

Dissertation evaluation

Title of dissertation: Study on the Collaboration Process of Individualized Education Plan

Author of dissertation: Karchung Karchung

Evaluator: PhDr. Iva Strnadová, Ph.D.

The role of Individualized Educational Plans (IEP) in the process of educating children with special educational needs is indisputable. I acknowledge your dissertation submitted as an effort to contribute to this area of research, especially due to its focus on dynamics of process in developing the IEPs within the team. You have logically structured your dissertation into six chapters, bibliography and six appendices.

The abstract is an explanation of rationale for your dissertation rather than an overview of its content. There is missing information about the methodology used and the number of participants being involved.

The key terms and concepts are described, however I would like to hear your voice more, especially in chapter two where the terms are defined but not discussed. Generally I find the chapter two too broad. As you have decided to study the collaboration process of IEP in the Czech Republic, I am not sure why you refer to IDEA in chapter 2.5.1. In chapter 2.5.3 where you define the content of IEP given by legislation, yet again unfortunately refer to IDEA instead of Czech legislation which should have been the main framework for your dissertation. I am aware that it is not available in Czech language however as you were using the service of a translator you could have also asked her to translate the appropriate part of Amendment no.73/2005Sb. (only one page of text).

The research strategy selected in order to study the collaboration process of IEP – semi-structured interviews - was a good decision. Though there is no remark about intellectual disability or dyslexia in your dissertation, you suddenly state in chapter 3.5.6.3 that student participants were selected according to their age, intellectual disability and dyslexia. Why have you decided for these two types of special educational needs? If children with intellectual disability and dyslexia were your aim group, there should be at least one subchapter dedicated to this issue in chapter one. *I recommend you to explain at the viva the*

reason for focusing on given aim group. In chapter 3.6 you state that the transcribed interviews “were e-mailed to the interviewees to cross check them.” ***Did all participants speak English, even the parents and students? If not, how did you ensure they were able to understand the transcribed data? Please, explain at the viva.***

The process of analyzing the data is not sufficiently explained. ***Please, describe it in more detail at the viva.***

Chapter four focuses on analyzing data. I would highly recommend using quotations of participants to illustrate your arguments.

Recommendations on page 77 are rather confusing. ***Recommendation 2 is very general. Please, provide more details at the viva.*** Recommendation 4 is not based on accurate information. The decision about placement of the child is done by parents; Special Education Centers only provide recommendation. ***What do you mean by recommendation 5 “Schools need to be provided with adequate support to mainstream children with special education”? Please, explain at the viva. I would also like to see implications for future research – please, provide them at the viva.***

Chapter six is more the summary of literature review than of your own research.

The suggestions for improvements:

- The formal side of the dissertation deserves a bit more attention – e.g., spacing, binding, etc.
- In some subchapters you refer only to one resource which is not sufficient (e.g. chapter 3.5.4 is solely based on Aitken 2008).
- The figure on page 48 has no reference to its source and also lacks the numbers.
- There are English grammatical and spelling mistakes.

I recommend the dissertation to be accepted to the viva.

Evaluation: 3

Prague, 3rd August 2008



PhDr. Iva Strnadová, PhD.