

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2956-333X/2026-6-5>

CONFLICTS BETWEEN TEACHERS AND PARENTS IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN CASES OF GRADING PROBLEMS: CAUSES, CONSEQUENCES, LEGAL SUPPORT AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Alena Rakoušová,

PhDr, Mgr., DiS.

*University of Social Sciences and Security in Prague, Foreign Branch
Czech Republic*

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0158-6432>

rakousova@wsnsb.cz

Summary. The aim of the article is to analyze conflicts between teachers and parents in inclusive education that arise in connection with the grading of pupils, especially in cases where assessment concerns special educational needs, support measures, recommendations of a school counselling facility, and the fairness of pedagogical procedure. The article seeks to define the main causes of these conflicts, their consequences for the pupil, the parent, the teacher, and the school, and to formulate legally and pedagogically grounded possibilities for their prevention and resolution. The paper is prepared as a qualitative content analysis of documents using an analytical-synthetic procedure. It is based on relevant legal regulations, especially the Education Act and implementing decrees, methodological materials of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, documents and results of investigations by the Czech School Inspectorate, a report by the Public Defender of Rights, and scholarly literature relating to pupil assessment, inclusive education, support measures, and communication between school and family. Based on an analysis of these sources, typical conflict situations, their causes, manifestations, and possible ways of resolution are identified. The analysis shows that conflicts between teachers and parents do not arise only because of the grade itself, but above all in situations where assessment criteria are not clearly established and communicated, where parents' and teachers' expectations regarding the meaning of grading differ, where support measures are not sufficiently taken into account or documented, and where the school is unable to demonstrate under what conditions the pupil's performance was assessed. Significant sources of conflict also include late informing of parents, inconsistent work with electronic grading, the difference between the pupil's effort and his or her actually demonstrated performance, an inappropriately chosen form of knowledge verification, an unclear relationship between an individual approach and fairness toward other pupils, and disputes concerning the assessment of behavior. The consequence of these situations is often a loss of trust between the parent and the school, demotivation of the pupil, a defensive position on the part of the teacher, escalation of the conflict to school management, a counselling facility, the Czech School Inspectorate, or other institutions, and a weakening of the school's ability to professionally defend its procedure. The conclusions of the article confirm that fair grading in inclusive education cannot be based only on subjective pedagogical judgment or on a general assertion that support was provided to the pupil. It must be professionally justified, clearly communicated, appropriate to the pupil's educational needs, and documented by specific pedagogical records. A key prerequisite for conflict prevention is the clear definition of assessment criteria, ongoing communication with parents, respect for the recommendations of the school counselling facility, an appropriate choice of forms of knowledge verification, regular evaluation of support measures, and a unified school procedure. The resolution of conflicts therefore does not consist in an automatic change of the grade, but in a transparent assessment of what was evaluated, according to which criteria, under what conditions, and whether the pupil was actually provided with appropriate support.

Keywords: assessment, inclusive education, grading, conflicts, support measures, parents, school counselling facility, teachers.

1. Introduction

Grading is a cornerstone of communication and conflict in the relationship between family and school, whether it concerns the grading of pupils who do not need support measures or pupils with special educational needs. Conflicts between teachers and parents in inclusive education often focus precisely on grading. In these situations, a grade is not perceived merely as information about the pupil's performance, but also as an expression of whether the school understands the child, whether it respects the child's difficulties, and whether it treats the child fairly. A dispute over a grade can therefore quickly turn into a dispute over trust between the parent and the school. Grading may be particularly sensitive for younger pupils, because for them a grade need not be merely information about performance, but also a message about acceptance, success, and position in the class. It is therefore appropriate for the teacher to accompany grading among younger pupils with comprehensible feedback and to choose other forms of assessment

as well, for example verbal assessment, self-assessment, or peer assessment among pupils. Grading as such brings a number of problems, although in some systems (especially those focused on performance and routine) it may have its significance and may appear more effective than in differently structured systems where the pupil's creativity and originality are decisive. Such values cannot be expressed by a grading scale, and the teacher needs to choose another method of assessment (verbal assessment, pupil self-assessment, peer assessment among pupils). These forms support performance orientation and competitiveness less among pupils who compare grades with one another. Scales and point systems function similarly to grading and essentially represent only a variant of it. Grading also represents a conflict of criteria – whether to assess the child in relation to individual progress or in relation to the class norm. Grading tends to support the latter option. If the teacher grades individual progress, effort is given greater priority. Every child has the right to the time in which education takes place. Every child has his or her own individual pace. In the case of an individual relational norm, far more problems and conflicts arise because the criteria are usually completely unclear to other pupils and parents.

2. Theoretical Framework of School Psychology and Systemic Student Support

The legal framework consists primarily of Act No. 561/2004 Coll. (the Education Act), which regulates support measures, assessment rules in the school rules, and the possibility of reviewing assessment results. Decree No. 48/2005 Coll. is also relevant, according to which assessment should be pedagogically justified, professionally correct, and documentable, and should respect the pupil's individual educational needs as well as the recommendations of the school counselling facility. For pupils with special educational needs, Decree No. 27/2016 Coll. works with various forms of assessment and with consideration of the pupil's limitations and progress. For the section on the escalation of disputes and complaints, the methodological recommendation of the Czech School Inspectorate on resolving complaints already at the school level is relevant.

In inclusive education, grading cannot be separated from support measures, school rules, the recommendations of the school counselling facility, and assessment rules. It is precisely here that many conflicts arise. The parent expects the school to take into account the child's special educational needs. The teacher, on the other hand, must assess the achieved educational outcomes, preserve the professional correctness of assessment, and proceed according to the school's rules. If these rules are not clear in advance, documentable, and communicated in an understandable way, space is created for misunderstandings, complaints, and escalated disputes.

This paper is prepared as a qualitative content analysis of documents using an analytical-synthetic procedure. It is based on relevant legal regulations, methodological materials of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, documents of the Czech School Inspectorate, a report by the Public Defender of Rights, and scholarly literature relating to the issue of grading pupils in inclusive education. Based on an analysis of these sources, typical causes and manifestations of conflicts between teachers and parents are identified, especially in situations where there are differing perceptions of the fairness of assessment, the implementation of support measures, or communication between the school and the family.

Adults, parents, and teachers are models of behavior for pupils. The way parents resolve conflict situations with the school has an influence on the child and his or her later conduct in relation to people. "According to the data obtained, interaction between family and school significantly affects adolescents' ability to effectively manage not only interpersonal conflicts but also digital risks, with the key factors here being the joint activation of prevention, community-oriented interventions, and partnership-based communication across the entire school community" (Šimek, p. 288). In an inclusive environment, the resolution of a conflict is a sensitive situation. "An inclusive environment is not only about academic performance but also about relationships, trust, and safety" (Oláh, Šimek, 2025, p. 76). The professionalism of the teacher plays an important role in the issue of conflicts. The teacher's skill in resolving various tensions is first manifested in work with the class and similarly appears in dealing with parents. The teacher should be able to respond to the situation in the class and select appropriate activities for class meetings. The class is a living organism, and tension also appears in it. Some authors state in this regard: "The teacher's reflection also encompasses the systematic processing of how they selected

specific experiential activities, how they responded to group tension, how they guided targeted feedback, and how they managed the ethical demands of experiential situations.” (Šimek, Lengyelfalussy, Oláh, Spak, 2025, p. 49). On the other hand, parents also have an influence on the situation in the class, although not entirely directly. Some parents tend to create a hyperprotective environment for the child, excessively adjust the child’s conditions, and make the situation easier. This approach does not greatly help the child in building the skill of resolving conflicts. The situation usually escalates when the parent actively creates conflict situations and repeatedly visits the school and tends to solve everything for the child. “In reality, children do not need parents who would solve every problem for them and organize every minute of their lives, but they much more urgently seek parents who are truly present with them, both physically and with their full emotional attention, without constantly watching the phone screen and without a hidden effort to achieve further performance” (Šimek, p. 246). At the very end of the introduction, we allow ourselves to add essential information: “Schools must embody respect, trust, and openness – an indispensable foundation for preventing violence and fostering the development of a healthy and secure educational community” (Matějka, Kořán, Milfajt in Šimek, 2025, p. 60).

In the following section, we will deal with the individual types of conflicts between parents and teachers in connection with grading in an inclusive environment.

3. Types of conflicts

Conflict: the parent disagrees with the grade because the child has special educational needs

One of the most common causes of conflict is a situation in which a pupil receives a worse grade and the parent objects that the teacher did not sufficiently take the pupil’s difficulties into account. This may involve, for example, a pupil with specific learning disorders, attention disorder, a slower working pace, anxiety, or another disadvantage. The parent then claims that the grade is unfair because the child had to perform under conditions that did not correspond to his or her abilities.

The cause of the conflict is often uncertainty about what exactly should have been taken into account in the assessment. The teacher may proceed from the assumption that he or she is assessing knowledge or skills according to established criteria. The parent, however, expects the grade to reflect the child’s difficulties, effort, and individual progress more significantly. If the school and the parent do not clarify in advance how support measures will be reflected in grading, space for a dispute arises. The teacher usually respects the recommendation of the pedagogical-psychological counselling center. The methods are listed in it. A child with support measures (whether of the second or third level) should have, for example, enough time to complete the task, or a shortened assignment, individual support from a teaching assistant in explaining the assignment, assistance with the first step, alternation of activities, the rule of practice “little but often,” renewed explanation of the material, verification of knowledge at the beginning of the lesson, while the child is not yet tired, etc.

The consequence of didactogenic causes may be the parent’s loss of trust in the teacher. The parent feels that the child is neither protected nor understood at school. The teacher, on the other hand, may feel accused of unfairness even though he or she proceeded according to his or her professional judgment. The pupil finds himself or herself between two contradictory interpretations: at home he or she hears that the grade is unfair, while at school he or she hears that the performance was insufficient. This may weaken the pupil’s motivation as well as respect for assessment rules.

The solution is not an automatic improvement of the grade, but a precise clarification of what was assessed, under what conditions, and whether appropriate support was actually used. The teacher should document the pupil’s specific work, the assessment criteria, and the manner in which he or she took the pupil’s needs into account. If it turns out that the pupil wrote the test under the same conditions as others, although he or she should have had, for example, more time, a shorter assignment, or another form of verification, it is appropriate to reassess the assessment or allow a new verification of knowledge under corresponding conditions.

Conflict: the parent demands a better grade for effort

Another common conflict is a situation in which the parent says: “The child studied, tried hard, we devoted a great deal of time to preparation at home, and yet the child received a bad grade.” At such

a moment, the parent does not perceive the grade as an assessment of the result, but as a devaluation of the child's effort and of his or her own parental support.

The cause is the difference between assessing effort and assessing achieved performance. In inclusive education, personal progress and effort are very important, but grading usually cannot be based solely on the fact that the pupil tried. If the grade were based only on effort, it would cease to be quality feedback and understandable information about what the pupil has actually mastered. At the same time, however, effort cannot be completely ignored, because in pupils with difficulties it may be an important indicator of development.

The consequence of the conflict is often a feeling of injustice. The parent may gain the impression that the teacher sees only mistakes and does not see the work the child has put in. The pupil may learn that effort "is not worth it", because he or she still will not achieve a good grade. The teacher may come under pressure to use the grade to appreciate even that which was not manifested in the performance itself. This type of conflict may correspond to an internal conflict in the teacher, who tends to reflect on fairness in grading.

The solution is to separate the grading of performance from verbal feedback on effort and progress. The teacher may tell the parent that he or she recognizes the child's effort, but that the grade expresses the degree of mastery of specific subject matter. At the same time, the teacher should clearly describe where the pupil has improved, what the pupil already masters, and what the pupil does not yet master. A practical solution may be a combination of a grade and an accompanying comment, or an agreement on partial goals so that both the pupil and the parent can see gradual progress. Within this conflict, so-called triads are recommended (a class meeting of the teacher with the parent and the pupil), where the teacher has the opportunity to provide feedback in the presence of the parent. The pupil and the parent have an opportunity to ask questions and prevent further possible misunderstandings.

Conflict: the parent claims that the teacher does not follow the recommendations of the counselling facility

A very serious conflict arises when the parent objects that the school does not follow the recommendations of the school counselling facility or the individual education plan. For example, the parent may claim that the child should have had more time, a reduced assignment, the possibility of oral verification, tolerance of specific errors, or other assessment conditions.

The cause may be either an actual failure to follow the recommendation or a different interpretation of what the recommendation means in a specific teaching situation. Sometimes the recommendation is formulated generally and the teacher is not sure how to translate it into specific grading. At other times, the teacher uses the support measure, but the parent does not know about it because the school does not communicate the procedure sufficiently.

The consequence may be an escalation of the conflict to school management, the counselling facility, or a complaint. The parent perceives the situation as a violation of the child's rights. The teacher may perceive the parent as controlling and distrustful. The pupil may begin to use the conflict to avoid work, or, conversely, experience increased uncertainty.

The solution is to unify the school's procedure in writing and in a matter-of-fact way. It is necessary to determine how exactly it will be reflected in assessment in individual subjects. For example, in written work, the pupil will receive extended time, specific types of spelling errors will not be decisive in the given type of tasks, in longer written answers it will be possible to supplement the work with oral verification, and the assignment will be divided into shorter steps. This will reduce the space for subjective interpretation and repeated disputes.

Conflict: the pupil masters the subject matter orally but fails in writing

A common practical problem is the difference between actual understanding of the subject matter and the ability to perform in a certain form. In conversation, the pupil may understand the subject matter, but in a written test he or she fails because of a slow pace, difficulties with reading, writing, attention, stress, or organizing the answer.

The cause of the conflict is the confusion of the knowledge being verified with the form in which it is demonstrated. If a test is intended to verify, for example, understanding of a natural science phenomenon,

but the pupil fails mainly because of reading the assignment or written formulation, the grade may not accurately show the level of understanding of the given subject matter. This happens in the case of pupils with twice-exceptionality (for example, an intellectually gifted child with dyslexia fails in written solving of word problems and tasks, although orally he or she can solve them effectively). The parent then objects that the child “knew it,” while the teacher has before him or her a weak written performance.

The consequence is a dispute over the fairness of assessment. The parent sees a discrepancy between home preparation and the school result. The teacher sees work that does not meet the requirements. The pupil may begin to reject tests because he or she perceives them as situations in which he or she repeatedly fails.

The solution is to verify whether the form of the test corresponds to what is actually to be assessed. If content understanding is being assessed, it may be appropriate to supplement written performance with oral verification, a practical demonstration, selection of an answer, shorter questions, or a structured worksheet. This is not a reduction of requirements, but a more precise verification of the goal. The teacher should assess what he or she actually intended to verify, not the pupil's secondary difficulty.

Conflict: the parent accuses the teacher of demotivating the child with worse grades

Sometimes the parent does not perceive the problem merely as a dispute over an individual grade, but as the child's repeated failure with a particular teacher. The parent may say that the teacher does not believe in the child, has taken against the child, or demotivates the child with his or her grades.

The cause may be long-term unclear communication, a lack of ongoing feedback, or repeated assessment without a specific description of the next path. If the pupil receives only bad grades but does not know exactly what to do to improve, grading loses its supportive function and becomes only a confirmation of failure. The pupil may not understand what he or she is doing wrong and how to correct the mistake.

The consequence is disruption of the relationship between the parent and the teacher; in the child, learned helplessness may then occur, and feelings of failure and helplessness may be reinforced. The parent no longer addresses a specific written test, but the overall credibility of the teacher. The teacher may begin to defend himself or herself with formal arguments, which further deepens the conflict. The pupil may accept the role of an unsuccessful child and stop trying (the Golem effect).

The solution is to move from general statements to specific data. It is necessary to go through several pieces of the pupil's work, show recurring difficulties, but also record progress. At the same time, it is necessary to set a short-term, achievable goal. For example, instead of the general requirement “he/she has to study more,” it is more appropriate to say: “Over the next two weeks we will monitor whether the pupil can complete an answer in a full sentence, read the assignment in parts, and correct his or her work according to the check”. In this way, the conflict shifts from the personal level to the level of specific support.

Conflict: the parent disagrees with the conduct grade related to the pupil's difficulties

In an inclusive environment, disputes also arise when the pupil's behavior is reflected in assessment. It is pedagogically inadmissible to include the pupil's behavior in the assessment of academic achievement. Here we mean a somewhat different situation, namely the grading of behavior. The parent may object that the child was not intentionally undisciplined, but acted as a result of a diagnosis, anxiety, impulsivity, attention disorder, or overload.

The teacher has a duty to ensure the safety of the child with support measures, but also the safety of other pupils. The cause of the conflict is an unclear distinction between manifestations of difficulties and conscious violation of rules. The teacher has a duty to maintain a safe and functional environment for all pupils. The parent, however, may legitimately expect the school to understand the causes of the child's behavior and not to assess them in the same way as ordinary indiscipline or deliberate violation of the school rules.

The consequence may be a strong defensive reaction from the parent. The parent feels that the child is being punished for something he or she cannot fully control. The teacher may feel that the parent excuses any behavior of the child. At the same time, the class may perceive the situation as unfair if the rules are not clearly explained and followed.

The solution is to distinguish understanding of the causes of behavior from resignation to rules. The school should seek support measures that reduce the risk of problematic behavior, for example a clear

structure of the lesson, predictable rules, the possibility of a short break, a calm place, visual support, or an agreed signal. At the same time, it must be established what behavior is unacceptable and how the school will proceed when it occurs. Assessment of behavior should be based on rules known in advance and on records of specific situations, not on an overall impression of the child.

Conflict: the parent learns about the problem only before grading is finalized

A very common cause of escalated conflict is late communication. The parent learns only at the end of the semester that the child is at risk of a bad grade or non-classification. At that moment, there is no longer enough time for remediation, and the parent reacts with pressure, a complaint, or a demand for a change of grade.

The cause is a failure of ongoing information. The teacher may feel that the grades were entered into the system and that the parent should have monitored the situation. The parent, however, may object that he or she did not recognize the seriousness of the problem from individual grades or that he or she was not alerted to the context.

The consequence is a last-minute conflict. The parent tries to save the result, the teacher defends the closed grading, and the pupil no longer has any real space for improvement. Such a situation reinforces distrust and evokes the feeling that the school merely announces consequences but does not help prevent them.

The solution is to introduce early warning and demonstrably inform legal guardians. If weak results repeatedly appear in a pupil with support measures, the school should inform the parents earlier than before the grading meeting. Communication should include not only the message that the pupil has bad grades, but also a proposal for further procedure, what can be made up, how the subject matter will be verified, what support the school will provide, what it has already provided although the academic achievement has not improved, and what is realistically expected from home preparation.

Conflict: the parent demands an individual approach, while other parents, pupils, or teachers perceive it as preferential treatment

In inclusion, tension often appears between an individual approach and the requirement of equality. The parent of a child with special educational needs demands an adjustment of assessment. The teacher or the surrounding environment fears that this will unfairly favor the child over others.

The cause of the conflict is a misunderstanding of the difference between support and an unfair advantage. A support measure is not intended to ensure a better grade for the pupil without corresponding performance. It is intended to enable the pupil to perform adequately at all and to demonstrate what he or she actually knows.

The consequence may be tension in the class and among adults. The teacher may be afraid to use the adjustment so as not to be accused of unfairness. The parent of the child with special needs may feel that he or she has to fight for every form of support. Other pupils may perceive the situation as unclear.

The solution is clear pedagogical argumentation. The teacher does not have to and must not disclose sensitive information about the pupil to other parents, but the teacher himself or herself must be clear about why the adjustment is justified. Within the class, the teacher may generally explain that fairness does not always mean identical conditions, but conditions appropriate so that everyone can work according to his or her possibilities and demonstrate the learning outcome. In the specific assessment, it must then be clear that an adjustment of form does not automatically mean a reduction of content. A suitable prevention is not to support the mentality of mutual comparison among children.

Conflict: the parent demands a change of grade and the school does not know how to proceed

Some conflicts grow from a conversation with the teacher into a formal request for a change of grade. The parent may claim that the grading is unfair, that the assessment rules were not followed, that the teacher did not take the recommendation of the counselling facility into account, or that the result does not correspond to the child's actual knowledge.

The cause is often insufficiently documented assessment or ignorance of the procedure for objections against grading. If the school does not have clear documentation, rules, and communication, it gets into a weak position. The dispute is then not only about the pupil's performance, but about whether the school proceeded correctly.

The consequence may be a formal complaint, a request for a review of assessment, or intervention by school management. This often intensifies the conflict, because the teacher perceives the situation as a challenge to his or her professionalism and the parent perceives it as a fight for the child's rights.

The solution is to proceed according to the rules. The school should first verify whether the assessment was carried out according to the school rules and according to the rules for assessing educational outcomes. It is necessary to gather documentation, written work, records of oral examinations, criteria, recommendations of the school counselling facility, records of provided support measures, and communication with the parent. If the rules were violated, the assessment needs to be corrected. If they were not violated, the result must be explained to the parent in an understandable way and documented.

Conflict: the electronic system shows an average, but the final grade does not correspond to it

Another type of conflict arises when the parent monitors ongoing grading in the electronic system and infers the expected final grade from the average of the grades. At the end of the semester, however, the pupil receives a different grade than the parent expected according to the electronic system. The parent may then object that the school assessed arbitrarily, unclearly, or unequally compared with other pupils.

The cause of the conflict is often an unclear relationship between ongoing grading, the weight of individual grades, the control average, and the final grade on the report card. If the school rules or assessment rules do not establish how teachers should work with the control average, space is created for different practice. In one investigated complaint, the Czech School Inspectorate found that the electronic system provided a so-called control average, but the assessment rules did not establish how teachers were to work with it. The lack of clarity then led to different final assessments of pupils with a similar or even worse average (Česká školní inspekce, 2025, p. 2).

The consequence is a loss of trust in the objectivity of grading. The parent does not ask only about one grade, but about the fairness of the entire assessment system. The teacher may argue by a professional assessment of the pupil's performance, but the parent sees a numerical figure in the electronic system and expects it to be decisive. The conflict thus shifts from the pupil's performance to the school's rules.

The solution is to precisely define in the school rules and in the assessment rules the relationship between ongoing grades, their weight, the control average, and final grading. If the final grade is not an arithmetic average, it must be clear what other criteria the teacher takes into account. The teacher must be able to document to the parent why precisely that grade was assigned, and not merely refer to his or her general pedagogical judgment. The electronic system should be used as a tool for providing information, not as a source of ambiguity.

Conflict: the parent objects that the teacher did not use criterion-referenced assessment recommended by the pedagogical-psychological counselling center

In inclusive education, a dispute may also arise when the counselling facility recommends criterion-referenced assessment, elements of formative assessment, or a motivational method of assessment, but the teacher continues to use mainly ordinary grading without clear criteria. The parent then objects that the school formally accepted the recommendation of the counselling facility, but in assessment it is not actually reflected.

The cause of the conflict is the difference between declared and actually used assessment. The teacher may be familiar with the recommendation, may provide the pupil with more time or tolerate certain errors, but may not be able to document that he or she actually assessed according to the recommended criteria. In one investigation, the Czech School Inspectorate stated that although the teacher reported various support measures, she could not document that she assessed the pupil by means of criterion-referenced assessment and that she used all elements of assessment increasing motivation to learn, as the recommendation had stipulated (Česká školní inspekce, 2022, p. 2).

The consequence is the formal fulfillment of support measures without their actual function. The parent may gain the impression that the recommendation of the counselling facility is merely a document for the school, not a binding basis for work with the pupil. The teacher, on the other hand, may believe that he or she provides support because he or she accommodates the pupil in individual matters. Without documents, however, it cannot be retrospectively proven how support was actually applied in assessment.

The solution is to translate the recommendation into specific assessment criteria. For example, in written expression, it is necessary to determine in advance whether the content, correctness of the solution, graphic presentation, spelling, independence, or work procedure is being assessed. In a pupil with specific difficulties, it must be clear which components of performance will be tolerated, which will be assessed, and how the pupil will receive feedback. Criterion-referenced assessment must not remain merely a word in the documentation; it must be documentable in the pupil's specific work.

Conflict: the parent claims that the school provides support, but cannot prove it

A significant source of conflict is a situation in which the school claims that it provided support to the pupil but cannot document it. The parent then objects that the support measures were merely formal, that teachers proceeded differently, or that the recommendation of the counselling facility was lost in the ordinary operation of the school.

The cause is insufficient documentation and inconsistent communication between the school, the parent, and the counselling facility. In a report on an investigation concerning the education of a pupil with a disability, the Public Defender of Rights stated that if a school does not adopt reasonable measures and does not sufficiently take into account the educational needs of a pupil with a disability in accordance with the recommendation of the school counselling facility, it may commit indirect discrimination (Veřejný ochránce práv, 2017, pp. 1–2, 5).

The consequence is a weakening of the school's position in the dispute. Even when teachers actually helped the pupil, without records, criteria, minutes from meetings, and specific documentation, it is difficult to retrospectively document what was actually done. The parent may then perceive the school as an institution that does not document its assertions, and the dispute may move to school management, the founder, the Czech School Inspectorate, or the ombudsman.

The solution is the systematic documentability of support. The school should keep records of what support measures were set, when they were implemented, how they were evaluated, and how they were reflected in the pupil's assessment. Teachers should have a unified procedure so that the parent does not receive different information from different teachers. Minutes from meetings with the parent should not be a formal cover for the school, but a brief, factual record of the agreed steps.

Conflict: the conduct grade is announced to the parent prematurely as a punishment for one incident

In practice, conflict may also arise around the assessment of behavior. The parent learns that the child will receive a reduced conduct grade immediately after a certain incident. The parent then objects that the school decided prematurely, did not assess behavior for the entire period, and did not give the child the opportunity for remediation.

The cause of the conflict is the confusion between a disciplinary measure and the grading of behavior on the report card. A disciplinary measure may respond to a specific act. A conduct grade on the report card, however, should express the pupil's behavior over the entire semester, not be an immediate punishment for one act. In its answers concerning assessment, the Czech School Inspectorate states that the grading of behavior cannot be carried out immediately after the pupil violates obligations, because the assessment of behavior on the report card should correspond to behavior throughout the whole semester (Česká školní inspekce, n.d., p. 5).

The consequence is a strong conflict with the parent. The parent may perceive the school's procedure as punitive, biased, and procedurally incorrect. In the case of a pupil with special educational needs, the conflict increases even more if the problematic behavior is related to impulsivity, anxiety, attention disorder, or overload. The school must then distinguish what was a conscious violation of rules, what was a manifestation of difficulties, and what support measures should have been set before the incident.

The solution is not to close the conduct grade prematurely. The school should record the incident, discuss it with the parent, adopt an educational or support measure, and monitor further development. If the conduct grade is to be reduced at the end of the semester, the decision must be based on the school rules, specific records, and an assessment of behavior over the entire period. In the case of a pupil with special educational needs, the school must at the same time document that it took the pupil's difficulties into account, while not abandoning the rules of a safe environment.

Conflict: the parent claims that the teacher disadvantages or humiliates the pupil during examination

A conflict around grading sometimes concerns not only the grade, but also the manner in which the pupil arrived at it. The parent may claim that the teacher disturbed the pupil during examination, verbally disparaged the pupil, humiliated the pupil in front of the class, lost the pupil's work, or did not provide the pupil with the same conditions as others. The teacher may reject such a claim. A situation of one claim against another arises. Some authors (Šimek, Vochozka) state and interpret "shaming as a pedagogical-psychological and social problem which, in the digital age, exceeds the scope of individual communication excesses." (Šimek, Vochozka, 2026, p. 280).

The cause of the conflict is insufficient provability of the course of assessment. In one complaint, the Czech School Inspectorate dealt with the parent's claims about the inappropriate behavior of the teacher, verbal attacks, disturbance during written testing, and the loss of the pupil's work. Because the complainant's claims stood against the claims of pedagogical staff and could not be proven, this part of the complaint was assessed as unproven (Česká školní inspekce, 2022, pp. 1–2).

The consequence is long-term damage to trust, even if the claim is not proven. The parent may feel that the school protects the teacher. The teacher may feel that he or she is being unfairly accused. The pupil may lose a sense of safety with a particular teacher, and every subsequent assessment may be burdened in advance by distrust.

The solution is to strengthen the transparency of assessment situations. In written work, the assignment, the time, for example also by a record in the class register, the conditions, the submitted work, and the assessment criteria should be clearly documented. For oral examination, it is appropriate to keep brief records of the topic, performance, and result. If repeated complaints occur, observation by school management, the presence of another pedagogical worker during verification of knowledge, or an agreement on another form of re-examination may help. The aim is not to create an atmosphere of control, but to prevent grading from standing only on unprovable claims.

Conflict: first-level support measures are not evaluated in time and the parent sees only worsening grades

Another conflict arises when the pupil's grades repeatedly worsen; the school claims that it provides first-level support, but the parent sees no evaluation of its effectiveness. The parent then objects that the school is only monitoring failure but did not take specific steps in time to mitigate it.

The cause is delayed or vague evaluation of support. The methodology for setting support measures points out that measures should be set so that they are evaluable, and in the assessment of pupils with special educational needs it emphasizes the need to work with an individual assessment norm and criteria, not only with comparison of the pupil with the rest of the class (MŠMT, 2016b, pp. 33–34). If the school only records bad grades but does not evaluate whether the chosen support is working, conflict is likely.

The consequence is late resolution of school failure. The parent learns about the seriousness of the situation only when the grades have accumulated. The pupil loses trust in his or her own abilities, and the teacher may feel that the parent comes only when it is already difficult to change the result. Grading then becomes a record of failure, not a tool of timely guidance.

The solution is to set specific support measures, the deadline for their evaluation, and criteria of success. For example: for six weeks, the pupil will receive shorter assignments, understanding will be verified orally and in writing, and the teacher will monitor the number of completed tasks, the correctness of key answers, and the degree of independence. After the set period has elapsed, the school and the parent will evaluate whether the measures lead to improvement or whether it is necessary to recommend an examination in a school counselling facility.

4. Conclusion

From the available investigation results and methodological materials, it follows that conflicts between teachers and parents in inclusive education do not arise only in connection with the grade itself. Their causes are broader and are related especially to unclearly established assessment criteria, different understandings of the meaning of grading, insufficiently documented consideration of support measures,

ambiguous rules for working with electronic grading, late or incomplete communication with parents, an inappropriate form of knowledge verification, premature assessment of behavior, and uncertainty in interpreting the recommendations of the school counselling facility.

The common denominator of these situations is a lack of clarity, predictability, and documentability of pedagogical procedure. Fair assessment in inclusive education therefore cannot be based only on the teacher's goodwill or on a general assurance that support was provided. It must be based on the school rules, the recommendation of the school counselling facility, specific assessment criteria, ongoing records of the support provided, comprehensible communication with parents, and regular evaluation of the effectiveness of support measures.

The consequences of disputes over grading affect all participants in education. The parent may lose trust in the school, the teacher may get into a defensive position, and the pupil may lose certainty about what is expected of him or her and how his or her performance is assessed. Grading then ceases to fulfill its basic function of feedback and becomes the subject of conflict.

The resolution of these situations must be specific, professionally justified, and documentable. It is not enough to refer generally to communication, cooperation, or an individual approach. It is necessary to determine precisely what was assessed, according to which criteria, what support was provided to the pupil, whether the form of verification corresponded to the goal of assessment, whether the school rules were respected, and whether the recommendations of the counselling facility were taken into account. In inclusive education, fair grading is possible only if it is continuously communicated, appropriate to the pupil's actual educational needs, and sufficiently supported by pedagogical documentation.

Bibliography

1. Česká školní inspekce. (2022). *Výsledek šetření stížnosti: ČŠIA-2328/22-A* [online]. Česká školní inspekce. Retrieved from: <https://www.csicr.cz/getattachment/c6526787-65a3-4fd8-bbf6-147bf6e1a120/Vysledek-setreni-stiznosti.aspx>
2. Česká školní inspekce. (2025). *Výsledek šetření stížnosti: ČŠIC-651/25-C* [online]. Česká školní inspekce. Retrieved from: https://www.csicr.cz/getattachment/6543f4e4-a7f8-44ba-9a02-f55b05e0f0d8/Vysledek-setreni-stiznosti-CSIC-651_25.aspx
3. Česká školní inspekce. (2026). *Metodické doporučení prevence a postup při šetření a vyřizování stížností a podnětů* [online]. Česká školní inspekce. Retrieved from: https://www.csicr.cz/getattachment/d5ae79c1-bfe0-4d56-aae6-a95249d6b0d3/Metodicke-doporuceni_prevence-a-postup-pri-setreni-stiznosti-a-podnetu_aktualizace_27_4_2026.aspx
4. Česká školní inspekce. (n.d.). *Z dotazů zaslaných České školní inspekci a odpovědi na ně* [online]. Česká školní inspekce. Retrieved from: https://www.csicr.cz/html/Z_dotazu/resources/pdfs/Z_dotazu_.pdf
5. Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy. (2005). *Výhláška č. 48/2005 Sb., o základním vzdělávání...* [online]. Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy. Retrieved from: https://msmt.gov.cz/uploads/legislativa/48_2005_k1.9.2024.pdf
6. Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy. (2016). *Výhláška č. 27/2016 Sb., o vzdělávání žáků se speciálními vzdělávacími potřebami...* [online]. Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy. Retrieved from: https://msmt.gov.cz/uploads/legislativa/27_2016_1.9.2025.pdf
7. Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy. (2016b). *Metodika pro nastavování podpůrných opatření ve školách...* [online]. Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy. Retrieved from: <https://msmt.gov.cz/file/38983/download/>
8. Oláh, A., & Šimek, V. (2025). Activating teaching methods within contemporary pedagogical and psychological frameworks. In K. Wojtanowicz & M. Duda (Eds.), *Holistyczne wsparcie dziecka i rodziny. Interdyscyplinarna perspektywa społeczna* (pp. 69–84). Uniwersytet Papieski Jana Pawła II. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.15633/9788383701097.05> (doi.org in Bing)
9. Šimek, V. (n.d.). Dětství není projekt: O tom, proč milující rodiče svým dětem ubližují. In *Společne pre deti: Presadzovanie najlepšieho záujmu dieťaťa...* (pp. 242–249).
10. Šimek, V. (2025). Ending silence on teacher bullying in Czechia demands unified action and accountability / Konec mlčení o šikaně ze strany učitelů v Česku vyžaduje jednotný postup a odpovědnost. In M. Matějka, R. Kořán, & R. Milfaiť (Eds.), *Společenská odpovědnost za udržitelnost světového dědictví / Social Responsibility for Sustainability of the World's Heritage* (Vol. III, pp. 39–64). Panevropská univerzita, Fakulta VŠO. ISBN 978-80-7615-105-5
11. Šimek, V., Lengyelfalussy, T., Oláh, A., & Szpak, A. (2025). Pedagogical facilitation and relational dynamics as the foundational framework for experiential teaching and the achievement of deep learning. *Łódzkie Studia Humanistyczne*, 2025, (4), 42–56. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2956-333X/2025-4-5> (doi.org in Bing)
12. Šimek, V. (2025). Pedagogicko-psychologické souvislosti vztahu rodiny a školy při prevenci rizikového chování. In K. Mičková & L. Lešková (Eds.), *Rodina dnes: Kríza alebo príležitosť?* (pp. 281–290). Verbum. ISBN 978-80-561-1198-7

13. Šimek, V., & Vochozka, M. (2026). Zostuzování v digitálním věku jako pedagogicko-psychologický a sociální problém. In *Future Human Society Conferences II. Odolnost člověka a společnosti* (pp. 280–288). Eastern University of Management and Education Inc. ISBN 978-80-909857-2-8
14. Veřejný ochránce práv. (2017). *Zpráva o šetření ve věci vzdělávání žáka se zdravotním postižením, sp. zn. 5252/2015/VOP/JKV* [online]. Kancelář veřejného ochránce práv. Retrieved from: <https://www.ochrance.cz/uploads-import/ESO/5252-2015-VOP-JKV-Z17.pdf>
15. Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy. (2004). *Zákon č. 561/2004 Sb., školský zákon* [online]. Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy. Retrieved from: https://msmt.gov.cz/uploads/legislativa/skolskyzakon_kedni_1.9.2025.pdf