34.88) and mathematics (M = 30.81) and that school skills programs are more modestly individualized (M = 28.34).

Table 7

General performance indicators of regression models: multiple correlation coefficients and multiple

determinations

Model	R	R^2	ΔR^2	Standard error
IEP – literacy	.05	.003	- .009	.449
IEP – mathematics	.082	.007	- .005	.448
IEP - school skills	.073	.005	- .007	.448
IEP – socialization	.039	.002	- .010	.449

Note. R-multiple correlation coefficient; R^2-coefficient of multiple determination; ΔR^2-corrected R^2

The regression solution did not reveal a statistically significant difference in the orientation of teachers in the development of the IEP, so the results obtained can be generalized to the included sample. In support of this, we conclude that the work of teachers in a very small percentage is explained by the domains of educational areas. This model of variance explains only approximately 2.3% of this ratio.

Table 8

Summative indicators of analysis of variance for testing regression models

Model		SS	Df	MS	F	P
IEP - literacy	Regression	.046	1	.046	.230	.633
	Residual	16.730	83	.202		
	Total	16.776	84			
IEP-mathematics	Regression	.113	1	.113	.563	.455
	Residual	16.663	83	.201		
	Total	16.776	84			
IEP - school skills	Regression	.090	1	.090	.449	.505
	Residual	16.686	83	.201		
	Total	16.776	84			
IEP – socialization	Regression	.026	1	.026	.129	.720
	Residual	16.750	83	.202		
	Total	16.750	84			

Note. SS - sums - degrees of freedom; MS - average squares; F – Fisher F ratio

With the help of standardized regression coefficients *β*, partial contributions of (individual) variables were estimated. The F ratio is not statistically significant for any category within the first model p_1 = .633, p_2 = .455, p_3 = .505, p_4 = .720 > 0.05. Beta values further confirm the strength of individual tests but without a statistically significant difference in relation to the work of teachers in order to interpret this relationship.

Table 9

Partial contributions of predictor variables to school satisfaction forecasts for students and teachers

Model		B	Std. error	β	sr^2	T	P
	Constant	1.173	.210			5.583	.000
IEP - literacy		.003	.006	.006	> .01	.480	.633
	Constant	1.429	.216			6.603	.000
IEP -		-.005	.007	-	> .01	-.755	.455

		B	SE	β	sr²	t	p
mathematics				.082			
	Constant	1.385	.177			7.804	.000
IEP - school skills		-.004	.006	-.073	> .01	-.670	.505
	Constant	1.360	.254			5.358	.000
IEP - socialization		-.003	.007	-.039	> .01		.720

Note. B - nonstandardized regression coefficient; β– standardized beta coefficient; sr²– square of semipartial correlation coefficient; t - Student's t test.

However, we can consider in which areas there is a higher risk of giving importance to content instead of the needs of the child: this impact in literacy is 0.9%, mathematics 0.7%, school skills 0.5% and socialization 0.2%, and teachers seem to be more objective in quality assessments of support and development of IEP-s in the field of socialization and school skills than in regard to content related to literacy and numeracy. As defined variables in the prediction of this relationship do not statistically significantly contribute to the exclusive orientation of teachers to the teaching content, i.e., say the opposite, we can partially accept the hypothesis because the domains of educational areas determine the teacher's orientation to the teaching content when drafting the IEP only 2.3%. This implies that the inverse ratio is focused on the needs of the child, which further confirms the quality of support provided.

Quality of work of teachers with support

Table 10

Suggestions for improving the quality of work of teachers

Suggestions of teachers	*f*	*%*
Develop representative tools for assessing child support for teachers.	18	21.2
Organize learning opportunities (seminars, trainings) in order to harmonize the way of individualization of the educational process (including IEP).	17	20.0
Continuous support of professional associates (pedagogues, psychologists, speech therapists, special educators… any professional help is welcome).	15	17.6
The development of the IEP must follow the pace of the child's progress (monthly, quarterly, etc.).	11	12.9
Provide the possibility of adjusting the class schedule that follows the child's abilities (ratio of directed activities and school skills).	6	7.2
Dedicated teachers can succeed in their work.	4	4.7
Provide the possibility of creating a class schedule that follows the child's	4	4.7

abilities (ratio of directed activities and school skills).		
Hiring more assistants.	4	4.7
Provide support with pedagogical documentation	3	3.5
To support the teachers with didactic-methodical materials.	3	3.5

Teachers' suggestions are divided into 9 categories. 21% of the sample is focused on the quality of observation of child support, i.e., proposal to make tools for the purpose of assessing support. Twenty percent of respondents emphasize the need for learning in order to quality educational work, and the constant support of professional associates in this process expects 17.6% of respondents. The fourth proposal refers to the quality of the IEP, which must meet the needs of the child (12.9%), and the fifth to the schedule of classes, which also follows the pace of focused activities and skills in relation to the child's progress, 11.76%. Other proposals concerned administrative-logistical and personnel support to make the work of teachers, aimed at individualizing the program, better (up to 25%). All the suggestions given in Table 10 concern the direct improvement of work with children for which IEP-s are being developed. In accordance with the obtained data, we single out the classification of priorities: 1. Assessment of support and quality of work with children (34.1%) 2. Support for teacher competencies (42.3%) and 3. Administrative and logistical requirements in the work of teachers (18.9%) and conclude that the fourth The hypothesis is accepted: "Teachers who develop IEP-s for the focus of work improvement have - a child."

CONCLUSION

Individualized programs for all children

Following the answers of teachers, regardless of the group, whether they work in class or subject teaching, when individualizing educational programs, they are focused on the areas of socialization, literacy, mathematics and school skills. An analysis of studies dealing with the reasons for the development of IEP (Halvorsen, 2011; Kvam, 2013) showed that the main characteristics are the approach of teachers and/or fully and more specifically formulated IEP to make students feel included in school society or to make teaching better. The research sample on which the hypotheses were tested implies a different experience. IEPs are made for children who follow teaching activities with help, which requires their constant intervention to achieve success. However, in testing the second hypothesis, teachers confirm that this priority order is not present in their practice; in the development and implementation of IEP, they keep their focus on the 1st cognitive, 2nd affective and 3rd psychomotor areas. The results imply a teacher's focus on educational content at the expense of skills or the possibility that the children for whom they developed IEP-s had more difficulties in cognitive functioning compared to physical, behavioral and the like. This order of IEP representation was typical for both groups, and no statistically significant difference was found in the dependence on work with younger and older students (class/subject). In accordance with the obtained results, the second hypothesis was accepted because no statistically significant difference was found in the application of the IEP for the areas of literacy, mathematics, socialization and school skills with regard to the work of teachers in class and/or subject teaching. Taking into account the present order in practice, it was considered interesting to check the implication, whether the quality of support will be reduced if the teacher is focused on the teaching content, as well as the cognitive domain of education (e.g., mathematics and literacy) and in the third task, the contribution of domains in educational areas to the orientation of teachers to teaching content during the development of the IEP or the child was examined. The risk of giving importance to content instead of the child's needs in literacy is 0.9%, mathematics 0.7%, school skills 0.5% and socialization 0.2%, and it seems that teachers will be more objective in the quality of assessment support and IEP for socialization and school skills than

in regard to content related to literacy and numeracy skills. The third hypothesis was partially accepted because the domains of educational areas determine the teacher's orientation toward teaching content when drafting the IEP, only 2.3%. This implies that the inverse ratio is focused on the needs of the child, which further confirms the quality of support provided. In the fourth task, teachers gave recommendations regarding the improvement of the current quality of support. In accordance with the obtained data, we single out the classification of priorities: 1. Assessment of support and quality of work with children (34.1%) 2. Support for teacher competencies (42.3%) and 3. Administrative and logistical requirements in the work of teachers (18.9%). The fourth hypothesis was confirmed in favor of the child-oriented paradigm "Teachers who develop IEP-s for the focus of work improvement have - the child.

It seems that the results of the research implicitly speak about the essence of school - school learning, and teachers involved in providing support, drafting IEP, daily testify to the values of their own professional role in the mission of education, tailored to the child. However, in favor of taking a broader perspective of the work, it is necessary to take into account that the research was attended by teachers who create IEPs exclusively for children with developmental disabilities. The unspoken perspective of teachers refers to children who, for any reason, need support (talented, socioeconomic difficulties, children on the move, etc.), and for whom we do not have data at the moment (no IEPs are being made?). The results of the research can serve as a starting point for further studies but also in favor of changes and achieving the quality of educational work.

REFERENCES

Bachke, C. C. (2015). Individualized Education Plans: What Characterizes the Research. Society integration education *Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference.* Rezekne Academy of Technologies.

Bjelopoljak, Š., & Kafedžić, L. (2018). Od stigme do školskog (ne)uspjeha. In: Arnaut, A. (Ed.) *Zbornik radova 7. međunarodnog naučno-stručnog skupa Obrazovanje, jezik, kultura, tendencije i izazovi: SaZnanje.* Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Zenici, pp. 26–35.

Bjelopoljak, Š., & Midžić, A. (2021). Pedagogical discourse of curriculum development based on the orientation of educational practice. *Metodički obzori*, *16*(1), 57–76. https://doi.org/10.32728/mo.16.1.2021.03

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. A. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain*. David McKay.

Bognar, L., & Matijević, M. (2002). *Didaktika*. Školska knjiga.

Brajković, S. i Žokalj, G. (2021). *Učenje u tijeku: kako formativnim vrednovanjem potaknuti učenje.* Korak po korak.

Deschenes, C., Ebeling, D., & Sprague, J. (1994). *Adapting Curriculum and Instruction in Inclusive Classrooms: A Teacher's Desk Reference.* The Center for School and Community Integration, Institute for the Study of Developmental Disabilities.

Epstein, A. S. (2007). *The Intentional Teacher: Choosing the Best Strategies for Young Children's Learning.* National Association for the Educationof Young Children.

Havelka, N. (2000). *Učenik i nastavnik u obrazovnom procesu.* Zavod za udžbenike.

Hodžić, S. (2017). *Smjernice za rad defektologa/edukatora - rehabilitatora u redovnoj osnovnoj školi.* Zavod za odgoj i obrazovanje osoba sa smetnjama u psihičkom i tjelesnom razvoju.

International Step by Step Association (2005). *ISSA Pedagogical Standards for Preschool and Primary Grades.* International Step by Step Association.

Kafedžić, L. (2015). Stručno usavršavanje nastavnika za odgojno-obrazovni rad u inkluzivnim odjeljenjima. Publikacija stručnih radova i izlaganja sa stručnog simpozijuma *Unapređenje obrazovnog sistema u oblasti primjene inkluzivnih principa podučavanja, Save the Children Norway*, pp. 8–21.

Kafedžić, L. (2020). *Da niko ne izostane: osnove specijalne pedagogije.* Lejla Kafedžić.

Kafedžić, L., & Kobetić, D. (2020). *Smjernice za inkluzivni odgoj i obrazovanje.* APOSO: https://aposo.gov.ba/sadrzaj/uploads/Smjernice.pd

Kartika, A., Suminar, D. R., Tairas, M. M. W., & Hendriani, W. (2018). Individual Education Program (IEP) Paperwork: A Narrative Review. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology, 7*(2–29), 682. https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i2.29.13997

Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice, 41*(4), 212–218.

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. (1973). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, the Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook II: Affective Domain.* David McKay Co., Inc.

Kvam, A. (2013). *Porte to the news: A phenomenological study of the working world with real intensifications with individual planners.* NTNU Open, Department of Education

Livazović, G., Alispahić, D., & Terović, E. (2015). *Inkluzivni odgoj i obrazovanje u školi.* Udruženje „Društvo ujedinjenih građanskih akcija."

Nordahl, T & Overland, T. (1997). *Individual load planner.* Ad Notam Gyldendal.

OECD (2005). *The Definition and Selection of Key Competencies: Executive Summary.* http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/47/61/35070367.pdf

Runde, A. (2013). Scholarships are available for poor training and off-league students. *Lovogrett, 52*(6)*,* 428–447.

Stančić, Z., & Đurđica, I. (2008). Individualized Education Programs and Competences of Pupils with Disabilities in Regular School. In V. Paar, & N. Šetić (eds.), Hrvatski obrazovni sustav u odnosu prema obrazovnoj politici Europske unije: europski referentni okvir

temeljnih kompetencija: zbornik radova 10. škole učitelja Hrvatske. Hrvatski pedagoško-književni zbor. Edukacijsko-rehabilitacijski fakultet.

Wilson, G. L., Michaels, C. A., & Margolis, H. (2005). Form versus Function: Using Technology to Develop Individualized Education Programs for Students with Disabilities. *Journal of Special Education Technology, 20*(2), 25–37. https://doi.org/10.1177/016264340502000204

INTERNET SOURCES

https://kidshealth.org/en/parents/iep-teachers.html
https://slideplayer.si/slide/17500142/
https://skolazazivot.hr/kurikulumi-2