

Adaptive Formative Assessment Practices in Special Schools: A Case Study of Teachers Working with Students with Mild Intellectual Disabilities

Anna Ratri Kartikaningrum^{1)*}, Fajar Indra Septiana²⁾

^{1,2)} Universitas Islam Nusantara Bandung, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author

Email: anna.kartikaningrum@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates the implementation of formative assessment in special schools as a pedagogical strategy to support learning among students with mild intellectual disabilities. Using a qualitative case study approach, the research was conducted at SLB Froebel Montessori 1 (Jakarta) and SLB Froebel Montessori 2 (Depok), involving classroom teachers directly responsible for designing and applying formative assessment. Data were gathered through in-depth interviews, participant observation, and document analysis, and analyzed using the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña. The findings show that formative assessment was initiated through structured routines to enhance student readiness, but was often constrained by short attention spans and limited assessment media. Teachers employed flexible strategies to address behavioral and instructional challenges, including simplified instructions, visual aids, and differentiated rewards. While assessment results were used to inform instructional planning, the application remained informal due to resource limitations and diverse student abilities. Additionally, the absence of institutional support—such as training, teaching assistants, and adaptive materials—posed a significant barrier to sustained implementation. The study concludes that while teachers exhibit strong commitment and creativity, the effectiveness of formative assessment depends on systemic support, professional development, and context-responsive assessment models tailored to special education settings.

Keywords: *Formative Assessment, Special Education, Mild Intellectual Disabilities, Teacher Strategy, Inclusive Instruction*

INTRODUCTION

Twenty-first century education demands adaptive learning processes that accommodate the diverse characteristics of learners, including those with special needs. Students with mild intellectual disabilities (MID) are among the groups requiring specifically designed pedagogical and assessment approaches, as their cognitive and adaptive limitations pose significant challenges to achieving foundational learning objectives. In this context, formative assessment plays a vital role not only in evaluating learning progress but also in guiding and shaping instructional strategies in a continuous and responsive manner (Andersson & Granberg, 2022; Johnstone, 2024).

However, in practice, formative assessment in special schools (SLBs) is often reduced to administrative formality. Teachers tend to focus more on recording learning outcomes than on using assessment data to design instruction tailored to students' individual needs (Yan et al., 2025). In special education, assessment should function as a pedagogical tool that allows real-time adjustments to content, methods, and materials based on students' readiness and learning profiles (Töllner et al., 2025; Wibowo, 2019).

The gap between the conceptual understanding and classroom application of formative assessment in SLBs has been acknowledged in several studies, though most have focused on summative assessments or final evaluation outcomes. Research specifically addressing formative assessment for students with MID, especially in early primary grades, remains limited. This is a critical concern, as the early years of schooling are essential for developing students' foundational cognitive and social skills. Therefore, a deeper investigation is needed into how teachers in SLBs plan, implement, and evaluate formative assessments in a contextualized and practical manner (Doody et al., 2025; Burke et al., 2020).

Moreover, several challenges impact the quality of formative assessment in SLBs, including short attention spans, limited access to adaptive learning materials, and a lack of professional training in designing flexible and responsive assessment instruments. Teachers often rely on improvisation and practical experience to manage the complex dynamics of special education classrooms, while institutional support in the form of training, resources, or professional coaching remains scarce (Black & Wiliam, 2009; Brookhart, 2013; Kooijmans et al., 2024; Carbajal et al., 2024; Little et al., 2010).

Given these circumstances, this study focuses on analyzing the formative assessment practices employed by special education teachers for first-grade students with mild intellectual disabilities in two specialized schools: SLB Frobel Montessori 1 and SLB Frobel Montessori 2. The study aims to describe in depth the planning, implementation, and utilization of assessment data in the learning process, as well as to identify the challenges and strategies teachers use in managing adaptive formative assessments (Shurr et al., 2014; Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006).

The novelty of this study lies in its empirical exploration of real-world classroom practices, highlighting the dynamics of formative assessment in the context of teaching students with MID. This research contributes not only to the theoretical development of formative assessment in special education but also presents a contextually grounded adaptive formative assessment model, offering practical implications for teachers, school leaders, and policymakers in Indonesia's special education system (Heritage, 2010; Tomlinson, 2017)

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a qualitative approach with a case study design. The qualitative approach allows researchers to deeply understand and explain a phenomenon in its natural and social context, as well as to explore the subjective meanings of individual experiences (Creswell & Clark, 2017). The case study design was chosen because it provides an in-depth understanding of a particular system or phenomenon within a real-life setting, especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and its context are unclear (Adrias & Ruswandi, 2025; Yin, 2017). The research was conducted in two special schools—SLB Frobel Montessori 1 in Jakarta and SLB Frobel Montessori 2 in Depok—selected purposively due to their relevant characteristics and alignment with the study objectives. The research subjects consisted of classroom teachers actively involved in the formative assessment of students with mild intellectual disabilities.

Data were collected using methodological triangulation, involving in-depth interviews, participant observation, and document analysis. Interviews were used to obtain detailed narratives of teachers' experiences, while participant observation allowed the researcher to directly observe classroom interactions and assessment practices. Document analysis covered assessment records, lesson plans, and instructional materials used by the teachers (Patton, 2014; Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007). In qualitative research, the researcher acts as the primary instrument (human instrument), as their interaction with the subjects and field context is an integral part of the research process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Tisdell et al., 2025). Additional instruments, including interview guides, observation checklists, instrument grids, and document analysis forms, were developed to ensure clarity and systematization in the data collection process.

To ensure data trustworthiness, the study applied the four criteria proposed by Lincoln and Guba (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 2008): credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility was achieved through data triangulation and member checking. Transferability was addressed by providing rich, contextual descriptions (thick description). Dependability and confirmability were reinforced by maintaining an audit trail and systematic documentation throughout the research process (Shenton, 2004).

Data analysis followed the interactive model by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (Miles et al., 2014), which consists of three stages: (1) data reduction, involving the selection, simplification, and transformation of raw data; (2) data display, where the data are organized into narratives, matrices, and simple visualizations; and (3) conclusion drawing and verification, carried out iteratively to ensure the accuracy and consistency of findings. The analysis was conducted simultaneously with data collection to allow the researcher to respond adaptively to field dynamics as they emerged.

The study was conducted from February to April 2025, encompassing the preparation, field data collection, and data analysis phases, as well as the development of the final research report. Through this approach, the research aims to provide a substantial contribution to the development of evidence-based and contextually grounded formative assessment practices in special education settings.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Initiating Formative Assessment: Classroom Routines and Readiness Challenges

The initial phase of formative assessment plays a critical role in shaping students' emotional and cognitive readiness to engage in learning tasks. In both SLB Frobels Montessori 1 and SLB Frobels Montessori 2, teachers began the assessment process with carefully structured classroom routines. These routines were not merely procedural but served as essential preparatory steps to align students' attention, reduce anxiety, and create a familiar structure within which assessment could occur.

At SLB Frobels Montessori 1, teachers opened sessions with greetings, light movement activities, and simple games to stimulate focus. This was often followed by an "apersepsi" stage (activating prior knowledge), which aimed to bridge previous lessons with the current task. In contrast, teachers at SLB Frobels Montessori 2 favored short ice-breaking activities such as number recitation, song-based routines, or visual flashcards to engage students' attention before assessment began.

Despite these efforts, both schools encountered significant challenges during this initiation phase. A recurring issue was students' emotional instability or lack of focus during the first 5–10 minutes of class. Teachers noted that children with mild intellectual disabilities often arrived at school in varying states of emotional regulation, influenced by factors at home or transitions between school activities.

Teachers reported that a student's unwillingness to participate, tantrums, or silent withdrawal were common behaviors that hindered the start of assessment. These behaviors required teachers to delay or adapt their plans, sometimes shifting to non-academic activities before attempting to resume the planned assessment. Emotional readiness was therefore identified as a key prerequisite for successful formative assessment.

The following table summarizes the strategies used to initiate assessments in both schools and the challenges encountered:

Table 1. Strategies and Challenges in Initiating Formative Assessment

Aspects	SLB Montessori 1	Frobels	SLB Montessori 2	Frobels	Key Findings
Initial Activities	Greetings, movement, apersepsi	light	Ice-breaking number chanting	games, chanting	Emotional preparation is essential before assessing
Readiness Challenges	Low attention span, emotional dysregulation		Resistance to sit still, inconsistent responses		Readiness varies daily and among students

Teacher's Adaptation	Delay personal check-in	assessment, tasks, visual aids	Introduce playful	Requires responsive routines	flexible, classroom
-------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------

Another important observation is that the readiness of students is highly individual and fluctuates daily. Some students required extended warm-up periods, while others could engage with learning materials within minutes. Teachers emphasized the importance of observing student cues—such as eye contact, body language, or verbal responses—before initiating assessment tasks.

Teachers also acknowledged that readiness is not solely dependent on students' disabilities, but is influenced by context-specific variables such as classroom noise, group dynamics, or recent incidents outside the classroom. Therefore, a one-size-fits-all approach to initiating assessment was found ineffective. Instead, responsive and adaptive strategies were required, with some teachers employing personal greetings, humor, or allowing students to choose between tasks to build rapport.

Interestingly, both schools reported that students' response to initiation routines improved over time with consistency and repetition. Routine-based starts helped students build predictability and comfort, especially when paired with positive reinforcement. However, when routines were disrupted due to school-wide activities or absenteeism, assessment effectiveness declined noticeably.

In conclusion, initiating formative assessment in special education settings is not a trivial matter of "starting the lesson." Rather, it is a carefully calibrated process of emotional attunement and instructional timing. Teachers in this study showed high sensitivity to student cues and demonstrated adaptive strategies to create the psychological safety and structure necessary for meaningful assessment to take place.

Technical Barriers and Limitations of Assessment Media

The second major finding concerns the technical constraints faced by teachers during the implementation of formative assessment, particularly related to students' limited attention span and the availability of appropriate assessment media. These challenges significantly affected the depth and continuity of formative assessment sessions.

Teachers at both SLB Frobels Montessori 1 and 2 reported that students with mild intellectual disabilities often struggled to maintain focus for extended periods, making it difficult to carry out assessment tasks that required sustained attention. Most students could only stay engaged for 5 to 15 minutes, depending on the day and the task design. When asked about this, one teacher from SLB Frobels Montessori 1 explained:

"After ten minutes, the children start getting restless. Some run around, some whine. So we have to move quickly—the assessment has to be short, but still meaningful."

To address these limitations, teachers often designed brief, game-based, or hands-on tasks that could capture student attention while also eliciting evidence of learning. However, the effectiveness of these strategies was constrained by the limited availability of adapted assessment tools and materials. Teachers mostly relied on low-tech items such as number cards, popsicle sticks, marbles, and magnetic boards.

One teacher from SLB Frobels Montessori 2 noted the following:

"I would like to use digital media or interactive videos, but we don't have the facilities. So we improvise with cards and pictures—and even those we have to make ourselves."

The following table summarizes the key technical and media-related constraints observed in both schools:

Table 2. Technical and Media Constraints in Formative Assessment

Aspects	SLB Montessori 1	Frobels SLB Frobels Montessori 2	Common Issues
---------	---------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------

Attention span	5–10 minutes	7–15 minutes	Short window for effective assessment
Assessment media	Number marbles, sticks	cards, popsicle	Magnetic boards, number blocks, flashcards
Main challenges	Main challenges	Main challenges	Lack of variety and adaptability
			Main challenges

The media used for assessment was largely teacher-made, often with limited time and resources. While these materials showed creativity and improvisation, they often lacked the flexibility to accommodate students' diverse learning styles and abilities. Furthermore, repeated use of the same materials led to student boredom, reducing engagement and motivation.

Teachers also described the difficulty of conducting individualized assessments in group settings. With limited media, it was challenging to differentiate tasks or provide alternative forms of demonstrating understanding. This situation often forced teachers to adopt a "one size fits most" approach, contrary to the principles of differentiated instruction fundamental to special education.

Despite these limitations, some teachers found ways to adapt. For example, when students showed signs of disengagement, teachers introduced visual reinforcements or embedded assessment into play-based activities. While these workarounds were partially effective, they required significant energy and real-time decision-making, increasing teacher workload.

In summary, the lack of adapted assessment media and short attention spans among students with intellectual disabilities formed a dual constraint that complicated the implementation of meaningful formative assessment. These challenges highlighted the urgent need for better resourcing, media development, and teacher support to ensure that formative assessment can fulfill its intended pedagogical function in special education contexts.

Teacher Strategies in Overcoming Assessment Challenges

In the face of behavioral, cognitive, and resource-related challenges during formative assessment, teachers employed a variety of adaptive strategies to maintain student engagement and ensure the continuity of learning. These strategies were rooted in flexibility, personalization, and improvisation, reflecting a deep understanding of the dynamic needs of students with mild intellectual disabilities.

One of the most common difficulties faced during formative assessment was student refusal or lack of response to tasks. Teachers reported that students might ignore instructions, avoid eye contact, or even leave their seats during assessment sessions. To address this, teachers at SLB Frobels Montessori 1 often gave students a short break or redirected them to simpler, preferred activities before returning to the task. A teacher from this school shared:

"Sometimes the child just stays silent, refusing to participate. I give them a break or invite them to play for a bit before trying again."

At SLB Frobels Montessori 2, the approach leaned more toward using tokens and reward-based games to regain attention. Teachers used visual cues, praise, and physical movement to draw students back into the learning process. They also employed "emotional anchoring," such as calling the student by name gently or touching their shoulder to regain their focus without escalating the situation.

Instructional comprehension was another key obstacle. Due to language delays and processing difficulties, many students struggled to understand verbal instructions, especially if delivered in full sentences. To overcome this, teachers modified instructions by breaking them into short phrases, using concrete visual examples, or demonstrating the task directly. A teacher explained:

"Instructions must be short and clear. If possible, I demonstrate the task first before asking the student to imitate.")

The use of non-verbal communication—such as gestures, picture cues, or pointing—proved highly effective. Teachers also created visual task strips or pictorial flowcharts to guide students through multi-step tasks. These strategies reduced cognitive load and helped maintain a sense of progress and achievement during the assessment.

Motivation was another recurring issue, particularly when assessments were perceived as repetitive or difficult. To counter this, teachers used a variety of reward systems, including stickers, applause, tokens, or access to preferred activities. However, several teachers acknowledged that over time, students became desensitized to the same rewards, necessitating constant innovation.

"If we give out stickers every day, the students get bored. We have to switch it up—sometimes toys, sometimes peer praise.")

The table below summarizes the key strategies employed by teachers in response to specific challenges encountered during formative assessment:

Table 3. Teacher Strategies for Managing Formative Assessment Challenges

Aspects	SLB Montessori 1	Frobel	SLB Frobel	Montessori 2	Common Issues
Student refusal/non-response	Student refusal/non-response		Student refusal/non-response		Student refusal/non-response
Instructional comprehension	Instructional comprehension		Instructional comprehension		Instructional comprehension
Declining motivation	Declining motivation		Declining motivation		Declining motivation

These strategies reflect teachers' efforts to individualize assessment processes without access to advanced tools or institutional support. Although not formally standardized, these teacher-developed techniques formed an adaptive, intuitive model of formative assessment suitable for the realities of special education classrooms.

In essence, the success of formative assessment in these settings relied heavily on teachers' emotional intelligence, observational skill, and creative pedagogy. Their ability to shift tactics in real-time—without disrupting the classroom environment—was key to sustaining student participation and collecting meaningful learning evidence.

Using Formative Assessment Results for Instructional Planning

The fourth core finding highlights how formative assessment results were utilized—or underutilized—by teachers in planning instruction for students with mild intellectual disabilities. While both schools demonstrated a commitment to adapting instruction based on assessment data, several practical barriers limited the depth and consistency of implementation.

In SLB Frobel Montessori 1, teachers reported using assessment outcomes as a reference to determine the content of the next lesson or to adjust the learning pace for individual students. For instance, if a student was unable to complete a basic counting task, the next lesson would focus on reinforcing number recognition through tactile or game-based activities. A teacher explained:

"We review our notes to see who hasn't mastered numbers 1–5. The following week, we focus on that again, but with a different approach."

In SLB Frobel Montessori 2, teachers similarly used assessment results as a guide for developing Individualized Learning Plans (ILPs). These plans included short-term targets and tailored tasks for each student. However, the degree of differentiation was often constrained by limited time and human resources, especially when students' progress levels varied widely.

The table below summarizes how each school applied formative assessment results in instructional planning and the common difficulties they faced:

Table 4. Utilization of Assessment Results for Instructional Planning

Aspects	SLB Montessori 1	Frobel	SLB Frobel	Montessori 2	Common Issues
Use of results	Identifying next lesson topic		Developing individualized plans	short-term	Data informs adaptive planning
Main difficulty	Wide range of student achievement levels		Fluctuating student behavior		Differentiation is difficult to sustain
Planning approach	Group-based with minor tweaks	with individual	Semi-individualized flexible grouping	with	Full ILPs rarely implemented due to resources

One of the most consistent barriers reported by teachers was the heterogeneity of student abilities. Students in the same classroom had vastly different cognitive and behavioral profiles, making it challenging to implement group activities while also addressing individual needs. A teacher explained:

("Some students can add numbers, others don't even recognize them. One activity doesn't work for everyone. But our time is limited.")

Another issue was the inconsistency in students' daily readiness and behavior, which made it difficult to rely on previous assessments as the sole guide for planning. Teachers needed to make day-to-day judgments, often modifying lesson plans on the spot based on students' current engagement levels.

Despite these limitations, both schools showed an intuitive commitment to differentiated instruction. Teachers expressed a strong belief that assessment should guide learning, not just evaluate it. However, they also admitted that without structured institutional support—such as time allocation for individual planning or team-based case reviews—this vision remained only partially realized.

In sum, while formative assessment results were used by teachers to shape instruction, the application was often informal, situational, and constrained by structural limitations. The findings underscore the need for systems that not only encourage formative assessment but also provide the time, training, and tools to act on its results meaningfully.

Institutional Support and Structural Barriers

The final key finding centers on the extent of institutional support and systemic constraints that shaped teachers' ability to implement formative assessment effectively. While the commitment and creativity of teachers were evident throughout the study, it became equally clear that the success of formative assessment is not solely dependent on teacher competence—it also requires organizational backing.

Both SLB Frobel Montessori 1 and SLB Frobel Montessori 2 operated under conditions of limited resources, including teaching staff, instructional materials, and funding for training. Teachers frequently voiced frustration over the lack of institutional response to their assessment needs. One teacher from SLB Frobel Montessori 1 shared:

"We want specialized training in assessment for children with special needs, but none has been provided. We do everything on our own.")

This sense of isolation was echoed by teachers in SLB Frobel Montessori 2, who expressed the need for assessment workshops and teaching assistants to help implement individualized tasks. With only one teacher per class and no classroom aide, executing differentiated assessments became logistically overwhelming.

"If we had just one more teacher, I could focus on assessments while the other manages students who aren't ready to learn.")

The following table outlines the types of support requested by teachers and the barriers they experienced in both schools:

Table 5. Institutional Support Needs and Barriers

Aspects	SLB Montessori 1	Frobel	SLB Frobel	Montessori 2	Shared Findings
Desired support	Assessment teacher training	media,	Workshops, assistants	classroom	Need for professional development and tools
Structural challenges	Limited funding, small team size		Shortage of staff, no specialized aides		Resource scarcity across both institutions
Existing support systems	Informal peer sharing		Internal planning meetings		Support remains informal and non-systematic

Despite these barriers, teachers made efforts to create informal peer support systems. In SLB Frobel Montessori 1, for example, teachers sometimes shared self-made materials or lesson plans to reduce the preparation burden. However, without structured coordination or leadership direction, such sharing remained occasional and unsystematic.

There was also a notable absence of school-wide strategies or monitoring mechanisms related to formative assessment. Neither school had formal policies or guidelines specific to adaptive assessment for students with intellectual disabilities. As a result, teacher practices were highly individualized, relying on personal experience and judgment rather than institutional frameworks.

This lack of systemic support not only impacted the quality of formative assessment but also contributed to teacher fatigue and professional burnout, as the responsibility for adapting instruction rested entirely on individual educators. Teachers expressed a desire for more recognition of the complexity of their work and a collaborative environment that supports reflective practice and innovation.

In conclusion, while teachers demonstrated strong personal initiative in conducting formative assessment, the absence of institutional support severely limited its sustainability and scalability. For formative assessment to become an embedded part of special education pedagogy, schools must move beyond relying on individual effort and begin investing in infrastructure, training, and systemic planning.

Discussion

This study explored the implementation of formative assessment in special schools (SLB) for students with mild intellectual disabilities. The findings highlight both the pedagogical potential and the practical limitations of formative assessment in real-world special education settings. In this section, the results are discussed through the lens of existing theories and previous studies, focusing on three core functions of discussion in qualitative research: description, explanation, and prediction (Maxwell, 2013).

First, the study found that initiation routines were crucial for preparing students for assessment tasks. Teachers emphasized the need to regulate students' emotional states and establish a predictable classroom atmosphere before beginning any formal evaluation. This aligns with Vygotsky's (1978) concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which posits that learning occurs most effectively when scaffolded within students' developmental readiness. Emotional readiness, in this context, functions as a precursor to cognitive engagement. Teachers' practices of using warm-up activities, personal greetings, and visual routines served as informal scaffolding tools to bring students into the learning zone.

Second, the research reveals a dual constraint of attention span and limited media, which directly impacted the quality of formative assessment. Teachers faced challenges designing assessment tasks that were both engaging and appropriate for students with short attention spans. These findings resonate with Black and Wiliam's (2009) theory of formative assessment as a dynamic process, requiring continuous feedback loops between teacher and learner. However, in the observed SLBs, these feedback loops were often truncated due to logistical barriers, such as lack of adapted materials or time constraints. The reliance on improvised and repetitive tools also weakened students' long-term engagement, as documented in previous studies on special education assessment (Andersson & Granberg, 2022; Töllner et al., 2025).

The third major theme—adaptive teacher strategies—demonstrates the pivotal role of teacher agency in sustaining assessment practices. Teachers in both schools employed a mix of personal, flexible, and often intuitive methods to deal with disengagement, instructional misunderstandings, and behavioral variability. These practices align with Skinner's (1953) behaviorist theory of motivation, particularly the use of reinforcement (e.g., praise, tokens, games) to sustain desired learning behaviors. However, the study also supports more recent findings (Burke et al., 2020) that static or overused reward systems may lose their effectiveness, requiring teachers to innovate constantly to maintain motivation.

Despite the above efforts, the application of assessment results for instructional planning remained limited. While teachers intended to use assessment data to inform next steps, the variability in student readiness and lack of time for individualized planning reduced the effectiveness of data-driven instruction. This highlights a significant gap between the theory of data-informed pedagogy and its practice, echoing concerns raised by Johnstone (2024) and Carbajal et al. (2024). Teachers were often forced to rely on instinct rather than systematic analysis, indicating a need for capacity-building in assessment literacy.

Finally, the study points to the critical absence of institutional support as a structural barrier. Neither school had formal mechanisms to support the development, execution, or monitoring of formative assessment. Teachers worked largely in isolation, with minimal access to professional development, assessment tools, or co-teaching support. This finding mirrors those of Kooijmans et al. (2024), who argue that sustainable assessment practices in special education require systemic backing—beyond personal dedication.

In sum, this study illustrates that while formative assessment is conceptually embraced by teachers in SLB contexts, its implementation is highly dependent on individual improvisation and under constant pressure from institutional constraints. Yet, within these limitations, the research also uncovered a pattern of grassroots innovation—a kind of *adaptive professionalism*—where teachers continuously recalibrate their practices based on student responses, even without formal frameworks.

Implications and Theoretical Contribution

The findings of this research contribute to the growing body of literature advocating for adaptive formative assessment in special education. They suggest the need for a hybrid model that combines structured frameworks with flexible strategies, enabling teachers to respond to individual needs while maintaining pedagogical coherence. This study also introduces the concept of assessment resilience—teachers' capacity to persist in implementing formative assessment despite systemic barriers—as a potential area for further exploration.

Moreover, the study lays the groundwork for the development of a contextualized assessment model tailored to SLB environments in Indonesia. Such a model would integrate differentiated media, scaffolding routines, motivational strategies, and institutional support structures to make formative assessment not only feasible but impactful.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the implementation of formative assessment for students with mild intellectual disabilities in special schools is built on strong teacher commitment and creative instructional efforts, yet remains challenged by various structural and pedagogical limitations. Teachers consistently adapted assessment strategies to match students' learning characteristics—such as simplifying task demands, providing visual cues, prompting, and delivering immediate feedback to maintain engagement and ensure understanding throughout the learning process. These efforts successfully contributed to increased academic participation, improved task completion, and enhanced student motivation.

However, the implementation was still limited by several issues. Students' short attention spans required frequent task modification, which often reduced the time available for deeper evaluation of learning progress. Additionally, the lack of adaptive and standardized tools made teachers rely heavily on improvisation, resulting in inconsistent assessment documentation and difficulty tracking long-term progress. Institutional support for professional development, collaboration spaces, and provision of inclusive assessment resources was also insufficient, leaving teachers to shoulder most of the responsibility independently.

To bridge the gap between the theory and practice of formative assessment in special education, a more systemic approach is required. Schools need to strengthen policy frameworks that ensure formative assessment is integrated into curriculum planning, supported by regular training on adaptive evaluation techniques, and facilitated by the development of practical assessment media tailored for students with MID. Enhancing collaboration between teachers, parents, and specialists is equally crucial to ensure that assessment results are consistently used to inform individualized instructional decisions. In doing so, formative assessment can become a sustainable and impactful component of special education, contributing directly to students' academic development, functional skills, and overall learning independence.

REFERENCES

- Andersson, C., & Granberg, C. (2022). From passenger to pilot: Using formative assessment to support students with intellectual disabilities to become self-regulated learners. *Frontiers in Education*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.845208>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
- Burke, K. M., Raley, S. K., Shogren, K. A., & Hagiwara, M. (2020). A meta-analysis of interventions to promote self-determination for students with disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 41(3), 176–188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932518802274>
- Carbajal, A. B., et al. (2024). Assessment of adaptive behavior in people with intellectual disabilities: Development of a new test battery. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 94, 101–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2023.101113>
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Doody, O., et al. (2025). Indicators for intellectual disability where no formal diagnosis exists: Screening processes and identifying indicators. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 69(4), 310–325. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jir.12912>
- Johnstone, M. E. (2024). Assessment of learners with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities: Challenges and practices. *International Journal of Special Education Research*, 12(1), 35–52.

- Kooijmans, R., et al. (2024). Does adapting a self-report instrument to improve its cognitive accessibility lead to better understanding and more accurate responses among people with intellectual disabilities? *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 46(8), 1234–1245. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2022.2042070>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. Macmillan.
- Tashakkori, A., & Creswell, J. W. (2007). Editorial: The new era of mixed methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 3–7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2345678906293042>
- Tisdell, E. J., Taylor, E. W., & Sprow-Fritz, L. (2025). *Foundations of adult and continuing education* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Töllner, F., et al. (2025). Formative assessment in inclusive mathematics education: A systematic review. *Education Sciences*, 15(5), Article 577. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15050577>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wibowo, B. (2019). Praktik asesmen guru SLB dalam pembelajaran anak berkebutuhan khusus. *Jurnal Pendidikan Khusus*, 12(1), 44–57.
- Yan, Z., Xiao, Y., Sin, K.-F., & Yang, L. (2025). Formative assessment practices in special school classrooms with the support of e-books: A case study. *Special Education Review* (in press).
- Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.