



# Journal of Educational Sciences

Journal homepage: <https://jes.ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JES>



P-ISSN  
2581-1657

E-ISSN  
2581-2203

## Evaluation of Individualized Education Program Implementation in Special Needs Center Services at Sekolah Alam Depok

Miranti, Abdul Rahman A. Ghani\*, Hamid Al Jufri

Educational Administration Study Program, University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka, Jakarta, 12130, Indonesia

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received: 23 July 2026

Accepted: 07 Sept 2026

Available Online: 15 Sept 2026

#### Keywords:

CIPP Model,  
Individualized Education Program (IEP),  
Inclusive Education,  
Program Evaluation,  
Special Needs Center (SNC)

#### \* Corresponding author:

E-mail: [rahman.ghani@uhamka.ac.id](mailto:rahman.ghani@uhamka.ac.id)

#### Article Doi:

<https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.9.p.719-734>

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



### ABSTRACT

The Individualized Education Program (IEP) is an important strategy for providing inclusive education that responds to the diverse needs of students with special needs. This study evaluated IEP implementation at the Special Needs Center (SNC) of Sekolah Alam Depok using the Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) evaluation model. A qualitative evaluative design was employed, involving the school principal, SNC facilitators, Special Education Teachers (GPK), and parents selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, observations, and document analysis and analyzed qualitatively across the four CIPP components. The findings indicate that IEP implementation is supported by inclusive policies, systematic needs assessment, relatively adequate resources, collaborative practices, and adaptive instruction that contribute to students' academic, social, and independent development. However, gaps remain in continuous teacher professional development, the systematization of IEP-related documentation, individualized learning facilities, and monitoring mechanisms. These findings indicate that the sustainability of IEP services depends not only on maintaining existing practices but also on institutionalizing continuous capacity building, integrated documentation, and systematic monitoring. Practically, the evaluation provides evidence-based priorities for schools to strengthen IEP planning, implementation, progress monitoring, documentation, and school-parent collaboration, thereby supporting more consistent and sustainable inclusive education services.

## 1. Introduction

The implementation of quality and fair education for all students, including students with special needs (ABK), is an important part of the implementation of inclusive education that ensures that every student receives services according to their

---

characteristics, potentials, and needs (Fathinnaufal & Pamungkas, 2025; Husain & Hermanto, 2026; Khuluqo, 2017). This commitment is further strengthened through Permendikbudristek Number 48 of 2023 which requires education units to provide proper accommodation for students with disabilities in order to access, participate, and obtain educational services optimally. The principle of providing education that is fair and respects the needs of each individual is also in line with the value of justice in Islam as stated in Surah An-Nisa' verse 58, which emphasizes the importance of fulfilling the mandate to those who are entitled and making decisions fairly.

In the context of inclusive education, this mandate is realized through the provision of educational services that are in accordance with the needs and characteristics of each student without discrimination (Aulia & Hermanto, 2026; Fathinnaufal & Pamungkas, 2025). However, the implementation of inclusive education in Indonesia still faces various challenges, including limited resources, educator competence, individual service management, and coordination between stakeholders that are not optimal so that it has an impact on the quality of services received by students with special needs (Smith et al., 2018; Sunardi et al., 2011). These conditions show that the success of inclusive education is not only determined by the existence of policies, but also by the effectiveness of the implementation of service programs that are able to accommodate the individual needs of each student.

One form of service that is the foundation of inclusive education is the Individualized Education Program (IEP) or Individualized Learning Program, which is an educational program that is prepared based on assessment results to determine learning goals, learning strategies, support services, and evaluation mechanisms for the development of students with special needs (Arriani et al., 2021). IEP is designed as a guideline for the implementation of individualized services so that each student can obtain learning that is in accordance with their abilities, obstacles, and potentials (Dwimarta, 2015). Therefore, the IEP not only serves as an administrative document, but also as a collaborative reference for teachers, support staff, and parents in planning, implementing, and evaluating educational services in an ongoing manner (Blackwell and Rossetti, 2014).

Previous studies consistently indicate that the implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) enhances the effectiveness of inclusive education when systematically designed and implemented. IEPs have been shown to support students' academic and functional development, optimize educational services through individualized learning adjustments, and facilitate differentiated learning using multisensory approaches (Hibana, 2023; Mardiana et al., 2020; Trimurtini et al., 2023). Nevertheless, their implementation remains challenged by inconsistent application in inclusive classrooms, limited educator competence, and insufficient collaboration among stakeholders (Faza & Fitrika, 2024; Mardiana et al., 2020). These findings underscore the importance of developing well-structured, needs-based IEP interventions to maximize learning outcomes for students with special needs (Rabaika et al., 2025).

---

---

However, most previous studies have focused more on the implementation, design development, or effectiveness of IEPs in the learning process, while studies that evaluate the implementation of IEPs comprehensively from the perspective of context, input, process, and program outcomes are still relatively limited. In fact, a thorough evaluation is needed to find out whether the implementation of the IEP is in accordance with the needs of students, supported by adequate resources, implemented consistently, and able to produce the expected outputs (Arifin, 2019; Arifin and Latifah, 2009; Musringudin et al., 2022). In the perspective of program evaluation, the Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) model provides a comprehensive evaluation framework because it not only assesses program outcomes, but also identifies factors that affect the success of implementation so that it can be the basis for decision-making for continuous program improvement (Sukardi, 2014; Warju, 2016).

This gap is also evident in the implementation of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) at the Special Needs Center (SNC) of Sekolah Alam Depok. Although interviews and student needs assessments have been conducted to support individualized services, a systematic written IEP has not been provided to parents, and learning goals, service strategies, implementation targets, and evaluation mechanisms have not been comprehensively documented. These limitations may weaken the continuity of planning, implementation, and evaluation while hindering ongoing monitoring of student progress. As a service unit supporting inclusive education, the effectiveness of IEP implementation is a key determinant of service quality for students with special needs (Sallis, 2014).

Based on this description, this study seeks to answer the question of how the implementation of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) in improving the quality of Special Needs Center services at Sekolah Alam Depok is reviewed from the aspects of context, input, process, and product. In particular, this study aims to evaluate (1) the suitability of the context of IEP implementation with the needs of students and school policies; (2) the adequacy of resources and inputs to support the implementation of IEP; (3) the implementation of IEP in learning practice and its coordination and evaluation mechanisms; and (4) the results of IEP implementation on student development and the quality of Special Needs Center services. This research is expected to make a theoretical contribution through the application of the CIPP evaluation model to the implementation of IEP in the context of the Special Needs Center, as well as provide practical recommendations for schools in strengthening the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of individual learning programs as an effort to improve the quality of inclusive education services.

## **2. Methodology**

This study uses an evaluative qualitative approach with the Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) model developed by Stufflebeam. This approach was chosen to comprehensively evaluate the implementation of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) through four evaluation components, namely context, input, process,

---

and product, so that it can provide an overview of the suitability of planning, resource readiness, program implementation, and the results of IEP implementation in improving the quality of Special Needs Center (SNC) services. The research was carried out at the Special Needs Center (SNC) of Sekolah Alam Depok, Depok City, Indonesia, in February-July 2026. The research is focused on evaluating the implementation of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) in educational services for students with special needs. The scope of the evaluation is compiled based on the four components of the CIPP model as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Scope of Implementation Evaluation  
Individualized Education Program Based on CIPP Model

| No | CIPP Components | Evaluation Focus                                                                                                      |
|----|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | Background      | School policies, early assessments, IEP goals, parent involvement, inclusive culture                                  |
| 2  | Input           | Human resources, teacher competencies, IEP documents, infrastructure, funding                                         |
| 3  | Process         | Preparation and implementation of IEPs, differentiation of learning, collaboration, monitoring and evaluation         |
| 4  | Product         | Academic and social development, independence, achievement of IEP goals, parental satisfaction, program effectiveness |

The research subjects consisted of school principals, Special Needs Center facilitators, Special Education Teachers (GPK), and parents of students with special needs who were selected as informants because they were directly involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of IEPs. Data were collected through observation, semi-structured interviews, and documentation studies. Observations were made on the implementation of IEP-based services and learning, interviews were used to explore the experiences and perceptions of informants regarding the implementation of IEPs, while documentation studies were conducted on IEP documents, student assessment results, development reports, and school policy documents related to inclusive education. These three data sources were used to obtain complementary evidence for each component of the CIPP evaluation rather than relying on a single source of information.

The validity of the data is maintained through triangulation techniques and source triangulation by comparing the results of observations, interviews, and documentation from various informants. Triangulation was conducted for each CIPP component by examining the consistency and differences among observed practices, informants' statements, and documentary evidence. Accordingly, statements obtained from interviews were not treated as stand-alone findings but were compared with relevant observations and documents to strengthen the interpretation of IEP implementation. Evidence from the three data sources was organized according to the CIPP components and used to identify convergent findings, complementary information, or discrepancies requiring further interpretation.

Furthermore, the data were analyzed in a qualitative descriptive manner using the stages of data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. The analysis

---

process began with coding and grouping data into themes that were consistent with the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) components. The coded findings were then compared with the IEP implementation standards to assess the level of suitability of program implementation. Evidence from interviews, observations, and documentation was retained during the coding and presentation stages to ensure that each major finding could be traced to its empirical source. The results of this analysis were subsequently used as the basis for evaluating the implementation of the IEP and formulating service improvement recommendations.

### 3. Results and Discussion

The implementation began with an initial assessment to identify each student's academic, social, communication, and adaptive needs. Based on the assessment results, individualized learning goals, instructional strategies, and support services were collaboratively developed by Special Education Teachers (GPK), SNC facilitators, classroom teachers, and parents. The IEP was then implemented through differentiated learning, periodic monitoring of student progress, and continuous communication with families to ensure that learning targets remained aligned with each student's development. This implementation process served as the basis for the subsequent evaluation using the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) framework.

#### ***Evaluation of Context Aspects: Suitability of the Implementation Foundation of IEP***

The results of the evaluation show that the implementation of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) at the Special Needs Center (SNC) of Sekolah Alam Depok was supported by a generally adequate implementation context. The school principal explained that the school mission explicitly supports individualized learning: "Our school's third mission is to meet learning needs individually through various learning styles. This means that the school strongly supports the implementation of the IEP for students with special needs". The principal also stated that the SNC was established in response to "the needs of parents and the needs of the children," indicating that the service was developed as a response to identified educational needs rather than solely as an administrative initiative. The planning process was assessment-based. According to the principal, "IEP planning begins with an interview with parents, followed by a measurable assessment conducted by the school psychologist. The assessment results are then used as a reference for determining the child's learning needs and are subsequently incorporated into the IEP".

The interview evidence was strengthened by the structured observation checklist and documentary review. The checklist indicated that formal IEP-related policies, early identification, diagnostic assessment, individualized program objectives, and parental involvement were implemented at a strong level. Documentary analysis of the reviewed IEP showed that planning was organized around baseline abilities, expected learning targets, learning media or strategies, current abilities, and

---

responsible implementers. For example, the reviewed IEP documented the student's baseline ability alongside the targeted learning outcome, the learning media or strategy used, the responsible implementer, and the follow-up activity. This provided concrete documentary evidence that assessment information was translated into individualized learning plans and subsequent learning activities. The document also identified the roles of school personnel and parents in carrying out and reinforcing selected activities. Together, these findings indicate convergence between institutional support, assessment-based identification of needs, individualized goal setting, and family involvement.

The findings further show that IEP implementation was grounded in the mapping of students' academic, social, communication, and adaptive needs and in the learning barriers identified through assessment. Rather than functioning merely as an administrative document, the IEP was used as a basis for determining individualized objectives and support. The convergence of interview, structured observation, and documentary evidence therefore indicates that the Context component provided a relevant foundation for implementation, although the strength of this foundation depends on the continued consistency of assessment and stakeholder involvement.

The findings are consistent with the concept of Context evaluation in the CIPP model, which emphasizes alignment between the needs of the target population, program objectives, and the supporting environment (Warju, 2016; Wulan et al., 2026). In inclusive education, needs identification is a fundamental basis for ensuring that the designed program addresses students' needs (Arikunto & Jabar, 2014; Husain & Hermanto, 2026). These findings also support Blackwell and Rossetti (2014), who emphasized that IEPs should be developed based on individual assessments involving multiple stakeholders, particularly schools and parents. Thus, the context aspect at SNC Sekolah Alam Depok provided the principal prerequisites for IEP implementation through policies supporting individualization, assessment-based planning, individualized goals, and family collaboration.

### ***Evaluation of Input Aspects: Readiness of Resources to Support the Implementation of IEPs***

The evaluation of the Input aspect shows that SNC Sekolah Alam Depok had relatively adequate basic resources to support IEP implementation, although several structural limitations remained. The facilitator explained that implementation involved multiple stakeholders: "First, there are the GPK, parents, psychologists, facilitators, coordinators, and the SNC principal". The facilitator also noted that newly recruited GPK received initial training before beginning their duties. Coordination was organized through scheduled meetings, including SNC coordination and cross-division coordination. These accounts indicate that the school had established a basic human-resource and coordination structure for individualized services.

---

---

The structured observation checklist provided more specific evidence of resource readiness. GPK availability, teacher competence, training exposure, IEP-related administrative documents, adaptive learning media, and the student-to-educator ratio were generally rated as adequate. The involvement of psychologists or therapists was rated strongly. However, funding support and accessibility facilities were rated as limited, and the administration and documentation system was assessed as not yet fully systematic. Documentary review also showed that the IEP specified concrete learning materials, responsible implementers, and the frequency of activities at school and at home, indicating that available resources were translated into individualized instructional planning.

Nevertheless, several aspects require strengthening. The facilitator stated, “For highly specific needs, the facilities are still very limited; so far, we still use materials customized by the GPK”. This finding suggests that resource adequacy should be assessed not only by the presence of personnel and facilities but also by their suitability for increasingly diverse individual needs. Continuous professional development is also needed so that educators can strengthen their capacity to formulate long-term targets, conduct individual evaluation, and implement more specific learning strategies.

The documentation system represents another important limitation. The school principal acknowledged that written IEP-related documents were available but had not yet been fully organized or systematized and were still being improved. This finding converges with the structured observation checklist, which also indicated that administrative and documentation procedures were less systematic than other input indicators. This condition may be related to the fact that IEP practices at the SNC have developed primarily as part of practical service delivery, while the documentation component is still developing toward a more integrated institutional system. Consequently, the availability of individual IEP records does not necessarily mean that planning, monitoring, evaluation, revision, and progress documentation are managed through one consistently integrated mechanism. Thus, although basic resources were available, accessibility, specialized materials, continuous professional development, and systematic documentation remained areas requiring institutional strengthening.

The limited continuity of professional development may pose a similar challenge. Although initial training is provided to newly recruited personnel, the increasingly diverse characteristics of students require ongoing opportunities to strengthen teachers' competencies. Without continuous professional development, educators may have different levels of readiness in formulating individualized targets, adjusting instructional strategies, and documenting student progress. When documentation and professional development are not sufficiently institutionalized, continuity of IEP implementation may depend more heavily on the initiative and experience of individual teachers or staff. Changes in personnel could therefore affect the consistency of planning, monitoring, evaluation, and documentation of student development. Therefore, the current input condition can support implementation in the short term, but its sustainability depends on the school's

---

---

ability to continuously strengthen teacher competence, individualized facilities, and integrated documentation.

From the perspective of the CIPP model, the input aspect assesses the readiness of resources that support program success (Emakulata et al., 2026; Warju, 2016; Wulan et al., 2026). Therefore, the availability of human resources, facilities, administrative support, and management support is an important prerequisite for optimal IEP implementation. These findings are consistent with Kozikoğlu and Albayrak (2022), who found that teachers generally have positive attitudes toward IEP implementation but continue to face challenges related to professional competence, the need for continuous training, and limited support resources. The findings also support Rudyati (2010), who emphasized that the success of IEP implementation is strongly influenced by teacher readiness, school system support, and systematic program administration. Thus, although the input aspect is relatively adequate, improving teacher competence and strengthening the support system remain priorities for program development. These findings indicate that resource readiness should be viewed as a dynamic rather than static condition. Sustained investment in teacher capacity building and documentation management is therefore essential to maintaining service quality and ensuring the long-term sustainability of inclusive education. This interpretation is consistent with previous research emphasizing that effective IEP implementation requires continuous institutional support rather than one-time resource provision (Kozikoğlu & Albayrak, 2022).

### ***Evaluation of Process Aspects: Implementation of IEP in Learning Practice***

The results of the Process evaluation show that IEP implementation was translated into daily learning practices through individualized activities, adaptive strategies, direct guidance, and ongoing monitoring. The GPK explained, “Every learning program still refers to the facilitator. I ask for time after snack time to conduct individualized learning. The students are reminded gradually, negotiated with to participate in learning, habituated, and guided”. This account indicates that implementation was not limited to a fixed instructional procedure but was adjusted to students' readiness and responses.

Field observations provided direct evidence of this practice. Students were observed completing individualized learning tasks with close adult assistance. One activity involved a student working on a worksheet while receiving one-to-one guidance from an educator. Another activity involved the use of manipulable letter-based learning materials with direct educator support. These observations showed that individualized planning was translated into concrete learning interactions and that support was adjusted during the activity rather than remaining only in written plans. The use of adaptive strategies was also evident in the development of learning media. The GPK explained, “The Special Education Teachers (GPK) can make the media independently and use whatever is available. For example, stones or bottle caps can be used for mathematics and counting”. Documentary evidence supported this finding because the reviewed IEP specified learning materials or media, implementation procedures, responsible persons, and the student's current level of

---

---

ability for particular targets. Selected activities were implemented at school and reinforced by parents at home, demonstrating continuity between planning, instructional practice, and follow-up support.

Monitoring was embedded in daily learning activities. The GPK stated, “We observe the child while playing and gradually create some distance to monitor the child”, and explained that previous evaluation results were used to adjust subsequent targets. The GPK also described a practical challenge related to the student's mood and readiness, noting that implementation could be postponed until the situation became more conducive. These accounts, together with the observed individualized activities and the monitoring information recorded in the IEP, indicate that implementation involved adaptation rather than rigid delivery of predetermined activities.

The convergence of interview, observation, and documentary evidence shows that IEP implementation at SNC did not stop at planning but was operationalized through individualized tasks, direct support, adaptive media, monitoring, and follow-up. This reflects inclusive education principles that center learning on individual needs through flexible strategies and differentiated support. However, the evidence also indicates that the operational flexibility observed in daily practice needs to be accompanied by sufficiently systematic documentation so that adaptations, decisions, and subsequent progress can be consistently communicated across educators and service periods. At the same time, the findings suggest that consistency depends on systematic documentation and continuous educator capacity development.

These findings are consistent with Mardiana et al. (2020), who found that the success of individual learning programs is strongly determined by consistency in the learning process, not only at the planning stage. The findings are also supported by Iryani et al. (2023) and Trimurtini et al. (2023), who explained that differentiated learning through IEPs can accommodate diverse student characteristics and thereby improve the effectiveness of inclusive education services. From the perspective of CIPP evaluation, process quality is a key indicator of program success because it demonstrates the extent to which implementation is aligned with the planned design (Warju, 2016; Yusuf, 2017). Therefore, stakeholder collaboration, continuous monitoring, and systematic documentation of adaptive decisions are important factors in maintaining the effectiveness and continuity of IEP implementation.

### ***Evaluation of the Product Aspect: Impact of IEP Implementation on Students***

The evaluation of the Product aspect shows that IEP implementation contributed positively to several dimensions of student development, while not all targets were necessarily achieved completely. A parent reported that the child's learning had “improved and increased” and that the child could understand sentences, although longer sentences still required assistance. The parent also stated, “The child's confidence has increased and the child is now able to try communicating with new people”. These accounts provide direct evidence of perceived development in academic functioning and confidence.

---

---

Improvements were also reported in functional independence and social awareness. The parent explained that the child had become more aware of what needed to be done and could remind family members about activities such as a swimming schedule and the equipment required. The parent further reported that the child had become more sensitive to social situations and more able to observe the surrounding environment according to the situation and condition. These outcomes indicate that the perceived benefits extended beyond academic learning to everyday functioning and social participation.

Documentary evidence provided additional support for these reported outcomes. The reviewed IEP recorded baseline abilities, expected targets, and current abilities, enabling progress to be traced against individualized indicators. The documentation showed the relationship between students' initial abilities, targeted skills, learning activities or media, and their current abilities, providing evidence that student progress was monitored against individualized targets. The document showed that some sensory and learning activities could be performed independently, whereas other targets still required guidance or further practice. Field observations also showed students participating actively in structured individualized activities with direct support. Taken together, the evidence suggests progressive and individualized outcomes rather than a uniform or complete achievement of all predetermined targets.

However, these positive outcomes should not be interpreted as indicating that implementation is already optimal. Student development outcomes depend on the continuity of individualized planning, implementation, monitoring, and revision. The documentation limitations identified in the input aspect may make it more difficult to trace student progress systematically over time, while the limited continuity of professional development may affect educators' ability to maintain consistent individualized strategies. Thus, the issue is not merely the availability of documentation but the extent to which documentation can function as a shared institutional reference for continuing and evaluating individualized services. Consequently, positive outcomes achieved at present may be more difficult to sustain if mechanisms for documenting progress, revising targets, and strengthening teacher capacity are not improved.

These findings show that the benefits of IEP implementation are not limited to learning outcomes but also extend to functional independence, communication, social participation, and perceived service quality. This finding supports Dwimarta (2015), who found that IEPs help teachers organize learning more systematically according to students' needs, thereby supporting academic and non-academic development. The findings are also consistent with Khoeriah (2017), who emphasized that IEPs have a meaningful impact when consistently applied in learning practices rather than treated merely as administrative documents. In addition, Faza and Fitrika (2024) found that IEP implementation in Indonesia contributes to the quality of inclusive education by promoting more personalized and student-centered services. Thus, the product evaluation indicates that IEP implementation at SNC Sekolah Alam Depok contributed positively to student development while supporting the improvement of inclusive education services.

---

Sustaining these benefits requires continuous monitoring, periodic revision of individualized learning plans, systematic documentation, and stronger collaboration between schools and families (Faza & Fitrika, 2024; Khoeriah, 2017).

Overall, the results indicate that IEP implementation at the SNC of Sekolah Alam Depok has been supported by an appropriate context, relatively adequate resources, adaptive implementation practices, and positive student and parent outcomes. However, the evaluation also reveals that effectiveness should be understood as an ongoing condition rather than a final achievement. The main areas requiring strengthening are the continuity of teacher professional development, the integration and systematization of IEP-related documentation, and the consistency of monitoring and follow-up. Table 2 summarizes the findings across the four CIPP components and highlights both the strengths of implementation and the areas requiring further development.

Table 2. Summary of IEP Implementation Evaluation Results Based on CIPP Model

| No | Components | Key Findings                                                                                                              | Implications                                                                             |
|----|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | Context    | Inclusive policies, early assessment, individual goals, parental involvement                                              | The foundation for the implementation of IEP is according to the needs of the students   |
| 2  | Input      | Human resources, GPK, IEP-related documents, and adequate learning media; teacher training still needs to be strengthened | Resource readiness is relatively adequate but requires continued capacity building       |
| 3  | Process    | IEP is applied in learning through differentiation, collaboration, and periodic monitoring                                | Implementation is adaptive and generally consistent                                      |
| 4  | Product    | Improvements in academic development, social interaction, independence, and parental satisfaction                         | IEP implementation contributes positively to the quality of inclusive education services |

As summarized in Table 2, the four CIPP components demonstrate that IEP implementation has established a supportive foundation, sufficient basic resources, adaptive learning practices, and positive outcomes. However, the table also shows that these strengths are accompanied by structural issues that may affect continuity. In particular, the availability of IEP-related documents does not necessarily mean that the documentation system is fully integrated, while the provision of initial teacher training does not ensure continuous professional development. These conditions suggest that the underlying challenge is not simply a lack of resources, but the incomplete institutionalization of mechanisms that connect planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and documentation. When these mechanisms remain dependent on individual practices, continuity may be vulnerable to changes in personnel or differences in staff initiative and experience. These conditions indicate that future improvement should focus not only on maintaining existing practices but also on institutionalizing documentation, monitoring, and capacity-building mechanisms. The consistency of these findings was further examined through methodological triangulation using interviews, observations, and document analysis, as presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Synthesis of Triangulated Empirical Findings Across CIPP Components

| No. | CIPP Component | Interview Evidence                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Observation Evidence                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Documentary Evidence                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-----|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1   | Context        | The principal explained that the school mission supports individualized learning and that the SNC was established in response to the needs of children and parents. The principal stated that IEP planning begins with parent interviews and psychological assessment before learning needs are incorporated into the IEP. | The structured observation checklist indicated strong implementation of IEP-related policies, early identification, diagnostic assessment, individualized objectives, and active parental involvement.                                  | The reviewed IEP recorded baseline abilities, learning targets, learning media or strategies, current abilities, and responsible implementers, including roles for school personnel and parents.        |
| 2   | Input          | The facilitator stated that implementation involved “GPK, parents, psychologists, facilitators, coordinators, and the SNC principal.” The facilitator also reported initial training for new GPK and limitations in highly specialized learning facilities.                                                                | The checklist showed generally adequate GPK availability, teacher competence, training exposure, adaptive media, and staff-to-student ratios. Funding and accessibility were limited, while documentation was not yet fully systematic. | The IEP specified concrete learning materials, responsible implementers, and activity frequency at school and at home, showing how available resources supported individualized planning.               |
| 3   | Process        | The GPK explained that individualized learning referred to the facilitator's program and that students were “reminded gradually, negotiated with, habituated, and guided.” The GPK also described using self-made or available materials such as stones and bottle caps.                                                   | Students were observed completing individualized tasks with close adult support, including worksheet-based activities and letter-manipulation activities with direct educator guidance.                                                 | The IEP documented specific activities, learning media, implementation procedures, responsible persons, current abilities, and follow-up practice at school and at home.                                |
| 4   | Product        | A parent reported improvement in understanding sentences, independence, social awareness, and confidence, stating that the child was increasingly able to communicate with new people.                                                                                                                                     | Students were observed participating in structured individualized learning activities with direct support and active engagement in the tasks.                                                                                           | The reviewed IEP compared baseline abilities, expected targets, and current abilities, documenting both independently achieved activities and targets that still required guidance or further practice. |

---

Table 3 demonstrates the convergence of concrete evidence obtained from interviews, observations, and documentary sources across the four CIPP components. Interview evidence provides participants' explanations and representative accounts, observation evidence shows practices and conditions identified through field observation and structured checklists, and documentary evidence shows what was recorded in the reviewed IEP-related materials and development records. The triangulation indicates that the main findings were derived from complementary sources rather than from a single informant or technique. It also reveals an important distinction concerning IEP documentation: relevant planning and assessment records were available and used, but the overall documentation system had not yet been fully organized or systematized. This suggests that the current IEP system is operationally functional but has not yet been fully institutionalized as an integrated documentation and monitoring system. As a result, the continuity of planning, progress monitoring, evaluation, and follow-up may depend partly on how consistently individual educators maintain and communicate records. Therefore, the evidence supports the conclusion that IEP implementation was operationally established while its documentation system remained an area requiring institutional strengthening (Warju, 2016; Yusuf, 2017).

#### **4. Conclusion**

This study indicates that the implementation of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) at the Special Needs Center (SNC) of Sekolah Alam Depok has generally supported inclusive education through a strong policy foundation, systematic needs assessment, adequate resources, collaborative instructional practices, and continuous monitoring. These integrated components have contributed to improvements in students' academic, social, and independent development while enhancing the overall quality of inclusive education services. However, the findings also show that effectiveness remains an ongoing process rather than a final condition, particularly because IEP documentation, professional development, and monitoring mechanisms still require further institutional strengthening. The findings indicate that successful IEP implementation depends not only on careful program planning but also on the alignment of institutional policies, resource readiness, consistent instructional practices, and sustained collaboration among schools, teachers, and families. This study also demonstrates the usefulness of the Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) model as a comprehensive evaluation framework for identifying both the strengths of IEP implementation and areas requiring improvement. The evaluation provides practical guidance for schools by highlighting the need to strengthen teacher professional development, establish more systematic IEP documentation and student progress monitoring, and enhance school-parent collaboration to ensure more effective and sustainable individualized educational services.

This study is limited by its focus on a single school and its qualitative approach; therefore, the findings are contextual and cannot be generalized to all inclusive education providers. The evaluation also relies primarily on informant perceptions and program documentation without quantitatively assessing students' long-term

---

---

achievement. Future research should involve multiple inclusive schools with diverse characteristics and employ mixed-methods or longitudinal approaches to provide a more comprehensive assessment of IEP effectiveness. Further studies could also examine how teacher competence, school-parent collaboration, and institutional support influence the success of inclusive education services.

### Acknowledgement

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr. Abdul Rahman A. Ghani, M.Pd., for his invaluable guidance, constructive feedback, insightful suggestions, and continuous support throughout every stage of this research. His academic expertise and thoughtful direction have been instrumental in strengthening both the conceptual foundation and the overall quality of this study. The author also extends heartfelt appreciation to all individuals and institutions who provided assistance, encouragement, and support, whether directly or indirectly, during the research process. Their contributions have been greatly valued and have played an important role in the successful completion of this research.

### References

- Arifin, Z. (2019). *Evaluasi Pembelajaran: Prinsip, Teknik, Prosedur*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Arifin, Z., & Latifah, P. (2009). *Evaluasi Pembelajaran: Prinsip, Teknik, Prosedur: Standar Penilaian Menurut BSNP, Model Evaluasi, Instrumen Evaluasi, Penilaian Berbasis Kelas, Penilaian Portofolio, Analisis Kualitas Tes Refleksi Pelaksanaan Evaluasi*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=V15NMwEACAAJ>
- Arikunto, S., & Jabar, C. S. A. (2014). *Evaluasi Program Pendidikan: Pedoman Teoritis*. Bumi Aksara.
- Arriani, F., Hidayah, N., & Pramesti, F. (2021). *Panduan Penyusunan Program Pembelajaran Individual*. Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi.
- Aulia, C. R., & Hermanto, H. (2026). Co-Teaching Level of Regular Teachers and Special Supervisory Teachers in Elementary Schools Providing Inclusive Education in Padang City. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(3), 383–391. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.3.p.383-391>
- Blackwell, W. H., & Rossetti, Z. S. (2014). The Development of Individualized Education Programs: Where Have We Been and Where Should We Go Now? *SAGE Open*, 4(2), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014530411>
- Dwimarta, R. (2015). Rancangan IEP (Individualized Educational Program) bagi Anak Berkebutuhan Khusus pada Pendidikan Inklusif. *Meretas Sukses Publikasi Ilmiah Bidang Pendidikan Jurnal Bereputasi*, 1(2), 230–236.
- Emakulata, M., Afandi, A., Rosnija, E., Enawaty, E., & Sanulita, H. (2026). Evaluation of the New Student Admission System Service Program in Improving Educational Quality at SMA Negeri 5 Sekadau Hilir Using the CIPP Model. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(5), 51–65. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.5.p.51-65>
-

- 
- Fathinnaufal, M., & Pamungkas, B. (2025). Implementation of Inclusive Education at Sangkulirang Elementary School 006 East Kutai. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(5), 4608–4619. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.5.p.4608-4619>
- Faza, G., & Fitrika, R. (2024). Implementation of IEP (Individualized Educational Program) Program in Indonesia: Literature Analysis and Implications for Inclusive Education. *Journal of Education Research*, 5(4), 5762–5767. <https://doi.org/10.37985/jer.v5i4.1875>
- Hibana, H. (2023). Individual Learning Program as Implementation of Inclusive Education in Integrated PAUD Mutiara Yogyakarta. *QALAMUNA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Agama*, 15(1), 155–166. <https://doi.org/10.37680/qalamuna.v15i1.2338>
- Husain, R., & Hermanto, H. (2026). Managing Inclusive Education in a Primary School at UNG Laboratory Elementary School. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(2), 2520–2531. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.2.p.2520-2531>
- Iryani, E., Hufad, A., & Rusdiyani, I. (2023). Efektivitas Model Pembelajaran Inklusif Terintegrasi Model Pembelajaran Differensiasi pada Sekolah Dasar Inklusi. *Research and Development Journal of Education*, 9(2), 968–978. <https://doi.org/10.30998/rdje.v9i2.19505>
- Khoeriah, N. D. (2017). Individualized Educational Program dalam Implementasi Pendidikan Inklusif. *INCLUSIVE: Journal of Special Education*, 3(1), 41–49. <https://doi.org/10.30999/jse.v3i1.151>
- Khuluqo, I. E. (2017). Developing Indonesian Inclusive Educational Model. *International Journal for Studies on Children, Women, Elderly and Disabled*, 2, 118–124.
- Kozikoğlu, İ., & Albayrak, E. N. (2022). Teachers' Attitudes and the Challenges They Experience Concerning Individualized Education Program (IEP): A Mixed Method Study. *Participatory Educational Research*, 9(1), 98–115. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.22.6.9.1>
- Mardiana, A., Muzakki, I., Sunaiyah, S., & Ifriqia, F. (2020). Implementasi Program Pembelajaran Individual Siswa Tunagrahita Kelas Inklusi. *SITTAH: Journal of Primary Education*, 1(2), 203–217. <https://doi.org/10.30762/sittah.v1i2.2491>
- Musringudin, M., Rahman, A. A. G., & Priyono, D. (2022). *Modul Pembelajaran Evaluasi Program Pendidikan*. CV Media Sains Indonesia.
- Rabaika, K., Ayu, P., & Mahanani, R. (2025). The Intervention Design of Individualized Education Program (IEP) for Inclusive Students: Case Study at SDN. *Happiness: Journal of Psychology and Islamic Science*, 9(1), 12–28. <https://doi.org/10.30762/happiness.v9i1.2780>
- Rudiyati, S. (2010). Pengembangan Pengelolaan Program Pendidikan Individual “Individualized Education Program/IEP” bagi Anak Berkelainan di Sekolah Inklusif. *Jurnal Pendidikan Khusus*, 6(1), 54–64. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jpk.v6i2.6736>
- Sallis, E. (2014). *Total Quality Management in Education* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Smith, T. E. C., Tyler, N. C., & Skow, K. W. (2018). *Teaching Students with Special Needs in Inclusive Classrooms* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Sukardi, S. (2014). *Evaluasi Program Pendidikan*. Bumi Aksara.
- Sunardi, S., Yusuf, M., Gunarhadi, G., Priyono, P., & Yeager, J. L. (2011). The Implementation of Inclusive Education for Students with Special Needs in
-

- 
- Indonesia. *Excellence in Higher Education*, 2(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.5195/ehe.2011.27>
- Trimurtini, T., Mahanani, K., & Bektiningsih, B. (2023). Penerapan IEP (Individualized Education Program) dengan Pendekatan Multisensori sebagai Wujud Pembelajaran Berdiferensiasi bagi Siswa Sekolah Dasar Inklusi. *Bernas: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 4(1), 696–704. <https://doi.org/10.31949/jb.v4i1.3616>
- Warju, W. (2016). Innovation of Vocational Technology Education Program Evaluation Using CIPP Model. *INVOTEC*, 12(1), 36–42. <https://doi.org/10.17509/invotec.v12i1.4502>
- Wulan, M. N., Listyasari, W. D., Santosa, H., & Huda, S. (2026). A Systematic Literature Review on the CIPP Evaluation Model in Education: Examining Its Trends, Applications, and Research Gaps. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(3), 307–320. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.3.p.307-320>
- Yusuf, A. M. (2017). *Asesmen dan Evaluasi Pendidikan: Pilar Penyedia Informasi dan Kegiatan Pengendalian Mutu Pendidikan* (Edisi ke-1, Cet. 2). Kencana Prenada Media Group.

How to cite this article:

Miranti., Ghani, A. R. A., & Al Jufri, H. (2026). Evaluation of Individualized Education Program Implementation in Special Needs Center Services at Sekolah Alam Depok. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(9), 719-734.

---