

individualized education plan. With the exception of Nova Scotia [32] and Newfoundland and Labrador [30], there is an inclination to include these personalized adjustments and modifications directly in the individualized education plan. Only Nova Scotia separates the two by placing adjustments in the student's file and modifications in the individualized education plan.

Of interest is that the 13 Canadian jurisdictions have established an extensive list of accommodations for these students (depending on the difficulty) during their provincial assessments, including general adaptations pertaining to the presentation of the assessments and increased time allotments to complete these exams. Here, the Northwest Territories [33] are the exception by not considering CITs among its official accommodation measures.

5.2.6. Review. As shown in Figure 1, the review takes place at the end of the process and helps to determine the relevance of pursuing the individualized education plan as it was conceived for the special needs student. While most Canadian jurisdictions recognize the importance of this element, there are nuances in terms of the recommended frequency of review. Indeed, the government of Nunavut [34] indicates no such recommendation as to how often the IEP should be revised, while the other jurisdictions include this directive, which varies considerably depending on location. Four jurisdictions recommend an annual review, at the end of each school year [17] [21]. In the provinces of Québec and New Brunswick, there is no definite schedule of review; as each IEP is different and the situation varies depending on the needs addressed [13] [31].

5.2.7. Transition. The intervention plan ensures the function of transition when it allows for of continuity instructional measures to ease the passage from one environment to another [13] [17] [18]. By taking advantage of what worked with the student up to now, the function of transition becomes relevant, particularly at the end of a cyclical process. Some Canadian provinces and territories have welcomed transition as an integral part of the IEP, while others prefer a separate document.

6. Conclusion

The individualized education plan is now a shared and supported method with several commonalities. Yet while the IEP is used daily in today's schools and its implementation issues have been resolved, its legal premises continue to vary significantly from one education system to another. The same can be said regarding the quantity and quality of documents defining its use in Canada's different provinces and territories. Overall, however,

these intervention plans contain similar elements and implementation processes, meaning that although they may differ, their ultimate goal is the same.

The functions are also basically the same across the country, except regarding the function of identification. Indeed, this relatively new function differs significantly among the provinces and territories, through such transformations as inclusion and the non-categorical approach. Focusing on the nature rather than the causes of the student's difficulties holds the school team accountable for the function of identification. That said, there is evidence of a transition in Canada, particularly in categorical provinces. In British Columbia, for example, both a diagnosis and 30 hours of intervention with a remedial teacher may serve for this identification. Provinces using a non-categorical system have included this new function in their IEP, while categorical provinces such as Alberta and Ontario are now open to allowing the use of IEPs without the need for a diagnosis. Moreover, while each function is presented linearly within the cyclical configuration of the IEP (see Figure 1), results indicate that aspects of some of them manifest over a wider time period, such as the function of collaboration which has been mainly studied under the angle of its occurrence after the meeting to establish the IEP, even if it may also take place beforehand.

The fact that certain functions not explicitly expressed in the existing documentation does not mean that these stages of action are not part of the IEP of a particular province or territory or team responsible for its implementation.

7. References

- [1] S. Higgins and J. Barresi, "The changing forces of public policy", *Exceptional Children*, 45(4), 1979, pp. 270-277.
- [2] D. Poirier, L. Goguen, and P. Leslie, *Education rights of exceptional children: A national study of multi-level commitment*, Carswell, Vancouver, 1988.
- [3] A. Aucoin, L. Goguen, and R. Vienneau, "Pas plus spécial que nécessaire: analyse des politiques scolaires de la Nouvelle-Écosse à l'égard de l'inclusion scolaire des élèves avec handicaps", *Education et Francophonie*, 39(2), 2011, pp. 23-49. http://www.acelf.ca/c/revue/pdf/EF-39-2-023_AUCOIN.pdf. (Acces date 28 March 2016).
- [4] K. Rotter, IEP used by general and special education teachers. *SAGE Open*. April-Jun, 1-8. Plan (IEP) goals and objectives, *Journal of Early Intervention*, 23(2), 2014, pp. 92-105.
- [5] D. Mitchell, M. Morton, and G. Hornby, *Review of the literature on Individual Education Plans: Report to the New Zealand Ministry of Education*, Christchurch, New Zealand, 2010.

- [6] E. Drasgow, L. Mitchell, and T. Rowand Robinson, Developing Legally Correct and Educationally Appropriate IEPs. *Remedial and Special education*, 22(6), 2011, pp.359-373.
- [7] S. Rodger, Individual education plan revisited: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Development and Education*, 42, 1995, pp.221-239.
- [8] C. Christle and M. Yell, Individualized Education Programs: Legal Requirements and Research Findings, *Exceptionality*, 18(3), 2010, pp. 109-123.
- [9] S. W. Smith, Individualized education programs (IEPs) in special education: From intent to acquiescence. *Exceptional Children*, 57, 1990, pp. 6-14.
- [10] Gouvernement du Canada, Loi constitutionnelle de 1867, Canada Retrieved from <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/fra/const/page-1.html> (Access date 28: March 2016).
- [11] R. Legendre, *Dictionnaire actuel de l'éducation* (3rd ed), Guérin, Montréal, 2005.
- [12] E. Barton, "Individual education plan", *Encyclopedia of Autism Spectrum Disorder*, Springer, New Haven, CT, 2013, pp. 1569-1574.
- [13] Québec, Le plan d'intervention... au service de l'élève : cadre de référence pour l'établissement des plans d'intervention, Ministère de l'éducation, Québec, QC, 2004. Retrieved from http://www.mels.gouv.qc.ca/fileadmin/site_web/documents/dpse/adaptation_serv_compl/19-7053.pdf7. (Access date: 28 March, 2016).
- [14] D. Bateman and C.F. Bateman, *A Principal's Guide to Special Education*, Council for Exceptional Children, Arlington, VA, 2001.
- [15] South Dakota Department of Education, *Individual Education Program (IEP): A Technical Assistance Guide*, Special Education Programs, Pierre, SD, 2013.
- [16] Ontario, *Plan d'enseignement individualisé (PEI)*, Ministère de l'Éducation, Toronto, ON, 2004.
- [17] Manitoba, *Plan éducatif personnalisé: guide d'élaboration et de mise en œuvre d'un PEP*, Éducation Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, 2010.
- [18] Prince Edward Island, *Individualized Educational Planning (IEP): Standards and guidelines*, Department of Education, Charlottetown, PEI, 2005.
- [19] Alberta, *Individualized Program Plans*, Ministère de l'Éducation, Edmonton, AB, 2005. Retrieved from http://www.learnalberta.ca/content/kes/pdf/or_ws_tea_ld_b_01_ipp.pdf. (Access date: 28 March, 2016).
- [20] Northwest Territories, *Northwest Territories Individual Education Plans: Guidelines for Development and Teacher Resource Kit*, Education Culture and Employment, Yellowknife, NT, 2006.
- [21] British Columbia, *Individual Education Planning for Students with Special Needs: A Resource Guide for Teachers*, Ministry of Education, Victoria, BC, 2009.
- [22] Québec, *Loi sur l'instruction publique*, Chap. I-13.3, Ministère de l'Éducation, Québec, QC, 1988. Retrieved from http://www2.publicationsduquebec.gouv.qc.ca/dynamicSearch/telecharge.php?type=2&file=/I_13_3/I13_3.html. (Access date: 28 March, 2016).
- [23] British Columbia, *School Act*, Ministry of Education, Victoria, BC, 1996.
- [24] Northwest Territories, *Loi sur l'éducation*, Ministère de l'Éducation, Yellowknife, NT, 1995. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gov.nt.ca/fr/fichiers/legislation/education/education.a.pdf>. (Acces date 28 March 2016).
- [25] Saskatchewan, *Policy, Guidelines, and Procedures for Functional Integrated Program*, Saskatchewan Learning, Regina, SK, 2006.
- [26] Alberta, *Pour démarrer: travailler le processus d'élaboration du PIP*, Alberta Education, Edmonton, AB, 2007.
- [27] Yukon, *Special Program Services: A Handbook of Procedures and Guidelines*, Department of Education, Whitehorse, Yukon, 1995.
- [28] Newfoundland and Labrador, *Individual Education Plan (IEP) Summary*, Department of Education, St-John's, NL, 2012a.
- [29] Québec, *Plan d'intervention*. Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport, Québec, QC, 2012.
- [30] Newfoundland and Labrador, *Service Delivery Model for Students with Exceptionalities Forms*. Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, St-John's, NL, 2011.
- [31] Nouveau-Brunswick, *Le plan stratégique et l'équipe stratégique: soutenir les élèves à besoins particuliers dans leurs apprentissages*, Ministère de l'Éducation, Services aux élèves, Moncton, NB, 2010.
- [32] Nouvelle-Écosse, *Politique en matière d'éducation spéciale*, Ministère de l'Éducation, Services aux élèves, Halifax, NE, 2008.
- [33] Northwest Territories, *The NWT School Handbook 2012-2013*, Education Culture and Employment, Yellowknife, NT, 2013.
- [34] Nunavut, *Foundation for inclusive education in Nunavut schools*, Curriculum and School Services Division, NU, 2008.