Kenya institute of special education and the transformation of teacher education in Kenya, 1986–2019

Rasto Olocho[1]
Joseph Wamocha Nasongo[2]
Eunice Kanaga Majanga[3]
Barasa Samson Omachar[4]

[1]olochorasto1968@gmail.com
[2]jwamocha@mmust.ac.ke
[3]kmajanga@mmust.ac.ke
[4]barasasam22@gmail.com

[1,2,3,4] Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya

https://doi.org/10.51867/ajernet.7.4.56

ABSTRACT

Special Needs Education in Kenya developed in the context of a disjointed teacher preparation process, unequal provision of specialized services, and continued exclusion of learners with disabilities. The purpose of this study was to examine the role of Special Needs Education in teacher education in Kenya from 1986–2019 at the Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE). The two theories of Policy Historiography Theory and Conflict Theory were used to guide the inquiry, and an interpretivist research design was used. Archival records and institutional documents were collected as primary evidence, and historical and scholarly documents were collected as secondary evidence. Twelve research participants were selected through purposive and snowball sampling from former and current KISE officials, former tutors, former students, and former education officials. In analysing the content of historical evidence, internal and external criticism, triangulation between documentary and oral sources, and qualitative analysis based on themes emerging during analysis were applied. The findings indicated that KISE's contribution to teacher education was highlighted in the standardization of Kenyan Sign Language, the standardization of Braille codes, the institutionalization of individualized education programmes (IEPs), inclusion of content on inclusive education in regular teacher education, co-teaching and collaborative classroom approaches, and the re-engineering of teacher education practice towards functional assessment and learner-centred support. The institute also worked on enabling teachers to use locally appropriate assistive technology (AT) materials and promoting practical improvisation. The research found that KISE transitioned special education teacher education from fractured, mostly segregated methods and practices towards a more professionalized, standardized, and inclusive model. It calls for consolidating compulsory inclusive education preparation throughout teacher preparation institutions, broadening students' exposure to individualized education and assistive technologies, and continuing collaboration between KISE, teacher institutions, and the Teachers Service Commission.

Keywords: Inclusive Education, Kenya, Kenya Institute of Special Education, Special Needs Education, Teacher Education, Teaching Practice

I. INTRODUCTION

Special Needs Education (SNE) is a field that should be responsive to the varying educational needs of learners requiring adjustments in the curriculum, input, assessment, communication, or learning support. Historically, SNE in Kenya has been related to charitable and missionary efforts, with the state progressively taking a greater role in teacher preparation, assessment, curriculum, and policy. Ndurumo (1993) noted that early special education provision was largely determined by disability type and was often tenuously linked to mainstream education provision. Teacher preparation then became a focal point in the growth of SNE because learners with disabilities would not realize the full benefit of access to school without teachers who had the knowledge and necessary hands-on skills.The Kenya Education Commission of 1964 (Republic of Kenya, 1964) noted the need for specialist personnel and emphasized the need to prepare teachers to cater for learners with special needs, a trend continued in subsequent commissions and policies, which have also called for greater specialist capacity and increased integration of learners with disabilities. Njoka and Syallo (2013) observed that despite legal and policy development of SNE in Kenya, implementation challenges persist, especially around staffing, resources, and coordination.

In 1986, the Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE) was established to form a national institutional foundation for special teacher preparation. The mandate of the institute was provided by Legal Notice No. 17 of 1986 (Republic of Kenya, 1986) and included teacher training, in-service education, research, educational and psychological assessment, production of specialized learning materials, and support for integration and inclusion. KISE then centralized programmes that had been offered in different teacher training colleges and increased specializations in

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC)

visual impairment, hearing impairment, intellectual disabilities, physical disabilities, autism, learning disabilities, communication difficulties, giftedness, and other areas of special need. KISE's contribution to teacher education was not limited to the award of certificates and diplomas. It was involved in the standardisation of communication systems such as Kenyan Sign Language and Braille, established Individualized Education Planning, championed inclusive education, introduced practical pedagogical interventions, and provided specialist knowledge to regular teacher education. Additionally, KISE trained teachers to improvise learning materials using local resources in schools that were unable to pay for imported assistive technologies.

The 1986–2019 timeframe was important, covering the shift from the early stages of institutional consolidation to broader teacher training, rights-based inclusion, and greater reliance on assistive technology. KISE developed during a period of significant shifts in national education policy, including Free Primary Education, the Persons with Disabilities Act 2003, the National Special Needs Education Policy Framework, and the Constitution of Kenya 2010. These changes heightened the need for skilled teachers and reinforced the conviction that learners with disabilities needed to be accommodated in regular schools. The present article thus explores the role KISE played in teacher education during these years in Kenya. It centres specifically on the pedagogic and professional changes related to the institute, such as standardisation of specialist communication, individualisation of teaching, diffusion of inclusive education into regular teacher training, co-teaching, and experiential teaching practice. Historical contextualization allows investigation not only of what changed but also of the institutional and policy processes resulting in such changes.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Prior to the formation of KISE, teacher preparation programmes for learners with special needs were disorganized, with institutions catering to learners with particular disability categories. Teachers of learners with visual and hearing impairments were trained separately, and there was inadequate or no training in inclusive teaching for many regular teachers. This fragmentation affected the uniformity of teaching and learning approaches, support in the classroom, and evaluation procedures.

While KISE functioned as the lead SNE teacher preparation institution in the country, research is still lacking on how KISE specifically changed teacher education, because no systematic documentation of this change exists in one historical account. Previous research exists on special education policy, inclusion, disability rights, and individual teacher competencies, but few studies have considered teacher education generally between 1986 and 2019 and illustrated the role of KISE in teacher education. This gap makes it challenging to appreciate the contribution of the institute towards the professionalization of SNE and to understand the history of the present SNE practice in Kenya for inclusive education.

1.2 Research Objective

To explore the role of Special Needs Education at the Kenya Institute of Special Education in teacher education in Kenya

1.3 Research Question

How has Special Needs Education at the Kenya Institute of Special Education contributed to teacher education in Kenya?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

This study was conducted based on Policy Historiography Theory and Conflict Theory. Policy Historiography Theory, as advanced by Gale (1994), can be used as a basis for examining educational policies as historical products shaped by social, political, and institutional forces. It proved helpful in tracing the development from previous fragmented arrangements in SNE to a more rights-based and centralized arrangement, and how KISE adapted to policy changes over time. This perspective was reinforced by Conflict Theory, which focused on differential access to education and work. Ritzer and Goodman (2004) noted that conflict perspectives focus on unequal distribution of resources, authority, and opportunity. Historically, learners with disabilities and teachers in charge of such learners received a lower level of resource provision and attention within institutions compared with mainstream education provision. Thus, the establishment and expansion of KISE can, at the very least, be considered a reaction to longstanding inequity in the education system.

Both theories provide the basis for the study of SNE-related institutional change and distributional conflict. Policy Historiography Theory was used to explain the history of teacher preparation structures, and Conflict Theory was used to interpret the pressure for specialized education to be recognized, prioritized, and given more resources and professional status.

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC)

2.2 Empirical Review

2.2.1 Special Needs Education and Teacher Preparation

Teacher preparation plays an important role in SNE because the efficacy of inclusive education depends on teachers' competence to identify learning needs, make adjustments in teaching and learning, use specialized communication systems, and appropriately assess learners. Chikati et al. (2019) explained that the development of special education in Kenya necessitates growth at the institutional level and the preparation of specialists in the field. Kiarie (2014) also revealed that the nature of legislation, litigation, and shifting expectations for access and inclusion have influenced the development of special education in Kenya.

The issue of teacher preparation was not confined to specialist schools. Wamae and Kang'ethe-Kamau (2004) suggested that inclusive education demanded that regular teachers acquire competencies that would enable them to work with learners who were hearing impaired and those with other educational needs. Mwoma (2017) also stated that the expansion of the education of children with special needs required teachers working in special schools and educational institutions to be appropriately prepared. These studies support the need to examine the role of a national specialist institution within the broader teacher education system.

The official mission of KISE was quite broad. The institute was mandated to run courses for teacher training; provide in-service programmes; set up correspondence programmes; organize an assessment service; carry out research; and create specialized materials. This was highlighted by the Kenya Institute of Special Education (2020) annual report, which showed the growth and development of its programmes to accommodate a broader spectrum of disabilities as well as competency-based and inclusive frameworks. The Kenya Institute of Special Education (2023) strategic plan for 2023-2027 was published after the study period, but nevertheless highlights the ongoing focus on teacher preparation, research in inclusive education, and assistive technology that began over the preceding decades.

2.2.2 Personalised and Inclusive Pedagogy

One of the main issues in SNE is the limitation of homogeneous classroom pedagogy. There are individual differences in communication, sensory processing, cognitive development, mobility, and pace of learning. Individualized Education Programmes (IEPs) create a framework for determining specific needs, setting learner-level goals, modifying instruction, and evaluating progress in relation to an individual learner's baseline. Findings from the literature examined in the study indicated that a shift from generalist teaching to individualized support required specialized teacher preparation.

Another prerequisite for inclusive education was that the preparation of regular teachers had to change. The results obtained by Long'ore (2023) showed that there are still challenges associated with the inclusion of learners with special needs in public schools and that the mere fact that learners attend a mainstream school does not mean that they are included. Adequate teacher preparation therefore needs to involve real-life strategies for adapting the curriculum, classroom organization, and assessment. In this regard, the role of KISE was valuable because it worked with specialist teachers and increasingly partnered with regular teacher colleges and mainstream schools. Another area was practical teaching. In the past, traditional teaching practice emphasized lesson presentation, schemes of work, lesson planning, and classroom control. SNE required additional skills: functional assessment, Braille, sign language, adapted materials, individual learning goals, and family/community involvement. Thus, the historical record indicates that alterations in the practice of teacher preparation proved to be as salient as modifications of formally taught curriculum content.

2.3 Knowledge Gap

While literature exists that highlights the rollout of SNE policy and inclusive education in Kenya, not much has been said about KISE historically as an agent of teacher education. A significant amount of the literature is about access, inclusion, or disability rights and is either school or policy-focused. Limited historical synthesis exists on the ways in which KISE standardized specialist communication, introduced individual plans, influenced the ongoing education of teachers, promoted collaboration, and altered the evaluation of teaching. The present study set out to address this gap by drawing evidence primarily from archives and other institutional records, together with oral recollections by individuals involved in or witnesses to these developments.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design and Paradigm

A historical research design with an interpretivist paradigm was used. Historical studies were suitable as the inquiry involved the reconstruction of what transpired from 1986 through 2019 and explanations of teacher education developments in institutional, policy, and professional contexts. The interpretivist paradigm paved the way for the inclusion of documentary evidence as well as the experiences and interpretations of those who experienced KISE firsthand. Historical research involves the systematic identification, evaluation, and interpretation of evidence about past events. Cohen and Manion (1994) stated that researchers must gather and combine evidence and analysis to explain and

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC)

give meaning to actions and events that occurred in history. This design was therefore suited to recording institutional developments and the meanings ascribed to them by former directors, tutors, and students.

3.2 Sources, Participants and Sampling

The study used primary and secondary sources. Primary sources included education reports, official records, institutional minutes, KISE records (Kenya Institute of Special Education Records, 2026), and documents created during the period studied and stored at the Kenya National Archives (Kenya National Archives, n.d.). Oral interviews were conducted to complement gaps in documentary records or to provide first-hand experiences of teacher preparation, curriculum development, and institutional practice. Twelve research participants were selected through purposive and snowball sampling techniques. These were people who had first-hand experience as KISE officials, tutors, former students, or education officials. Purposive and snowball sampling were used to ensure that the participants were knowledgeable about specific events relating to the historical questions, as well as to identify additional informants who had been involved in or witnessed significant events. The study focused on the appropriateness and relevance of the historical data, not on the size of the numerical sample.

3.3 Data Collection and Appraisal

The sources of data were archival research, documentariy analysis, and oral interviews. The interview schedules consisted of open questions that gave participants room to comment in their own words and allowed follow-up and probing for clarification. Archival work comprised a systematic review of records from the Kenya National Archives (n.d.) and the Kenya Institute of Special Education Records (2026). External and internal criticism were undertaken to establish the authenticity of documentary sources and their credibility. External criticism concerned the authenticity of the documents: whether they were genuine, well-dated, appropriately attributed, and so forth. Internal criticism considered the accuracy, meaning, and possible bias of the content. Evidence was triangulated across documents and interviews. Where oral evidence was used, it was, where possible, supported by institutional or archival evidence.

3.4 Data Analysis and Ethical Considerations

Verified evidence was qualitatively analysed. Documentary and interview data were placed in a matrix by research objective and theme. The analysis examined recurrent developments related to teacher preparation, instructional practice, inclusion, communication systems, and practical training. Comparisons of periods and institutions in the past were made to help identify continuity and change. Permission to conduct research was granted by Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology and the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation. The participants were briefed on the objectives of the study and volunteered to be part of the study. The oral-interview convention and interview dates were used when reporting evidence from interviews. In cases where consent to identification was not given, pseudonyms could be used following the ethical guidelines of the study.

IV. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

4.1 Findings

4.1.1 Standardising Kenyan Sign Language and Braille for Teacher Education

Standardization of specialist communication systems was one of KISE's first contributions to teacher education. There were various local communication and transcription practices in schools for learners who were deaf or visually impaired before the institute became a centralized national institution. The lack of consistency created difficulties for teachers, learners, and national assessment. Archival and oral evidence revealed that KISE convened native signers, teachers, linguists, and other experts to harmonize Kenyan Sign Language. A former tutor explained that at the time of drafting the early national diploma curriculum, “the institute discovered that even basic academic signs were not used consistently across schools. Standardisation work was a process that allowed for a continuous round of consultation and documentation rather than one that imposed terms from above” (Interviewee INT-01, oral interview, 13 May 2026). This account indicates that standardisation was developed through professional consultation rather than imposed as a purely administrative rule.

Braille was also affected by the process. KISE collaborated in standardizing transcription for Mathematics, Science, and other learning areas so that individuals with visual impairments could access the national curriculum. Institutional records highlighted that this work assisted in the development of a set of standardised adapted resources as well as more uniform assessment practices. The finding lends credence to the idea that teacher education concerns pedagogy as well as the creation of a professional language and shared instructional norms. It was noted that common communication systems among SNE teachers were developed, which strengthened professional identity. Teachers from various training backgrounds and assigned to different parts of the country could operate from a stronger teaching model. This contribution aligns with KISE's role as a national resource centre and its mandate to train staff in various fields of SNE (Kenya Institute of Special Education, 2010).

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC)

This finding agrees with Chikati et al. (2019), who traced the professionalisation of teacher education for teachers of learners with visual impairment, but it extends that historical account by showing that KISE influenced teacher education through the standardisation of communication systems used across schools and training programmes. It also supports Wamae and Kang'ethe-Kamau (2004), who emphasised the importance of teacher preparation and language in inclusive education, while providing a historical explanation of how shared communication standards became an institutional mechanism for that preparation.

4.1.2 Individualised Education Programmes and Learner-Centred Teaching

The second major contribution was the transition from uniform classroom delivery of instruction to individualized learning plans. KISE activities helped teachers understand functional assessment, identify learner needs, disaggregate broad curriculum goals into concrete steps, and monitor them against individual benchmarks. This was a major shift in their thinking about teaching, as former student stated. Before she was at KISE, one alumna was used to teaching an entire class as one unit and viewed lack of progress as a form of laziness or low ability. This shifted when, through training in individualized education programme , as teachers had to consider all the evidence of what a learner was able to do, establish where the learner's difficulties began, and then create individualized learning steps from that evidence (Interviewee INT-02, oral interview, 20 May 2026).

Success was also redefined through the IEP approach. Teachers were encouraged to consider improvement rather than comparison with the top student only. This was especially vital for learners who did not fit standard pacing due to sensory, cognitive, or communication needs. It challenged the notion that equality means treating everyone in exactly the same way. This historical finding has relevance to inclusive education. In the study by Long'ore (2023), the issue of inclusion was linked with the ability of schools to meet a variety of learning needs. The KISE approach gave teachers a workable means of doing this. It changed the orientation of teacher preparation from "fit the child to the curriculum" to "fit the curriculum to the child." The finding therefore supports Long'ore (2023) and Mwoma (2017) on the importance of teacher capacity for meaningful inclusion, but it extends those studies by identifying individualised planning as a historically institutionalised feature of teacher preparation at KISE rather than only a contemporary classroom strategy.

4.1.3 Inclusive Education: Regular Teacher Training Extended

The results also indicated that KISE's role was not limited to those who were directly recruited to the Kasarani campus. It was apparent that mainstream learners with mild and moderate needs, who were numerous, required more than preparation in a specialist setting for inclusive education to meet their needs. Hence, KISE's involvement in regular teacher preparation and inclusive education content preparation increased over time. Historical evidence revealed that the institute collaborated with national curriculum bodies and teacher education bodies to highlight the basic competencies of early identification, functional screening, classroom adaptation, and inclusive teaching and learning. The rationale behind the Policy Development Task Force (PDTF) was described by a number of education officials in the study as a desire to reduce the likelihood that regular teachers viewed learners with disabilities as the "domain" of specialist teachers.

One official explained that the idea used to be, "This child has a disability, they are not my responsibility, take them to a special school" (Interviewee INT-03, oral interview, 11 May 2026). The recollection illustrates the professional boundary that inclusive teacher preparation sought to change. The importance of this change lay in the fact that inclusion was no longer an activity of the specialist working at the edges of the school, but rather something to be taken on by the regular classroom teacher. The growth came as part of more sweeping policy adjustments in Kenya. The National Special Education Policy Framework (Republic of Kenya, 2009), which took an approach of access and inclusion, and the Constitution of Kenya 2010 (Republic of Kenya, 2010), which reasserted the rights of persons with disabilities, were some of these developments. KISE's contribution to teacher education was thus to translate these policy commitments into professional expectations for teachers in practice.

These findings support Wamae and Kang'ethe-Kamau (2004), who argued that regular teachers needed competencies for inclusive teaching. Likewise, Kiarie (2014) and Njoka and Syallo (2013), analysis emphasised legal and policy development, by identifying KISE as an institutional route through which national inclusion commitments were translated into expectations for regular teacher preparation.

4.1.4 Co-Teaching and Collaborative Classroom Practice

The study also identified that collaborative teaching techniques emerged through KISE. The school could still reproduce segregation within the school compound, even though some measures had been taken to physically bring learners with disabilities closer to mainstream schools. The unit was often seen as an SNE teacher's unit, with regular teachers playing a lesser role and having limited contact with the learners in the unit. KISE responded by training specialized teachers to operate as inclusion consultants and collaborators instead of being considered unit teachers working alone.

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC)

> *Oral evidence included methods whereby the regular and specialist teachers shared responsibility for a mixed classroom. These arrangements included one-teach-one-assist, station teaching, and parallel teaching. The regular teacher could retain subject content and pacing, while the specialist could focus on process, communication, and support for students needing extra assistance* (Interviewee INT-04, oral interview, 13 May 2026).

This contribution was important because it reduced both professional isolation and learner stigma. A specialist teacher, in collaboration with the regular classroom teacher, helped to make SNE knowledge visible in the mainstream classroom. For some learners, adaptation was possible without excluding them from a separate area for most of the school day. The approach also allowed regular teachers to learn inclusive practice through routine interactions. The finding supplements the overall argument that inclusive education depends on institutional infrastructures that ensure responsibility is spread among teachers rather than resting on one special educator. Historical evidence indicates that KISE facilitated teacher empowerment toward collaboration by positioning the specialist teacher as a resource to the entire school.

The finding qualifies the literature reviewed earlier by showing that teacher competence was not only an individual attribute but also a collaborative arrangement between specialist and regular teachers. Whereas Long'ore (2023) documented persistent inclusion challenges in public schools, the historical evidence here identifies co-teaching as one mechanism through which KISE attempted to bridge specialist knowledge and mainstream classroom practice.

4.1.5 Re-Engineering Teaching Practice and Practical Competence

Another modification that KISE made concerned the actual preparation of SNE teachers. Conventional teaching practice could involve only a few classroom observations focused on lesson planning, teaching, and management. This was deemed insufficient for SNE because, from the historical evidence, it failed to consider whether a trainee could use Braille, communicate using sign language, adapt materials, conduct functional assessment, or prepare an individualized learning plan.

> *Thus, it was decided that a more intensive practical orientation was needed in the institute. While trainees were placed in special schools to demonstrate technical skills, exposure to mainstream institutions was also provided so that they could identify learners who were struggling and design intervention strategies. Evidence that the learner had made some form of progress became a key element of practical assessment, rather than only evidence of the student teacher's presentation of a polished lesson* (Interviewee INT-05, oral interview, 13 May 2026).

The practical preparation also included community involvement. Trainees were expected to appreciate the broader social context that affected learners with disabilities and, in a limited number of cases, were responsible for identifying and referring children not enrolled in school. This expanded the teacher's responsibility to involve themselves in learners' education beyond the classroom.

The emphasis placed on practical preparation was further supported by KISE's ethos of improvisation. In contexts where imported assistive technology (AT) equipment was unavailable or too costly, trainees used local materials to create tactile maps, modified seating, learning devices, and other teaching aids. This approach directly addressed the conditions of schools lacking resources and strengthened graduates' ability to apply SNE concepts beyond well-resourced institutional environments. This finding agrees with Chikati et al. (2019), who showed that teacher education for learners with visual impairment required specialised preparation beyond general teacher training. It extends that account by showing that KISE linked practical competence to learner progress, functional assessment, communication skills, adapted materials, and locally improvised assistive technology, thereby tying professional preparation to the realities of resource-constrained schools.

4.6 Discussion

The results show that KISE's contribution to teacher education was technical and institutional. Technically, it standardized communication systems, strengthened individualized teaching, extended inclusive pedagogy, encouraged co-teaching, and highlighted competence at a practical level. Institutionally, it established a professional centre linking teacher preparation, policy, evaluation, research, and development of learning materials. These contributions can be explained through Policy Historiography Theory as part of an extended transition in the education system. KISE was not a solitary creation. Changes in its role as a teacher education provider responded to the expansion of access, the promotion of Free Primary Education, disability legislation, constitutional change, and pressure for inclusive education. Teacher preparation was adapted as the policy context shifted.

Conflict Theory also proved useful, as many of these changes were efforts to correct an earlier imbalance in educational opportunity. Historically, learners with disabilities had been beyond the reach of mainstream schools, while teachers who catered to them lacked resources and preparation. KISE helped to challenge this educational inequality by developing specialist capacities and spreading inclusive capacities throughout the broader teacher education system. The results also indicate that specialization and inclusion are not necessarily antithetical. The role played by KISE

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC)

required a high level of specialist knowledge, and this knowledge began to enter mainstream classrooms and routine teacher education. There is therefore evidence in the history that specialist provision can enhance inclusion rather than function as a standalone system. This is significant for present teacher training because an inclusive policy cannot be implemented in the absence of practical competence in learner diversity among teachers.

Taken together, the findings support Mwoma (2017), Kiarie (2014), Njoka and Syallo (2013), and Wamae and Kang'ethe-Kamau (2004) on the continuing importance of policy, teacher competence, and inclusive practice, but they add a historical institutional explanation by demonstrating how KISE converted these broad policy and pedagogical demands into standardised communication, individualised planning, collaborative teaching, and practice-based assessment. The findings also qualify any assumption that inclusion simply displaced specialisation: in the KISE history, specialist knowledge increasingly became a resource for mainstream teacher education rather than a separate endpoint. This provides an additional historical perspective on KISE as an institution that helped translate national inclusion aspirations into teacher-education practices between 1986 and 2019.

V. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

Between 1986 and 2019, the Kenya Institute of Special Education played an immense role in teacher education in Kenya. Its role went beyond training a specific group of teachers. The institute assisted in developing common professional standards, standardizing Kenyan Sign Language and Braille, introducing IEPs, improving practical preparation, encouraging co-teaching, and extending inclusive education to regular teacher preparation.

The results demonstrated the role KISE played in moving teacher preparation from a largely disability-specific and fragmented approach to a more coordinated and learner-centred approach. They also showed that inclusive education cannot be undertaken without specialist knowledge, adaptation, and collaboration. Its historical contribution is thus manifested in the competencies of SNE teachers as well as in the broader understanding that all teachers should be prepared to teach diverse learners. The process was not complete by 2019. Issues such as resources, staffing, specialist content, institutional resistance, and variability of implementation persisted. However, the historical evidence reveals that KISE provided an important foundation for inclusive teacher education in Kenya.

5.2 Recommendations

Special Needs Education (SNE) and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) should be integrated into pre-service teacher training programmes, and this preparation should continue to be compulsory through the Ministry of Education, KISE, and teacher education institutions generally. Core competence in identification, adaptations for learners in mainstream classrooms, communication support, and referral should not be treated as specialisms and should not be optional skills. KISE should continue to support and broaden the practical basis of teacher education. Practical input for teacher trainees is needed in individualized educational plans, functional assessment, adapted instructional materials, co-teaching, and assistive technology. Practical assessment should measure evidence of trainee progress and not focus exclusively on the manner of lesson presentation.

Teacher education institutions should further promote cooperation with KISE in the updating and development of specialist communication standards, inclusive curriculum resources, and professional development. The Teachers Service Commission should also facilitate continuous professional development of regular and specialist teachers in such a way that equips them to cooperate in inclusive schools. Finally, KISE's local improvisation tradition should be strengthened through research and innovation so that locally available teaching materials can be used in resource-limited situations without reducing the quality of learning.

Declaration of Interest

The authors declare that they do not have any known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Funding Declaration

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

Chikati, D. K., Wachira, L. N., & Mwinzi, J. M. (2019). The development of teacher education for teachers of the visually impaired learners in Kenya: A historical perspective. *Journal of Education and Practice, 10*(32), 111–114. https://doi.org/10.7176/JEP/10-32-12

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC)

Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1994). *Research methods in education* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Gale, T. C. (1994). Story-telling and policy making: The construction of university entrance problems in Australia. *Journal of Education Policy, 9*(3), 227–232. https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093940090303

Kenya Institute of Special Education Records. (2026, June 20). *Institutional archival records* [Unpublished archival material]. Nairobi, Kenya.

Kenya Institute of Special Education. (2010). *Fifth graduation booklet*. Kenya Institute of Special Education.

Kenya Institute of Special Education. (2020). *KISE annual report*. Kenya Institute of Special Education.

Kenya Institute of Special Education. (2023). *KISE strategic plan for the period 2023–2027*. Kenya Institute of Special Education.

Kenya National Archives. (n.d.). *Selected files on special education and the Kenya Institute of Special Education: KNA AMP/5/90; KNA XJ/20/24; KNA XJ/20/37; KNA XJ/22/3* [Archival records].

Kiarie, M. W. (2014). Legislation and litigation in the development of special education in Kenya and the United States: An overview. *International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science, 2*(7), 33–44.

Long'ore, P. L. (2023). *Determinants of inclusivity in teaching learners with special needs in public primary schools in Machakos Sub-County* [Master's research project, South Eastern Kenya University]. SEKU Institutional Repository. https://repository.seku.ac.ke/handle/123456789/7361

Mwoma, T. (2017). Education for children with special needs in Kenya: A review of related literature. *Journal of Education and Practice, 8*(28), 188–200. https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/39246

Ndurumo, M. M. (1993). *Exceptional children: Developmental consequences and intervention*. Longman Kenya.

Njoka, J. N., & Syallo, C. (2013). Special needs education: A review of legal and policy basis and their implications in Kenya. *Kenya Journal of Educational Planning, Economics & Management, 6*(1), 1–7.

Republic of Kenya. (1964). *Kenya Education Commission report (Ominde Report)*. Government Printer.

Republic of Kenya. (1986). *Legal Notice No. 17 of 1986*. Government Printer.

Republic of Kenya. (2009). *National special education policy framework*. Government Printer.

Republic of Kenya. (2010). *Constitution of Kenya*. Government Printer.

Ritzer, G., & Goodman, D. J. (2004). *Sociological theory* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Wamae, G. M. I., & Kang'ethe-Kamau, R. W. (2004). The concept of inclusive education: Teacher training and acquisition of English language in the hearing impaired. *British Journal of Special Education, 31*(1), 33–40. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0952-3383.2004.00324.x

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC)