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Abstract
There are no national laws in Indonesia which requires educational authorities to provide Individualised Transition Plans (ITPs) towards high school students with disabilities. It leads issues as to low education attainments the students from this population have as well as small numbers of the students entering universities and job markets. In lieu of legislations, it is argued that Indonesia has signed international agreement and policies which are actually meant to provide ITPs to secondary students with disabilities to improve their post school outcomes – education, employment and independent living – for this vulnerable group. Hence, document analysis methods were employed in this research to analyse the international, national and local policies that the country has been signed through analyzing the statements aligned with evidence-based transition skills and predictors. The method employed by O’Neill et al. (2016) was replicated to condense the list of practices in the NTACT website into broader categories to address youths academic, employment, and independent living needs. As for the international policy, 19 transition-aligned statements were found, accounting for community involvement, interagency collaboration and inclusion in general education. Meanwhile for the national policy documents, only 15 statements were aligned. Implication for policymakers and educational jurisdictions are also discussed.
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1. Research Background
As the attention towards the rights of people with disabilities has been rising over the last two decades, Indonesia has signed international and local agreements in recent times (Poernomo, 2016). So far, the country has signed several international agreements such as the Salamanca Statement on inclusive education and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (signed in 2007 and ratified in 2011), and the Biwako Millennium Framework for Asia-Pacific nations in 2007. At the national level, Indonesia chose as its national model of inclusive education implementation, the Inclusive Education Action Plan in 2015, in the special region of Jogjakarta. This model was to be followed by other regions.
It is interesting to look at how the implementation of inclusive education in sub-national level at this current stage. Sunardi (2015), for example, examine the readiness of Jogjakarta as the national model on implementing the inclusive education. The result indicates that regular classroom teachers are often not able to provide assistance to students with mild learning disabilities due to the teachers’ lack of training in the field. Another finding of the study is that the lack of supporting facilities and infrastructures to support inclusive education system in the district. In fact, consisted of 25 sub-districts, the modelling district has only 5 special schools. Additionally, lack of interagency collaboration is also evident. In fact, regardless each sub-district has its public health centre, none of them are involved in the inclusive education action and planning. However, regardless the limitations mentioned, the promising and optimistic condition found is that all of the stakeholders, e.g., teachers, parents, principals, and the community, showed positive attitude towards the inclusion. This is then the very important point to be picked up by the central government.

Another research examining the implementation of inclusive education in the country has been done by Pernomo (2016). He conducted the research within the broader area of Indonesia. Specifically, the study conducted in 5 provinces; Jakarta, West Java, Yogjakarta, East Java, and Bali, through direct observation and in depth interview towards stakeholders in each province. The participants (for each province) consisted of 2 principals, 2 teachers, 2 parents whose children have special needs, and 4 students with disabilities attending an inclusive school. The interview also conducted towards 2 officials of each province’s educational authority. Surprisingly, all of the students involved in the study expressed that they have experienced negative attitude towards them from the peers and even from their teachers. Therefore, the campaign of social awareness of students with disabilities is so essential for the country. Another finding of the study is that through interviewing the local authorities the study reveals that even the officers should understand the meaning of inclusive education first to be able to provide further support as well as the training regarding the inclusive education awareness of teachers, parents and the community.

So far, there are three national policy documents regarding the provision of basic education for children with special needs, namely the 2003 Law on the National Education System, Regulation of the minister of education and culture 64/2013 on content standards for basic and secondary education, and the 1991 Government’s regulation of special education. Overall, while the provision of free education for students with special needs is aimed to help the students to live a good life, it seems that the government has emphasized more on the academic outcomes while the employment and independent living outcomes are rarely mentioned.

Several policy documents regarding the inclusive education system in Indonesia have mentioned the need for an Individualised Education Plan (IEP) to support the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular education settings (The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation International Bureau of Education,
However, there is no single legislation that directly requires IEPs for students with disabilities. Best practice suggests that an individual transition plan to post-school life should be included for students in these IEPs as a means of operationalising as well as making post-school goals into reality (Flexer, Baer, Luft, & Simmons, 2013; La Plante et al., 1996). However, looking specifically at the post-school outcomes for students with disabilities, it seems that Indonesia has much work to do to meet its international and local agreements and policies.

According to a 2015 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) report, 4.7% of primary students with disabilities did not continue on to secondary education, and this percentage increases as they reach the age of 13 (OECD, 2015). Further, in the OECD report, it was suggested that the government and schools should provide better support for students with disabilities regarding their transitions across life span as, so far, the national policies addressing the problem are only focused on the academic aspect of students with disabilities. The OECD report should be considered a wakeup call for the government to provide a more reliable program, enabling students with special needs to be accepted and supported by their communities to lead a good life, on the same basis as those without disabilities.

As a means of increasing the post-school outcomes of students with disabilities, the USA mandated transition services under the 1990 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Since 1983, the USA has been leading the research regarding evidence-based transition practices (Kohler & Field, 2003; Halpren, 1992; Hazani et al., 1985). To improve the poor school outcomes of young Indonesian adults with disabilities, the government could look at the US research-based practices for guidance in tackling the issue (Sitlington & Frank, 1990).

The same as Indonesia, Australia also has no legislation which requires IEPs for students with special needs (Cumming, Strnadova, & Dowse, 2014; Mitler, 2012). The Australian Government does not require evidence of planning for transition to post-school lives for students with disabilities (Commonwealth of Australia, 2014). Building on this view, O’Neill and colleagues (2016) examine the Australian Government’s commitment to provide individualised transition plans (ITPs) for secondary students with disabilities to be able for them to live a good life. Through document analysis methods, O’Neill and colleagues (2016) propose an implication for educational jurisdictions and policy makers for further action.

O’Neill and colleagues later state that if Australia was to meet its obligations regarding what the country has signed up for, students with special needs would be receiving training and education in all of the evidence-based practices and predictors listed above. Since Indonesia has also signed and ratified the Salamanca Statement on inclusive education and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (signed in 2007 and ratified in 2011), the author conducted documents analysis by following the methods that O’Neill and colleagues employed. The author
also acknowledges O’Neill and colleagues (2016) by using their lists of evidence-based transition skills and predictors to analyse four policy documents that the Indonesian Government has signed and ratified. The documents will be explained as follows.

Building on above perspectives, this research aims to examine the readiness of the Indonesian government regarding the provision of transition programs and support for secondary students with disabilities. It looks at how aligned the existing frameworks for supporting young people with disabilities in Indonesia are with evidence-based transition practices. This also highlights how well the Indonesian government has progressed in providing post-school transition supports that lead to positive outcomes for students with disabilities. One way to do so is by examining how well current Indonesian policies align with the agreements signed and evidence-based transition practices. To achieve this, document analysis has been conducted on international and national agreements that Indonesia has signed. Document analysis is a method by which documents are examined as well as interpreted to obtain empirical knowledge (Bowen, 2009). It is also hoped that this analysis will aid in the development of an action plan to address any existing gaps in transition practices.

A useful model that can inform individual transition planning is the Taxonomy for Transition Programming Model that was first developed by Kohler in 1993. An updated version of the model was released in late 2016 (see Test, Fowler & Kohler, 2016). Currently, there are 11 evidence-based, 47 research-based, and 73 promising practices listed (NTACT, 2016). These EBTPs and Kohler’s model can be used to assess how well a nation is meeting its international and national agreements (see O’Neill, Strnadová, & Cumming, 2016).

Kohler taxonomy was generated from investigations reviewing research literature (Kohler, 1993), evaluation studies (Kohler et al., 1994), as well as transition project outcomes (Rusch et al., 2009; Wagner et al., 2006). In this research-based model, there are five broad areas identified, namely: Student-Focused Planning, Student Development, Interagency Collaboration, Program Structure, and Family Involvement. To improve evidence-based transition practices, the U.S Department of Education created the NTACT which annually updates evidence-based transition practices (EBTPs).

Looking specifically at the five Kohler areas, firstly, an important aspect of student-focused planning (SFP) is that decisions are made by taking into account the students’ visions, needs, and interests so that the stakeholders involved in the transition program could use the aspects of information to set both short and long term goals (Burns & Ysseldyke, 2009). Secondly, regarding the student development (SD), this area aims to identify the supports and accommodations students need to achieve success in both community and educational settings (Benitez et al., 2005; Baer et al., 2003; Wehmeyer & palmer, 2003). Meanwhile, interagency collaboration (IC) is fostered through agreements that clearly articulate responsibilities, roles, communication strategies, and other actions to enhance the development of program and service delivery. Lastly, regarding
the family involvement (FI), this area is associated with family and parent participation in delivering transition services and education. The FI also includes practices to facilitate the family involvement.

Both the Taxonomy and the NTACT website have been used by educators worldwide to support the transition of secondary students with disabilities to their post-school lives. It will then be useful to examine how well Indonesian policy has aligned with the NTACT EBTPs and Kohler’s Taxonomy. Therefore, the two will be used as platforms to address the following questions in the project:

1. How well is Indonesia meeting its international and local agreements and policies that it has signed related to the provision of evidence-based transition practices for secondary students with disabilities?

2. Of the policy statements located in international and local conventions, how many align with Kohler’s Taxonomy mentioned above?

To achieve the research aims, the method employed by O’Neill et al. (2016) will be replicated to condense the list of practices in the NTACT website into broader categories to that address youths academic, employment, and independent living needs. Then, the Indonesian policy documents will be analysed for evidence of commitment to these practices, and the alignment with Kohler’s Taxonomy.

Finally, this paper provides suggestions as to which EBTPs are being met and those that need attention to ensure evidence-based transition planning occurs for secondary students with disabilities in Indonesia, and that the country meets its obligations (Cook & Cook, 2013; Hale & Rollins, 2006; Cook & Odom, 2013). If Indonesia has a strong commitment regarding inclusion and the wellbeing of its young people with disabilities, then evidence of those practices should appear in national agreements, and these should align with Kohler’s Taxonomy. This project in its suggested action plan, could assist the Indonesian government to ameliorate the issues in post-school outcomes reported in the OECD report (2015).

2. Research Methodology

The method employed by O’Neill et al. (2016) will be replicated to condense the list of practices in the NTACT website into broader categories to address youths academic, employment, and independent living needs. Then, the Indonesian policy documents will be analysed for evidence of commitment to these practices, and the alignment with Kohler’s Taxonomy.

2.1 Determining Evidence-Based Practices

As it is unlikely that both international and national policy documents and statements mentioning individual instructional practices that supports transition development, in the process of determining evidence-based transition practices advocated by the NTACT. O’Neill and colleagues (2016) took a broader approach to examine the practices. Among 43 items (26 skills and 17 predictors), there were 25
transition skills and 14 predictors were condensed in the first step. Finally, the five selected skill categories to be used were student participation in goal planning and attainment, academic skills, functional life skills, interaction skills, and employment-related skills. Meanwhile, the predictor variables were reduced to 10.

### Table 1. The Lists of Evidence-Based Practices and Predictors in Secondary to Post-school

| Skills                                           | Predictors                             | Kohler Area                               |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Student involvement in goal planning and attainment | Community experiences                  | Student-focused planning (SFP)            |
| Academic skills                                  | Exit exam/high school diploma          | Student development (SD)                  |
| Functional life skills                           | Inclusion in general education         | Program development (PS)                  |
| Social skills                                    | Interagency collaboration               | Interagency collaboration (IC)            |
| Employment-related skills                        | Paid employment/work experiences       | Family involvement (FI)                   |
|                                                  | Parental/family involvement             |                                           |
|                                                  | Student support                         |                                           |
|                                                  | Transition program                      |                                           |
|                                                  | Courses to support postschool goals     |                                           |
|                                                  | Work-study programs                    |                                           |

(O’Neill, Strnadova, & Cumming, 2016)

#### 2.2 Selection for Policies for Analysis

Similar to Australia, Indonesia has no policies that solely focuses on the needs of transitions for students with disabilities. Therefore, in selecting the policy documents, the author selected the documents that focus on secondary students’ education, inclusion, disabilities, vocational education and training. Finally, 1 regional, 2 national, and 1 sub-national policy documents were selected.

**Biwako Millennium Framework.** United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific has adopted resolution 58/4 of May 2002 to promote a barrier-free, inclusive, and rights-based society for people with disabilities in the region of Asia-Pacific for the twenty first century. The document sets out a framework for action by governments in the region as well as by concerned stakeholders to achieve an inclusive-based society in the new era. This framework calls for actions that incorporate the millennium development goals along with the relevant targets to ensure that people with special needs become an integrated part of efforts to achieve the goals.

**National and Local standards.** Indonesian inclusive education system was initiated in 2003 based on the Direction Letter of the Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education under the section of Special Education in Regular Schools. As a result, the government published a guideline for the implementation of inclusive schools under the Indonesia Ministry of Education Regulation No 20/2003. The inclusive education system then has received more legal supports leading to the publication of the Indonesian ministry of education No. 70/2009 regarding the provision of inclusive
education for students with disabilities as well as those who are gifted and talented. In the provincial level, Yogyakarta, as the local model of implementing inclusive education, aims to achieve its vision of all schools being proposed as inclusive schools by 2025. In 2013, the province produced its regulation No. 21/2013 as a guide to provide non-discriminatory services. The regulation emphasizes on the identification of opportunities and challenges in accessing education for students with special needs and the inclusion of strategies to develop capacity for the implementation of inclusive education in Yogyakarta. Also, the regulation is aimed to support the development of quality inclusive education practices in the province.

3. Results

From the analysis of the four policy documents (one regional, two national, and one provincial), 38 evidence-based transition aligned statements were found. The majority of the statements were located in the regional policy, the Biwako Millennium Framework (United Nations Economic and Social Council, 2007). Among the four policies being analysed, none of them mention transition program. The following section will provide the results from the analyses of each document, and where the statements aligned with Kohler’s taxonomy areas.

3.1 Biwako Millennium Frameworks (Regional Policy Document)

Among the 19 statements found in the Biwako Millennium Framework document that aligned with evidence-based transition skills (n=5) and predictors (n=14), absent statements were found in academic skills, exit exam/high school diploma, and transition program (see Table 2). Meanwhile the most numerous statements were community involvement, interagency collaboration, and inclusion in general education.

The Biwako Millennium Framework document consisted of the most evidence-based transition aligned statements compared to the other documents analysed, accounting for 50% (19 of the 38) statements located. Given the fact that the framework calls for action towards an inclusive, barrier free and right-based society for people with disabilities in Asia and the Pacific, there were 9 statements supported inclusion as well as action from societies. For example, ‘Government, in collaboration with other stakeholders, need to provide support, leisure and recreational activities and facilities for persons with disabilities’ (p. 11). Regarding the alignment with Kohler’s Taxonomy areas, the Biwako Millennium Framework mostly aligned with the area of student development (n=15). However, the least aligned area is family involvement (n=2).
Table 2. Evidence-Based Skills and Predictor Statements in Regional Policy Analysis of the Selected Document

| Skills                          | Kohler area | Regional Policy Biwako Millennium Framework for Asia Pacific Nations Statement number and page |
|--------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Student involvement in goal planning and attainment | SFP, SD, PS | PR. 18, p.6 |
| Academic skills                | SD          |                                                                                          |
| Functional life skills         | SD, PS      | PR. 18, p.7 |
| Social skills                  | SD, PS      | PR. 23, p.9 |
| Employment-related skills      | SD, PS      | PR. 14, p.4; PR. 15, p.4 |

| Predictors                     |             |                                                                                          |
|--------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Community experiences          | SD          | PR. 29, p.11; PR. 33, p.13; PR. 34, p.15 |
| Exit exam/high school diploma | SD          |                                                                                          |
| Inclusion in general education | SD, PS      | PR. 23, p.9; PR. 35, p.15; PR. 55, p.26 |
| Interagency collaboration      | IC          | PR. 29, p.10; PR. 37, p.16; PR. 55, p.26 |
| Paid employment/work experiences | SD, PS     | PR.32, p.13; PR.34, p.14 |
| Parental/family involvement    | FI          | PR. 17, p.6 |
| Student support                | IC, FI, PS  | PR. 34, p.14 |
| Transition program             | PS          |                                                                                          |
| Courses to support post-school goals | SD, PS | PR. 37, p.17 |
| Work-study programs            | SD          |                                                                                          |

*Note: SFP: student focused planning; PR= principle; SD= student development; PS= program structure; P= preamble; T= target; IC= interagency collaboration; FI= family involvement; p=page.

3.2 National Policy Documents

As can be seen in Table 3, the alignment of the two national policies is 15 of the 38 statements aligned with evidence-based transition skills and predictors. The Indonesian ministry for education firstly took into account the inclusive education system in the 2003 Regulation (No.20/2003) then in 2009 a more specific Regulation (No.70/2009) was generated. Given the fact that the 2009 regulation was proposed to specifically cater for the needs of students with disabilities as well as gifted and talented, it is surprising that the latter only had 6 statements aligned with evidence-based transition skills and predictors while the former does have 9 of the 15 statements in the national policy documents.

3.2.1 The Regulation No. 20/2003

The Indonesian Ministry of Education Regulation No. 20/2003, contained only nine evidence-based transition skills and predictors. Interagency collaboration contained the most evidence-based, transition-aligned statements, accounting for two out of the nine
statements. Meanwhile functional life skills, social skills, employment-related skills, exit exam/high school diploma, inclusion in general education, family involvement, and work-study program account for the other seven statements (n=1 for each) and absents were in the other evidence-based, transition skills and predictors. It is interesting to note that this national policy document did mention the exit-exam/high school diploma while the statement was not mentioned in the Biwako Millennium Framework. Specifically, the Indonesian Ministry of Education Regulation No. 20/2003 states that ‘The certificate of completion that students with disabilities received from the informal community-based training is accepted as a national standardised certificate” (p. 9). In terms of the alignment with Kohler’s Taxonomy areas, the Indonesian Ministry Regulation No.20/2013 mostly aligned with the area of student development and program structure (n=6 for each of the two statements), followed by interagency collaboration and family involvement (n=1 for each of the two statements). However, it is important to note by the readers that some statements were frequently aligned with more than one of Kohler’s taxonomy areas.

3.2.2 The Regulation No. 70/2009.

The Indonesian Ministry of Education Regulation No. 70/2009, contained only six evidence-based transition skills and predictors. Half of the skills and predictors (n=3), mentioned inclusion in general education while each of the social skills, interagency collaboration, courses to support post-school goals accounts for the other three statements aligned. It is not surprising that 50% of the statements were mentioning the inclusion as the aim is the regulation is to better promote inclusive education system in the country. There is a positive indication of the provision of inclusive education done by the Indonesian government. In fact, while courses to support post-school goals were not mentioned in the previous regulation (No.20/2003), the statement was located in the 2009 regulation. Regarding the alignment with Kohler’s Taxonomy areas, the Indonesian Ministry of Education Regulation No.70/2009 mostly aligned with the area of student development and program structure (n=4 for each area), followed by interagency collaboration (n=1). Again, it is important to note that some statements were often aligned with more than one of Kohler’s taxonomy areas.
Table 2. Evidence-Based Skills and Predictor Statements in National Policy Analysis of the Selected Documents

| Skills | Kohler area | National Policy |
|--------|-------------|-----------------|
| Student involvement in goal planning and attainment | SFP, SD, PS | Indonesia Ministry of Education Regulation No 20/2003 Statement number and page |
| Academic skills | SD | Indonesia Ministry of Education Regulation No 70/2009: Inclusive Education for Students with Disabilities and with Giftedness/Special Talents. Statement number and page |
| Functional life skills | SD, PS | F1, p.1 |
| Social skills | SD, PS | F26, p. 9 |
| Employment-related skills | SD, PS | F26, p. 9 |
| Predictors | | |
| Community experiences | SD | |
| Exit exam/high school diploma | SD | F27, p. 9 |
| Inclusion in general education | SD, PS | F32, p. 11 |
| Interagency collaboration | IC | F9, p. 5; F54, p.17 |
| Paid employment/work experiences | SD, PS | F. 14, p. 5 |
| Parental/family involvement | FI | F7, p. 4 |
| Student support | IC, FI, PS | |
| Transition program | PS | |
| Courses to support post-school goals | SD, PS | F9, p. 4 |
| Work-study programs | SD | F26, p.9 |
| **Total n of statements** | 9 | 6 |

*Note: SFP: student= focused planning; F= framework; SD= student development; PS= program structure; P= preamble; T= target; IC= interagency collaboration; FI= family involvement; p=page

3.1 Local Policy Document (Yogyakarta Province Governor Regulation No. 21/2013)

The Yogyakarta Province Governor Regulation No. 21/2013 contained only four evidence-based, aligned transition skills and predictors (see Table 4). The alignments were identified in the academic skills, inclusion in general education, interagency collaboration and parental/family involvement (n=1 for each skill and predictors). Given the policy models the inclusive education implementation in the provincial level and is
to be followed by the other provinces of the country, the alignment indicates that generally the document poorly represents its aims.

However, there is a positive inclusive education movement and reformation found in the provincial policy. Indeed, the policy did mention the academic skills while the skills were not represented in any of the two national regulations. Specifically, it states that ‘inclusive education is a system that provides the same access to learners regardless their socio-economic, politic, ethnic, and religious backgrounds as well as regardless they have disabilities or not. the provision of such an education system aims to help the students to master their academic and other skills at the maximum level’ (p. 3). In terms of its alignment with Kohler’s taxonomy areas, the local policy mostly aligned with the area of student development (n=2) while the other two areas were interagency collaboration and family involvement (one alignment for each area). Overall, the local policy poorly represents all of the areas of Kohler Taxonomy.

In summation, through the method of document analysis, statements aligned with both evidence-based transition skills and predictors and Kohler’s taxonomy areas were found in the regional policy document. Unfortunately, from analyzing the above four documents, it could be concluded that none of them mentioned transition program that is the focus of this study.

| Local Policy | Kohler area |
|--------------|-------------|
| Yogyakarta Province Governor Regulation No 21/2013: Implementation of Inclusive Education | |
| Statement number and page | |
| Student involvement in goal planning and attainment | SFP, SD, PS |
| Academic skills | SD |
| Functional life skills | SD, PS |
| Social skills | SD, PS |
| Employment-related skills | SD, PS |
| Community experiences | SD |
| Exit exam/high school diploma | SD |
| Inclusion in general education | SD, PS |
| Interagency collaboration | IC |
| Paid employment/work experiences | SD, PS |
| Parental/family involvement | FI |
| Student support | IC, FI, PS |
| Transition program | PS |

Table 4. Evidence-Based Skills and Predictor Statements in Local Policy Analysis of the Selected Document
As the aim of this study is to examine post-school outcomes of Indonesian students with disabilities, it is important to note that none of the policy documents being analysed mentioning the transition programs. It could be considered a wakeup call by the government of the country since the provision of the transition programs could pave the way for students to develop their goal planning skills (Test et al., 2009). Also, looking at the dropped-out rates of secondary students with disabilities, 30% of them did not finish their secondary school in 2013, the transition programs are a way forwards to keep the students on tracks.

One of many indications of an improving post-school outcomes is that whether or not the students could easily find a job upon the completion of their study.
Unfortunately, all of the policy documents being analysed neglects to acknowledge the importance of students’ participation in work experience or employment. In fact, while both national and local policies did not contain the statement, the Biwako Millennium Frameworks only mentioned the statement twice (p. 13 & p.14). Therefore, it is not so surprising that the unemployment rate of Indonesian undergraduate students without disabilities is extremely high (6.2% in 2015 according to the National Bureau of Statistics), and not to mention the percentage of those of students with disabilities being jobless. According to Poernomo (2016), people with disabilities are vulnerable to being overlooked by the community as they have been seen as an economic burden by their families. Therefore, if the government of the country were to meet its obligation to help students with disabilities live a better life, it should take into account the importance of students with disabilities’ participation in work experience or employment.

Regarding the alignment of the four documents with Kohler’s taxonomy areas, it is obvious that the area of student-focused planning was being neglected in all of the policies. Indeed, the area was only found in the Biwako Millennium Framework document (n=1) while none of the 3 Indonesian documents aligned with the area. It is then important to note by the Indonesian government that skills related to student-focused planning (e.g. self-advocacy skills) are considered to be the best practices (Roberts, Ju, & Zang, 2014).

Regarding the use of people first language in the policy documents, it is evidence that both the two national and the local policies did not do so. For example, in the three Indonesian documents analysed, the word ‘kecacatan’ was used to referring to ‘disabilities’ but more likely to be properly translated into ‘handicap’. Another example, again in all of the 3 documents, it is written ‘anak berkelainan’ which refers to ‘disabled children’.

Therefore, it is essential for Indonesian government to develop educational guidelines that outline the best transition practices to benefit students with disabilities which have been marginalised for so long in the country as to a transition planning framework.

4. Conclusions

It has been ten years shy that Indonesian government mandating inclusive education system to be implemented in the country. Prior to that, however, there had been debates on defining and accommodating persons with disabilities. For example, the country’s 1997 law defines individuals with disabilities as ‘individuals with defects’. Although the country has been active participant of international conventions regarding supporting people with disabilities, its approaches have been criticised by the national-disability community, attempting to inserting new terms into the national discourse such as using “difable” to refer to ‘different abilities’ instead of selecting the word ‘handicap’ at that time. It then took the disability community to wrestle for four years,
forcing the government to ratify the CRPD in 2011 as the country did sign the document in 2007. However, it is unfortunately obvious that none of the recent Indonesian national and local policy documents analysed in this study that mentions the term ‘difable’ instead of ‘handicap’. It is therefore recommended that the future policy makers address this problem and build their awareness of such a sensitive as people first language.

Overall, upon analysing the documents, this study concludes that both evidence-based transition skills and predictors as well as Kohler’s taxonomy areas were overlooked by the country. If Indonesia were meeting its obligations, secondary students with disabilities will be receiving transition services to decrease the dropout rates of the students. Another implication of this study is that the future policy should include training towards teachers, parents, and the community to be able to proof that the commitment of establishing community-based inclusive awareness is not only a paper-based statement without any actions.
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