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ABSTRACT

This was a descriptive study which sought to evaluate the development and implementation of individualised educational programme by teachers of learners with intellectual disabilities in special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi counties, Kenya. To achieve this, the study was guided by the following objectives: to explore the criteria followed by teachers in developing and implementing Individualized Education Programme (IEP) for learners with intellectual disabilities, to establish the involvement of multidisciplinary team in developing and implementing IEP, to investigate the availability of resource materials for developing and implementing IEP, and to generally document the challenges encountered by teachers in developing and implementing the IEP. The target were the two counties, 6 special schools, 41 units and 47 headteachers who were purposively selected. Stratified random sampling was used to select 993 teachers. Purposive sampling procedure was used to select schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi counties. Questionnaires, interviews, document analysis and observation, were used to collect data after which Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze. The qualitative data from the interviews and observations were analyzed using descriptive and thematic text. Quantitative data from the questionnaire with a Likert Scale was analyzed using descriptive statistical analysis. Data analysis and interpretation revealed that teachers assessed learners in academic skills, adaptive skills, reading skills, writing skills, spelling skills, motor skills and social skills. Findings indicate that a multidisciplinary team was involved and that the teachers reported on how they developed the IEP. The research findings showed that learning resources were inadequate in schools and IEP also lacks resources and materials, sufficient funds and time for its implementation. The study established schools face many challenges namely: lack of good will from parents and sometimes from teachers and lack of support from headteachers and other stakeholders. Ministry of Education has also failed in terms of policy to reinforce the development and implementation of IEP in special schools and units for learners with intellectual disability. Generally, there is need for good concerted efforts among all stakeholders for IEP to be fully and effectively developed and implemented in the schools.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the background to the study, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research objectives, research questions and significance of the study. It also outlines limitations and delimitations of the study, research assumptions, theoretical and conceptual framework and operational definitions of key terms.

1.2 Background of the Study

Special Education for learners with intellectual disability has become a growing concern and a major issue in almost all parts of the world. Globally, access to individualized education programme (IEP) for the physically disabled is more popular in developed countries unlike in developing countries (Lincove, 2009). Efforts to ensure equitable access to IEP for children with disability have been a challenge particularly in developing countries in Asia and Africa. A majority of developed countries are on the verge of achieving development and implementation of the individualized educational programme which is a sharp contrast to the countries in Sub-Saharan Africa.

In the United States, laws have been passed particularly to protect the rights of exceptional learners and provision of services. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) states that all individuals irrespective of sex, race and economic status have a right to education. Education is a human right with the power to transform a person and it is the cornerstone of freedom, democracy and sustainable human development (UNICEF, 2001). The passage of PL 94-142 in 1975 and the Individuals
with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (1997) in the USA, strengthened the rights of learners with disabilities to a free appropriate education and ensured greater accountability for these learners (Allen, Smith, Test, Flowers, & Wood, 2001).

Globally, the field of Special Education is dramatically influenced by Jean-Marc Itard findings (1775-1838) when he worked with the boy who had mental disorder in Southern France (Patton & Mcmahon, 2006). It was around this period that “Special Education” started emerging. During this period children referred to in this study as Intellectually Disabled were known as “mentally retarded”. Intellectual Disability is a new term used when referring to a person who has certain limitation in intellectual functioning and in skills such as communicating, taking care of oneself and social skills. These limitation causes a child to learn and develop more slowly than a typical child. In such a case the school staff may work with the child’s parents and other professionals to develop an IEP; which describes the child’s unique needs and services that have been designed to meet those needs. A child with ID can do well in school but is likely to need the individualized help.

According to Salvador-Carulla and Bertelli (2007), Individualized Education Programme (IEP) is a written plan of action that specifies an individual’s progress towards specific educational goals, developed and implemented by a team of experts. In the USA, IEP has been the basis of special needs education since the inception and enactment of the Education for All Handicapped children Act in 1975. This still remains a core component of special education requirements and practices. For instance, the Individualized Disability Education Act (IDEA) requires that certain types of information have to be included in every learner’s IEP. The IEP is developed
to meet a child’s needs (Childre & Chambers, 2005). All IEPs, contain the following information regarding the child with disability: present levels of educational performance, measurable annual goals, special education and related services, participation levels with other non-disabled children, plan for delivering services and modifications, measuring and reporting progress as well as a degree of access to general curriculum including the amount of time spent participating in general education (Varma, 2009).

Studies in Inclusive Early Childhood Education by Burnett (1999) and Mattie and Kozen (2007) indicate that teachers of inclusive classes need support to develop and implement IEPs. They further note that effective implementation of IEP requires the collaboration of all the members of the support team. Nación and Campesinos (2002) and Sudhalter (2007) also posit that the support team members must work together to develop and implement IEPs for young children with disabilities in inclusive settings. Sudhalter (2007) observes that determination of students and their families who need IEP is the starting point and while preparing IEP planning comes after a rigorous evaluation.

According to the Ministry of Education, (2006) in Taiwan, Special Education Law provides the strongest legislative direction for mandating teamwork services in implementing Individualized Education Programme (IEP) which include a written document outlining early intervention services required in inclusive education. Similarly, in Turkey, the legal regulations, provide for IEP development to enable each and every child with the special need to benefit from an education service suitable for his/her needs and it further stipulates that IEP development shall be
undertaken by a team. Similarly, the Turkish Ministry of Education in 1997 recognized the need for having regulations for special education in which the principles of educating children with disability, their schooling process and the importance of IEP were clearly identified (Carter & Wilson, 2011).

According to Valenzuela and Martin (2005), in most African countries, children with special needs are mostly disadvantaged since they are unable to join school early in life. They eventually end up dropping out of school due to unconducive school environment that is characterized by congestion, lack of specialized personnel and facilities. Subsequently, most special needs children who require special attention and facilities to achieve their academic aspirations drop out. The teachers are unable to support them individually or in small classes since all classes are overwhelmingly large (Salvador-Carulla & Bertelli, 2007). Evidently today, with the emerging trend in education of learners with special needs many of these African countries now recognize Special Needs Education (SNE) as a necessity for all children with disability.

In preparation of all Special Needs Education (SNE) students in resource centre and special schools, the National Special Education Materials Centre was opened in Harare. However, IDEA demands that a child that receives special education must be receiving an Individualized Education Programme (IEP). Therefore, it is assumed that with recognition of special education, these African countries are developing and implementing IEP’s for learners with disabilities in their schools.
In Kenya, different commissions and sessional papers have fronted recommendations for children with intellectual disabilities. They include: the work of the Committee on Care and Rehabilitation of the Disabled (Mwenda, 1964) which resulted in the formulation of Sessional Paper No.5 of 1968. The Ominde Report (Kenya Education Commission, 1964) which recommends that learners with intellectual disability be integrated to learn in regular schools.

Moreover, the National Education Commission (The Gachathi Report, 1976) recommends several measures to address special needs education. These include: coordination of early intervention and assessment of children with special needs, creation of public awareness on causes of disabilities to promote prevention, research to determine the nature and extent of handicaps for provision of special needs education, establishment of early childhood development education (ECDE) programme as part of special schools and development of policy for integration of learners with special needs.

Besides, the Presidential Working Committee on Education and Training for the Next Decade and Beyond (The Kamunge Report, 1988), emphasized deployment of special needs education inspectors at district level, the total integration of children with disability, necessary facilities and equipment be provided for learners with special needs education and required that parents be more responsible for their childrens’ learning. The Sessional Paper No.1 of 2005 stated in part, the overall government policy direction on learners with special needs and disabilities. It sets out clear policy guidelines for all education subsectors, including SNE and further underscores the government commitment to ensuring that learners with special needs and disabilities
have equal access to quality and relevant education. It provides the overall policy framework for the education sector and references the necessary legal context within which education and training, including SNE, shall be designed, developed and implemented in Kenya. All the above policies in Kenya do not come out clearly on the use of Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) for students with intellectual disability in special schools or integrated programmes.

Despite the Kenya Governments silence on the issue of IEP it is noted that the education for learners with intellectual disabilities has been provided for in Kenya as early as 1948 (Mwangi, 2013), started by Rotary Club in 1948 at the St. Nicholas special school (currently known as Jacaranda special school). However, it was not until in 1960’s that teachers’ of learner with special needs started being trained specifically for learners with visual impairment, hearing impairment and those with intellectual disabilities in various institutions such as High Ridge Teachers Training College, Siriba Teachers College and Kamwenja TTC. In 1986, the training for teachers from the various institutions was moved to Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE) where they started training diploma teachers in Special Needs Education (SNE) in specific areas of disabilities including the area of intellectual disabilities. Currently, more graduate teachers are being trained in various universities including Kenyatta University, Moi University, Maseno University and many more from private universities (Ministry of Education, 2000). It is thus, clear that teachers for learners’ with intellectual disabilities in Kenya have been well prepared during their training to develop and implement an IEP.
Evidently, no study has been carried out in Kenya to evaluate the competency of these teachers’ of learners with intellectual disabilities in developing and implementing IEP. However, there is a related study carried out by Ndanu (2012). He investigated the influence of IEP for learners with learning difficulties in primary schools in Mwingi District, Kitui County in Kenya.

In this study, Ndanu used a study sample of 46 respondents which comprised 35 teachers, 10 headteachers and 1 area Education Officer. The findings of the study was that despite applying several teaching/learning strategies to facilitate teaching/learning processes, the performance of learners with learning difficulties was quite minimal. The study aimed at finding out how the administrative structure was put in place to implement the IEP in terms of resources, equipment and teachers capacity in public primary schools and challenges facing teaching in implementing IEP. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the data collected. His findings revealed that the use of IEP and other strategies were effective in enhancing the learners with difficulties. The study is similar to the present study as it investigates the challenges which teachers face in implementing IEP. However, it differs in the sense that the respondents in the current study were teachers’ of learners with special needs (intellectual disabilities) while in Ndanu’s study respondents were regular teachers. Similarly, the training of teaches is an expensive affair which requires the government to fund in order to achieve the objective of training teachers for learners with intellectual disability in the country.

Walingo (2017) analyzed IEP implementation in supporting the attainment of functional abilities in learners who are deaf-blind in selected schools in Kenya. In this
study, Walingo employed document analysis and a survey design in a mixed method research approach. The problem of the study was that persons who were deaf and blind experienced a lot of challenges in both hearing and sight that limit their interaction with the environment. The study aimed at analyzing the strategies that were used in the formulation and implementation of IEPs, the personnel who were involved, the quality of the formulated goals in identifying and addressing the needs of learners, the evaluation and reevaluations of IEPs and challenges encountered in the whole process and how they were addressed. The current study differs from Walingo’s study in the sense that the respondents were teachers who were intellectually disabled while Walingo’s were teachers of deaf-blind. The current study evaluated IEP while Walingo’s analyzed IEP implementation in supporting the attainment/functional abilities in learners who are deaf-blind. The findings revealed that there were no specific strategies that were used to formulate IEP goals and implement them. A multidisciplinary approach was not used in IEP formulation, implementation and reevaluation. The goals that were formulated did not capture adequately the needs of the learner that would have supported the attainment of functional abilities. Walingo’s study respondents were teachers of learners who were deaf-blind. It also differs in the use of adopted Program Evaluation for Procedure and Substantive Efficacy (PEPSE) – ICF-CY, and R-GORI in analyzing 54 IEPs for learners who were deaf and blind.

According to the report of the Task force, (2012) Kenya’s public spending on education has continued to rise over the years, particularly since the introduction of the Free Primary Education (FPE) in 2003. The sectors total expenditure increased from Kshs. 92.6 billion in 2005/6 to Kshs. 160 billion in 2009/10. The report further
shows that the University education unit spending totals Kshs. 137,707 was 18 times that of primary education. Therefore, with this massive expenditure it was important for this study to explore whether the IEP was being developed and implemented by these special education teachers who are trained especially for learners with intellectual disability and establish the challenges they face in the development and implementation of IEP in special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties in Kenya.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Despite the expensive and comprehensive training of teachers in Kenya in Special Needs Education to develop and implement IEP with learners with intellectual disabilities, their competency is still questionable. In line with their training, the special education teachers are expected to assess the individual child’s needs and develop and implement the IEP. When teachers do not develop the IEP, there is a lack of individualized goal setting and a teacher cannot measure an individuals’ academic and adaptive learning progress. Evidently, a child with intellectual disability when not given individual instruction to meet his/her unique needs will perform poorly in both academic and adaptive skills area. These concerns prompted the researcher to evaluate the development and implementation of individualized educational programs for learners with intellectual disabilities in Kisumu and Nairobi counties, Kenya.

1.4 Purpose of the Study

This study sought to evaluate the development and implementation of the individualized educational programme by teachers of learners with intellectual
disabilities in selected special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties in Kenyan.

### 1.5 Research Objectives

The study objectives sought to:

i. Establish the criteria followed by teachers in developing and implementing Individualized Education Programme (IEP) for learners with intellectual disabilities in special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi counties.

ii. Establish the involvement of multidisciplinary team in developing and implementing IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities in special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties.

iii. Investigate the availability of resource materials for developing and implementing IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities in special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties.

iv. Explore the challenges encountered by teachers of learners with intellectual disabilities in developing and implementing IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities in schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi counties.

### 1.6 Research Questions

i. What criteria is followed by teachers in developing and implementing IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities in special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi counties?

ii. To what extend is the multidisciplinary team involved in developing and implementing IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities in special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi counties?
iii. What resource materials are available for IEP development and implementation for learners with intellectual disabilities in special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties?

iv. What are the challenges facing teachers of children with intellectual disabilities when developing and implementing IEP in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties?

1.7 Significance of the Study

The study generated information on the challenges to successful development and implementation of the IEP for learners with intellectual disability. These findings may be beneficial to policy makers so as to make better the quality of education in special units and special schools for learners who are intellectually disabled.

The headteachers and teachers might benefit more since they could be equipped with more knowledge in IEP development and implementation. Parents of learners with intellectual disability may benefit and will understand their role in IEP development and implementation. There children might earn the necessary skills for independent living when more attention is given to them individually. Moreover, the study may create awareness on the importance of IEP in the education for learners with intellectual disabilities. Also, this study may be significant to future researchers and academicians in that they may use the results and findings as a foundation for their literature review. In this case, the researchers may also use the results to support their key findings in their research. The study also recommends topics for future studies to be pursued by other scholars.
1.8 Limitation and Delimitation of the Study

1.8.1 Limitation of the Study
The data obtained through the instruments in the present study might not be
generalized to the entire population of teachers and headteachers since the study was
only conducted in two counties in Kenya.

1.8.2 Delimitation of the Study
The study was delimited to special schools and units of learners with intellectual
disabilities in Kisumu and Nairobi counties in Kenya. Equally, the study was
delimited to headteachers and all special needs education teachers in both special
schools and units for learners with intellectual disability. The sample was from the
population of all units with learners who were intellectually disabled, all headteachers
of the regular schools with units and special schools for learners with intellectual
disability. The study excluded headteachers of regular schools which did not have a
unit. The interest of the survey was mainly to explore the competency of special needs
teachers in developing and implementing IEP with learners who were intellectually
disabled in units attached to regular schools and special schools for the same learners
in Kisumu and Nairobi counties.

1.9 Assumptions of the Study
This study made the following assumptions:

i. Honesty and willingness of respondents in the study area to give information
to the best of their knowledge.

ii. Special needs teachers for learners who are intellectually disabled are trained
on how to develop and implement IEP.
iii. The learner with intellectual disability in Kenya require Individualized Education Programme in order to learn.

1.10 Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

1.10.1 Theoretical framework

This study was guided by Four-step Model of Context Input Process and Product (CIPP) (Stufflebeams, 1961). According to this model, any evaluation of a programme is characterized by the following four areas: context, input, process and product. In the evaluation programme four areas were looked at. They are Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP). In this study, the context provides information on goals, objectives and priorities. Input shows activities of the programme such as the methods and strategies applied, resources used like human and materials. The process provides information on the programme as to what legal requirements and guidelines to be followed, identification of the problem and what strengths and weakness found in the programme. Lastly, the product entails the examination of the general and specific outcomes of the programme.

This model was relevant to this study, as it sought to evaluate the development and implementation of the IEP by addressing factors pointed out in CIPP. In IEP, the annual goals put in place for the implementation and assessment of the learners was done and the objectives determined whether they were responsive to the needs of the programme. Input in CIPP responds to the strategies such as human and material resources that were put in place to support the development and implementation of IEP. The process was the legal requirement put in place to be followed as a guideline for the development and implementation of IEP. Finally, the product which in this case was the learners who benefited from the IEP and became successful.
1.10.2: Conceptual Framework

**Figure 1.1:** Relationship between independent and dependent variables

*Source: Researchers own (2017)*
A conceptual framework is a set of broad ideas and principles taken from relevant fields of inquiry and used a structural format subsequent presentation (Bricki & Green, 2007). Figure 1.1 illustrates that in the learning process of a learner who is intellectually disabled; an IEP is used to guide the instruction. Therefore, it has to be developed and implemented by focusing on the IEP key components. These are learner’s present levels of educational performance, measurable annual goals and short-term instructional objectives, specific educational services to be provided, the extent to which the child will participate in general education, projected date for initiation of services, duration of those services and annual evaluation of progress made on IEP). When using a multidisciplinary team, they establish the present level of education performance, measurable annual goals, short-term objectives, special education and related services, the participation of a child with other non-disabled children, how progress is measured and reported, date of initiation, transition services and signatures of signatories. For the IEP to be developed there are strategies that ought to be followed. These are pre-referral of this child, referral, identification and eligibility. They require the involvement of human resources and material resources (paper, pen, files). Once the IEP is developed, there is a process of IEP implementation which will adapt Stufflebeam’s four-step model of CIPP (Context, Input, Process and Product). In this study, context provides goals, the present level of performance, special education and related services. Inputs are the strategies, human and material resources. Process in this study involves legal requirement and guidelines. Finally, since the present level of education performance was established, there is an evaluation to review whether what has been implemented leads to enhanced learning of the skills, knowledge and successful transition of the child with an intellectual disability which according to Stufflebeam’s theory is the product.
1.11 Operational Definition of Key Terms

**Evaluation:** Examining a set of practices about developing and implementing an Individualized Education programme (IEP) efficiency and quality. It is a form of systematic examination of events to be able to make more informed decisions about IEP implementation (Lincove, 2009).

**Individualized Education programme (IEP):** A written education plan that specifies what an individual learner needs to learn effectively. It is negotiated by a team of professionals and requires that special education and related services be provided to overcome those needs (Woods et al., 2013).

**Intellectual Disabilities (ID):** Substantial limitations in performing academic tests and also problems in performing everyday life social skills (Sudhalter, 2007).

**Intellectual Functioning:** General mental capacity, such as learning, reasoning, problem solving among others (Tammy & Bombeck, 2013).

**Interdisciplinary Team:** Members are characterized by formal channels of communication between them. Each team member is generally responsible for implementing a portion of the service plan related to his/her discipline (Heward; 2006)

**Implementation:** is the carrying out, execution, or practice of a plan, a method, or any design, idea, model, specification, standard or policy for doing something. As such, implementation is the action that must follow any preliminary thinking in order for something to actually happen (http://searchcrm.techtarget.com/definition/implementation).
**Multidisciplinary Team:** Members of different professional disciplines including the child’s parent/guardian and the child if necessary that work together for the benefit of the child with intellectual disability (Bandu & Jelas, 2012).

**Special Units:** A self-contained classroom which is a separate room or rooms dedicated solely to the education of learners with special needs within a larger school that also provides general education (Smith, Obrien, John, 2007).
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the review of related literature based on themes arising from the objectives of the study. These were the criteria for IEP development and implementation, personnel involved in developing IEP; human and material resources and challenges of implementing IEP.

2.2 Criteria for IEP Development and Implementation

This section explains IEP process, which is considered to be one of the most critical elements that ensure effective teaching, learning and better results for all learners with disabilities. In line with this observation, the review of literature done on Smith (2004, 2007) work gives seven steps to be observed in a comprehensive IEP planning process which begins with pre-referral and ends with a evaluation and review. He shows how each of these steps fits into the whole process of IEP planning and implementation.

2.2.1 Pre-referral

Pre-referral intervention refers to the process of identifying, developing, and implementing alternative education strategies for students who have recognized problems in the classroom before the student is referred to special education. A primary function of pre-referral team is identification of learners with special needs. When a student is located, adjustment must be made in the general education program to respond to his needs. If classroom modifications do not improve student performance then the student is formally referred to special education services (Doorlag & Lewis, 2003).
Pre-referral activities are employed to screen students before more formal identification procedures are implemented. In general, before any formal referral to special education is made, teachers and family members work together to see whether educational or behavioral difficulties can be resolved in the general education classroom. The assessments used during this step of the IEP process are intervention-based and are made in the student's general education class using direct measures of performance (McNamara & Hollinger, 2003).

The point here is to avoid unnecessary assessments and placements in special education, which are costly in time; money, and resources. During this pre-referral period, teachers try different validated teaching approaches to determine whether faulty instruction is the source of the problem (Barnett et al., 2004). They also make basic accommodations to the instructional program and systematically differentiate instruction more intensively. General education teachers receive both assistance and consultation from specialists. Students whose learning remains challenged are referred to special education and the next step of the IEP process.

A study by (Lloyd, Kauffman, Landrum and Roe, 1991) indicate that most reasons why classroom teacher refer students for special education and other types of support services are for many reasons such as general academic problems, difficulty in reading and behavioural problems such as in attentiveness.

Hartman and Fay (1996) studied the cost effectiveness of the pre-referral instructional support team process in Pennsylvania during the 1992-93 and 1993-94 school years. In this study, those 1,074 schools participating in Phases I through IV of instructional
support team implementation were compared to those schools employing a more traditional approach of obtaining services for students with learning problems, which involved referring students with learning problems directly for a multidisciplinary evaluation (MDE).

The costs and effectiveness of the traditional approach was based upon data from the Phase IV and Phase V schools before the instructional support team program was implemented in these schools. Costs associated with these two programs were primarily calculated according to personnel costs required to run the two programs. The long-term cost associated with servicing students in special education programs was estimated to be twice the cost of servicing regular education students.

The effectiveness of the two programs was measured according to effectiveness measures taken from the Instructional Support Team Projects data files (Kovaleski, McKinley, & McCloskey, 1995), which collected information on the numbers of instructional support team referrals, the number of psychological evaluations, the number of students placed in special education programs, and the number of same year retentions.

In the instructional support team schools, the average referral rate for instructional support assistance was 39 students out of 500, or 8% of students in IST schools; whereas, the more traditional schools that relied upon multidisciplinary evaluations to obtain services for students with learning difficulties averaged a 3% referral rate for multidisciplinary evaluations, which was interpreted by the researchers to mean that the instructional support team approach provided services to more students having
learning difficulties within a school. One of the factors utilized to determine the success of an instructional support team program is the percentage of students referred to the instructional support team who are able to continue to remain in their regular education classroom without the need for a multidisciplinary evaluation or special education services.

On the average 85% of students serviced through the instructional support team program did not need to be referred for a multidisciplinary evaluation because the team determined that their needs could be adequately met in the regular education classroom. Of those 15% of students referred for MDE, only 54% were placed. This result was unexpected given that the instructional support team referred the student on because they believed those student’s needs were not being met in the regular education classroom with the instructional support team interventions. However, this placement was higher than the traditional approach which placed only 37% in special education programs after a MDE referral. Approximately two-thirds of those students who did not qualify remained in the regular education classroom without any further instructional assistance.

In addition to the above, student retentions in grade declined in the first three years before the retention rates stabilized. This trend was estimated to result in a cost savings equal to the average cost of educating a regular education student each year multiplied by the number of students that might have been retained without the extra instructional assistance in the regular education classroom.
2.2.2 Referral

Normally, if pre-referral interventions are unsuccessful, an individual is referred for special education services. Referrals can come from many different sources: from parents, a social service agency, public health nurses, a doctor etc. Kroth, (1990) states that learners referral normally starts when the regular education teacher becomes concerned about a certain learner's behavior or academic achievement. Young children who are at risk of having disabilities because of improper prenatal care, low birth weight, accident or trauma during infancy, or child abuse are referred for special services.

Also, those with visible indications of a disability (e.g., a missing arm or leg, facial differences resulting from Down syndrome) or other signals of significant developmental delay (e.g., an 18-month-old not walking independently or a three-year-old not talking) are usually identified early and receive early intervention services during infancy or their preschool years. Typically, the referral process begins sooner for children with severe disabilities, because their disabilities are obvious at birth or during infancy.

As children grow older, other signs often trigger referrals. For example, a toddler who is not walking by age two and a preschooler not talking by age three are both candidates for early referrals. As children get older, reasons for referrals change as well. Students whose academic performance is significantly behind that of their classmates or who continually misbehave and disrupt the learning environment often draw the attention of their teachers.
Learners who are referred in most cases are those whose academic performance is significantly lagging behind their classmates. Yssedke et al., (1983) further points out that 75%-81% of learners referred by the teachers normally qualify for special education services. In the case of learners with intellectual disability they are normally noticed because of their failing to adapt academically or socially to the expected standards of their age mates. According to Smith, Tyler and Mclean (1998) the main referral process for the learner begins when the regular class teacher informs the school principal/head teacher, parents, counselor, or special service committee (also referred to as the appraisal and review team or the learner’s study team).

This committee then decides whether the learner needs to be evaluated more thoroughly. In such a case the person who referred the learner for special education services is expected to provide to the committee with relevant information on the learners behavioral observations, samples of academic work or anecdotal notes (e.g. results from each achievement test, scores from weekly quizzes and samples from learners writing and if social behavior is of concern a written description of the learners atypical behavior in the classroom and on the playground (Smith, Tyler and Mclean; 1998).

The special services committee reviews the information provided by the teacher. Normally, the permanent members of the committee include the school principal, the counselor, school psychologist and special education teacher. In every case of referral, the special committee/ special team decides whether a formal evaluation is needed. If this is recommended by the committee then a written notice of referral and a request
for consent to evaluate the learner is sent to parents. Parents are expected in return to respond in writing to consent before formal assessment is started.

Cline (1992) in Kihoro (2010) adds that a class teacher decision to refer a child for assessment may also be influenced by the teacher’s inability to recognize the differences between a child who has intellectual disability (ID) a child who has specific learning difficulties (SLD) or a child who has communication disorders. Such cases when referred to assessment may well be placed in special schools for children with intellectual disability, where they do not fit.

The Education Act of 1981 in the UK (Solity, 1992) in Kihoro (2010) stipulates that a parent or a guardian of the child suspected of having intellectual disability must give consent for a child to be referred for assessment. The permission must be given in writing. The child’s parent or guardian must be involved in the assessment process. A study by Ford and Webb (1994) that focused on desegregation of special educational programs suggested that lack of referrals and inadequate teacher training contributed to the under representation of African American students in gifted programs.

They concluded that special education programs need to be improved in the area of referrals of African American students with special needs and they called for multidimensional assessment strategies (Ford & Webb, 1994). Gilbert and Gay (1985) also noted that African American students were often misdiagnosed and misplaced because general education classrooms did not meet the criteria to properly refer students who were gifted.
Although some education scholars argued that teachers lack of referral of African American students who need special education may have been faced with strong anecdotal evidence that many African American students had low academic skills, learning disabilities or behavioral disorders that truly warranted a different learning environment. However, this anecdotal evidence ignores how the lack of culturally responsive referral systems may affect student performance.

Usually in Kenya situation, before placement in special school or a special unit for learners with intellectual disability, a thorough referral and assessment process must be undertaken by a team of professionals or a multidisciplinary team. The child suspected of having intellectual disability, the child’s parents or guardians and the child’s teacher must be actively involved in the process (Kihoro, 2010).

2.2.3 Identification

The purpose of identification in the IEP process is to determine whether: a learner has a disability, special education is required, and what types of services are needed. Evaluations are conducted by multidisciplinary teams made up of professionals who have expertise in each area of concern. Each member helps to evaluate the learner's unique strengths and needs. Information can come from a broad range of sources, including the learner’s parents and family members. In USA the assessment team leader is a school psychologist, an educational diagnostician, or a psycho-metrician and in some cases a teacher from the learner's school leads the team's efforts.
In this step, a lot of data about the learner is collected which is used to inform the team about the learner's abilities which includes: medical history, information about social interactions at school and at home, adaptive behavior in the community, educational performance, and other relevant factors are considered. Evaluations include an array of assessment instruments and procedures. Information is collected, from family members, about individuals' major life activities: performance at home, at school, in interpersonal relationships, and during leisure time. Formal tests—tests of intelligence, academic achievement, and acuity (e.g., vision and hearing)—are part of the information used to make decisions about students and their potential special education status.

Less formal assessments (school observations of social behavior, examples of academic assignments, direct measurements of academic performance, and portfolio samples of classroom performance) are also important pieces of evidence for this step in the IEP process. Luckasson et al., (1992) points out that for learners who are suspected to have intellectual disability assessment in specific adaptive skill areas which include communication, self-care, home living, social skills, community use, self-direction, health and safety, functional academics, leisure, and work are critical. One result of the evaluation step of the IEP process can be determination that the learner does not have a disability. In this case, the IEP process is discontinued. For those learners who do have disabilities, this phase of the process provides vital baseline information on the learner's performance which guides the development of the individualized program plan and later on the same information helps in evaluating the program's effectiveness.
Pierangelo, R. and Giulioni G. (1998) posit that effectively carried out assessment which would result in appropriate placement of a child must have the following components:

- an individual psychological evaluation
- general intelligence
- instructional needs, leaning strengths and weaknesses, social and emotional dynamics
- academic history including interviews or reports from the child’s past and present from the teachers
- physical examination of the child

According to Gargielo (2006) in Nyakundi (2015) Assessment is termed as the process of gathering information, analyzing it, and making viable judgment while placement is putting a learner in the most appropriate educational setting or positions. Klin and Volkmar (1995) recommended a multidisciplinary team for assessment and feel strongly that parents need to be a part of the assessment. Assessment results should translate easily into implications for adaptation, learning, and vocational training.

They suggested a comprehensive evaluation should include: developmental history, psychological assessment, communication assessment, and psychiatric evaluation. The aim of psychological assessment is to establish the overall level of intellectual functioning while profiling strengths, weaknesses, and style of learning. Assessments should also determine neuropsychological functioning (e.g., motor skills, memory, executive functions, problem-solving, visual-perceptual skills), academics, and
personality assessment. Communication assessment should obtain information on vocabulary, sentence construction, comprehension, non-literal communication skills, pragmatics, prosody of speech and content, and coherence and contingency of conversation. The psychiatric examination should include observations in structured and unstructured situations that investigate relationships, leisure skills, special interests, social and affective presentation, and behavior problems.

In Kenya, Educational Assessment Resource Centre (EARC) have the responsibility of assessing and placing learners with special needs (Nyakundi 2015). According to the Kochung (2003) EARC personnel were merely trained special education teachers without any further training on assessment and that most of the Educational Assessment Resource Centres lacked critical assessment equipment and tools. Nyakundi (2015) adds that the Ministry of Education (MoE) National Special Education Policy Framework Draft (2009) revealed that there was inadequate skilled labour for the assessment for placement decisions of learners with (SNE).

The Ministry of Education Policy for Special Education (2009) stipulates the responsibilities of the EARC as follows; identification and assessment of learners with disabilities, guidance and counseling for parents of children with special needs, running courses for parents of children with special needs, establishment of special needs units in regular schools and making referrals of children with special needs to special schools, unite and integrated programmes or for medical examination and treatment among many others not mentioned (Nyakundi, 2015). Solity (1992) in Kihoro (2010) states that both the Education for All Handicapped Children Act or PL 94-142, of 1975, in the United States of America (USA) and the 1981 Education Act
of United Kingdom (UK) state that the assessment process starts with the class teacher because of a child’s unsatisfactory performance in school.

2.2.4 Eligibility

The information from the identification step is used to recognize students who actually have a disability and qualify for special education services. For those students, the IEP committee then determines what components of the full range of special education and related services are needed so that an appropriate education can be planned for and ultimately delivered. The education of those students who do not meet the eligibility requirements remains the responsibility of general educators.

In the United States of America, the federal laws state that eligibility for special education services is determined by two criteria: it must be established that student has a disability and there must be evidence that the disability in some way adversely affects the student’s educational performance (Doorlag & Lewis, 2003). Achenbach (2005), in a special section of the Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology dealing with advancing assessment for children and adolescents, discussed the importance of evidenced-based assessment that has been omitted in the emphasis and search for evidenced-based treatments. He stated it is hard to determine how treatments are working if the problems they are based on have not been appropriately and adequately assessed.

2.2.5 Development of the IEP

Once it has been determined that a student is eligible for special education, the next step is to design the Individualized Education Programmes (IEP) (Doorlag & Lewis,
The IEP is a tool which is developed to ensure that school children with special needs receive the special education and related services which are appropriate to each child’s needs. Therefore, after thorough completion of the pre-referral, referral, evaluation, and eligibility steps of the IEP process, it is time to develop the actual individualized program plan for the learner who has qualified for special education. The next step requires that parents and the IEP team make decisions about appropriate education, other related services, and placement. The assessment results are used to help make these decisions. The IEP team then puts its crafted plan down in writing—resulting in the IEP that will guide the delivery of the child’s special education and related services. They must ensure that the resulting IEP addresses the minimal contents of the IEP—which are the key components as given by IDEA:

1. A statement of the learner’s present levels of educational performance;
2. A statement of measurable annual goals and short-term instructional objectives;
3. Specific educational services to be provided;
4. The extent to which the child will participate in general education, Projected date for initiation of services;
5. Expected duration of those services;
6. A statement of annual evaluation of progress made on IEP (Smith, 2007).

Ball (2009) focused on effective special needs schools, particularly for African American females, and underscored the development of a positive and caring environment, developing a trusting relationship with a student, being accepted, and getting personal attention. Ball (2009) pointed to the value of positive teacher expectations, an emphasis on academic rigor, and teacher genuineness during the
development process to determine whether: a learner has a disability, special education is required, and what types of services are needed. Denbo (2002) focused on school cultures that had effective leadership, support for development, teacher diversity, and the use of data to improve instruction.

2.2.6 Implementation of the IEP

Once the IEP is developed, the student's services and individualized program begin. The IEP now lays out what constitutes an appropriate education for the student, the extent to which the student participates in the general education curriculum, the accommodations the student receives both for instruction and for testing, and the array of multidisciplinary services from related service providers that support the student's educational program. For students who are participating in a different curriculum or whose goals differ from those of the general education curriculum, the IEP has specified alternate assessment procedures as well.

According to Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, (2007); for learner to advance appropriately towards his or her IEP goals, he/she must be involved in the general curriculum and participate in other school activities. Every individual involved in the provision of services to the learner should know and understand his or her responsibilities while carrying out the IEP. This helps to ensure that the learner receives the services that have been planned, including the specific modifications and accommodations that the IEP team identified as necessary. The school must take steps to ensure a student's IEP is implemented as recommended by the multidisciplinary committee, including but not limited to: providing copies of the learner’s IEP, as appropriate; informing each individual of his or her IEP implementation
responsibilities and providing a learner with his or her instructional materials in an accessible alternative format if recommended in the learner’s IEP.

According to Whitbread et al., the general consensus among teachers today is that they are feeling "overtaxed" (2007, p. 7) when it comes to working with parents to make decisions about appropriate education, other related services, and placement teaching special education students. Working with the parents, while providing accommodations and paperwork documentation, in addition to their regular workload, it is little wonder that teachers may be feeling overtaxed. If there are multiple parents or partners involved in the process, this can add to the load of working with and notifying not only the custodial guardian/partner/parent, but the non-custodial parent/partner also. This feeling of bum out among teachers may lead to resentment toward the parents they are working with or the entire IEP/special education process in which they are enveloped (Whitbread et al., 2007).

2.2.7 Evaluation and Reviews

Evaluation means procedures used to determine whether a child has a disability and the nature and extent of the special education and related services that the child needs. The evaluation results are very useful in determining how the child is currently doing in school and what areas of need the child has. This is one of the evaluation’s explicit purposes as reflected in IDEA’s definition of evaluation. For each IEP developed accountability is required (IDEA 2004)because it measures and determines whether the learner is making progress, educators are careful to describe expectations for tasks and skills the learner needs to learn in terms that can be evaluated. The purpose of the
IEP review meetings is to ensure that the learner is meeting his/her goals and making educational progress.

To assist in accountability process it is recommended that frequent assessments of the individual's performance occur, even if major IEP reviews occur once a year or only every three years. The purpose of such measurements of progress is to guide instruction and be sure those interventions scheduled are effective. It is important to know if the learner is not making the expected progress or if he/she has progressed much faster than expected. Together, parents and school personnel can then address the learners needs as those needs become evident (Ittenbach, Patton and Beirne-Smith, 1994).

Etscheidt (2003) reviewed 68 published legal cases occurring between 1997-2002 involving students with IEP issues and found three primary factors that lead to judicial decisions: the IEP must be matched to evaluation data (9 cases out of 21 decisions supported the school district), IEP team members must be qualified to develop 36 programs (all 9 case decisions supported the school district), and the methodology provided must assist the student’s achievement of IEP goals (8 out of 9 case decisions supported the school district). Etscheidt (2006) further investigated 52 published legal cases occurring after the changes in 1997 to IDEA law that involved Behavior Improvement Plans (BIPs) and found that although problems behaviors were clearly identified, school personnel had not always addressed them through the provision of a BIP. There were also problems with the BIP being informed by assessment and individualized for the specific child and behavior. Plans did not always include a positive change support and were not always implemented.
This study sought to establish the criteria and the key components used in developing and implementing the IEP by teachers of learners with intellectual disabilities in selected special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties in Kenya.

### 2.3 Involvement of Multi-disciplinary Team in IEP Development

According to Griffin (2011) an interdisciplinary team should be charged with the task of providing comprehensive, appropriate educational programmes for all learners with disabilities. The team members are composed of a group of individuals who have vested interest in the learners’ educational programme. Smith et al., (1994) add that team members should be teachers, psychologists, school administrators, parents, learners, advocates, nurses, social workers, occupational/physiotherapists, speech and language therapists. According to Woods et al. (2013), the needs of the individual learner should determine the exact composition of the team.

The size of the team increases proportionally to the degree of intensity of the learner’s suspected disability. Therefore, the team must make a coordinated effort to decide about critical areas such as assessment procedures, instructional objectives, educational placement, instructional strategies and evaluation. Each of these members has an important contribution to make to the team effort. Teamwork plays an important role in carrying out the IEP. Branding et al., (2009) support the idea of an interdisciplinary team of professionals working together with parents and families as observed by Smith et al (1994) and further argues that this may help provide the educational and related services that the learners with disabilities need.
Similarly, the IEP might contain points for action that go beyond the school and family with learners who are intellectually disabled therefore, many professionals are more likely to be involved in the provision of services and support to the learner. Support from a multidisciplinary team is required throughout schooling and as the child matures the involvement of social worker and other staff may be required as the child moves to adulthood. Sharing expertise and insights can help make everyone’s job a lot easier and can certainly improve results for learners with disabilities (Sudhalter, 2007). Schools can encourage teamwork by giving teachers, support staff and/or paraprofessionals time to plan or work together on such matters as adapting the general curriculum to address the learner's unique needs. Teachers, support staff and others providing services to learner with disabilities may require training and staff development (Test et al., 2004).

Communication between home and school is also important. Parents can share information about the learner’s home environment and build upon what the learner is learning at school. If the learner is having difficulty in school, parents may be able to offer insight or help the school explore possible reasons as well as possible solutions (Milsom, Goodnough, & Akos, 2007). It has been observed that a child with an intellectual disability is more likely to be successful at school with the support of parents (Barnard-Brak, Davis, Ivey and Thomson; 2009).In addition to special education, the learner may be receiving other related services which will involve many people. Therefore, having a person in charge of overseeing the deliverance of services as planned can help ensure appropriate implementation of the IEP and establish whether the learner is making the expected progress or not. Together,
parents and school personnel can then address the learners' needs as those needs become evident.

According to Heward, (2003) every team member conducts assessment, plans interventions and delivers services. He further shows that the headteacher/administrator is a vital participant in the IEP meeting, this individual represents the school system. This person knows a great deal about special education services and educating learners with disabilities (Carter & Wilson, 2011). He or she can talk about the necessary school resources and materials. This individual has the authority to commit resources and materials and be able to ensure that whatever services are set out in the IEP will actually be provided.

At least one of the learners’s regular education teachers must be on the IEP team if the learner is (or may be) participating in the regular education environment. The regular education teacher informs the team for instance on the following: general curriculum in the regular classroom, aids services or changes to the educational programme that would help the learner to achieve and strategies to help the learner with behaviour moulding, if it is an issue.

The regular education teacher may also discuss with the IEP team the support needed from other school staff that will enable the learner advance towards his or her annual goals in addition be involved and progress in the general curriculum, participate in extracurricular and other activities and be educated with other learners both with and without disabilities (Diliberto & Brewer, 2012).
Support for school staff may include professional development or more training for teachers, administrators, bus drivers, cafeteria workers and others who provide services for learners with disabilities. The learner’s special education teacher contributes valuable information and experience on how to educate the learner with disabilities.

According to Martin, Marshall and Sale (2004), the parents are key members of the IEP team. They know their children very well and can talk about their strengths and needs as well as offer ideas for enhancing their children’s education. Furthermore, they can offer insight into how their children learn, their interests and other aspects known by only parents. In addition, they can listen to contributions from other team members regarding their children’s needs and share their suggestions. Also, they can report on whether the skills the children learn at school are being used at home.

Another important member of the IEP team is the individual who can interpret what the learner’s evaluation results mean in terms of designing appropriate instruction. The evaluation results are very useful in determining the learner’s current performance in school and other areas of need that the learner may have. This IEP team member must be able to talk about the instructional implications of the learner’s evaluation results, which will help the team plan appropriate instruction to address the learner’s needs (Mattie & Kozen, 2007).

Parents may invite an advocate who knows the child, a professional with special expertise about the child’s disability, or others (such as a vocational educator who has been working with the child) who can talk about the child’s strengths and/or needs.
The school system may invite one or more individuals who can offer special expertise or knowledge about the child, such as a paraprofessional or related services professional.

Moreover, when developing an IEP, consideration should be taken on the learner’s need for related services. Thus related service professionals are often involved as IEP team members or participants. They share their special expertise about the learner’s needs and how their own professional services can address these needs (Mattie & Kozen, 2007). Depending on the learner’s individual needs, some related service professionals attending the IEP meeting or otherwise helping to develop the IEP might include occupational or physical therapists, adaptive physical education providers, psychologists, or speech-language pathologists.

When an IEP is being developed for a learner on transition age, representatives from transition service agencies can be important participants. Whenever a meeting is called to consider needed transition services, the school must invite a representative of any other agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services (Penuel et al., 2007). This individual can help the team plan any transition services the student’s needs. He or she can also commit the resources of the agency to pay for or provide needed transition services. If he or she does not attend the meeting, then the school must take alternative steps to obtain the agency’s participation in the planning of the student’s transition services.

Sandt & Karriker (2010) argue that if transition service needs or transition services are going to be discussed at the meeting, the learner must be invited to attend. Children
Services division of the Arizona Supreme Court Administration office of the Courts 2013 posits that a learner should be included in the process if he/she is old enough to understand and possibly assist the team in planning for his/her future. This allows them to have a strong voice in their own education and can teach them a great deal about self-advocacy and self-determination. They further state that currently more and more learners are participating in and even leading their own IEP meetings. By law, certain individuals must be involved in writing a learner’s Individualized Education Programme. Note that an IEP team member may fill more than one of the team positions if properly qualified and designated. For example, the school system representative may also be the person who can interpret the child’s evaluation results.

These people must work together as a team to write the child’s IEP. According to Sandt and Karriker (2010) a meeting to write the IEP must be held within 30 calendar days before deciding that the child is eligible for special education and related services. Each team member brings important information to the IEP meeting. Members share their information and work together to write the child’s Individualized Education Programme. Each person’s information adds to the team’s understanding of the child and the services the child needs.

This IEP team member must be able to talk about the instructional implications of the child’s evaluation results, which will help the team plan appropriate instruction to address the child’s needs. He or she may be a member of the team already, such as the learner’s special education teacher or the public agency representative, or may be someone else entirely, such as the school psychologist.
This study sought to establish the involvement of a multi-disciplinary team in developing and implementing the individualized educational programme by teachers of learners with intellectual disabilities in selected special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties in Kenya.

2.4 Availability of Resource Materials

Beirne Smith et al., (2006) state that policy makers must identify the most beneficial set of goals and allocate the necessary resources those IEP goals that might require resources in terms of human, money and materials should be addressed. According to Dabkowski (2006), some goals may require resources in terms of clerical support or supplies. It is important that the team identifies such resources at the time they generate goals. The individuals being supported under the IEP programme require school to provide accessible versions of instructional materials to learners’ with special needs. Students with disabilities should receive study materials in appropriate formats at the same time as their typical peers receive their textbooks. According to Valenzuela and Martin (2005), these individuals demand special administrative models (for example, special administrators, special staffing, facilities and funding).

Administrative mode according to Sudhalter, (2007) include planning, organizing, staffing, directing and coordinating which embodies supervising, reporting and budgeting. Staffing explains how the administrators arrange for the regular supply of personnel, staff training through workshops, seminars, teachers’ meetings and conferences, interest study groups, exchange visits, classroom visits and demonstration lessons to meet the needs of special needs individuals. Staffing is the
procedure through which the regular employment of the proper kind and number of staff necessary to accomplish the goals of the school or organization is achieved.

Thus, the morale of the staff in the school will be raised for higher productivity. Supervising refers to monitoring and coordinating the activities, facilities and personnel at various units of the special school (Demirel & Cokun, 2010). It also entails, provision of corrective measures and positive criticisms instead of judgment so as to achieve the set goals of building those special needs. Budgeting embodies fiscal management, financial planning and control by administrators in order to ensure that the available financial resources are not diverted from the main objectives which include: providing special facilities, equipment, environment, medical care, consultation services, clinics, among other things, for learners’ with special needs. In general terms, services rendered to the special needs learners are expected to be specially designed and delivered by highly trained and specialized personnel.

Therefore, this study sought to establish the availability of resource materials in development and implementation of the individualized educational programme by specialized teachers of learners with intellectual disabilities in selected special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties in Kenya.

2.5 Challenges of Developing and Implementing IEP

Studies done globally on challenges facing IEP development and implementation express concern about IEP implementation. Overall, the IEP literature produces specific understandings: (1) IEPs are common in special education provision across school systems internationally, (2) considerable variation exists in the actual
individualization of IEPs due to a number of factors such as school culture, classroom setting, teachers’ use of assessment data, and (3) collaboration in developing IEPs is varied with noticeable limitations in the involvement of parents, other professionals and learners. In similar vein, Childre and Chambers (2005) describe that context and school culture have significant effects on IEP practices and importantly influence the nature and level of collaboration between teachers, parents, students and other stakeholders when developing and implementing IEPs.

Ronaldi (1976) cautions that: staff development must take place first. He warns that teachers may end up with paperwork compliance rather than real exemplary implementation. According to Smith, (1990) and Sugai, (1985) they argue that developing, writing, and monitoring IEPs is quite time consuming, and some teachers report that the burden of the paperwork outweighs the usefulness of the document. However, the study of Abosi (2003) show that, the individuals with special needs are not well catered for by the government. He laments that teachers’ training and general development, for those with special needs is lacking, especially in Africa.

Furthermore, he emphasizes that planning, organizing and management of special education have been characterized by poor vision and commitment, inadequate funding, selfish interest among experts and negative attitudes as a result of negative African values, tradition and culture. These, among other things have influenced the proper delivery of services in form of rehabilitation, teaching, consultative services provision of quantity and quality teachers, to mention a few. Korir & Mukuria, (2007) argue that special education is multifaceted discipline that calls for professionals from all disciplines to work together. Many special education teachers in Kenya feel that
they are ill-equipped to simultaneously handle the multiplicity of academic and behavioral challenges presented by individuals with intellectual disabilities.


Lee-Tarver (2006) point out that IEP is perceived as necessary tool for planning, preparing and implementing educational goals and curriculum. A study by Salas (2004) shows that parents of children with special needs input is frequently not respected during IEP meetings. Collaboration in the IEP process discussed by Karvonen and Huynh (2007) describe the difficulties faced by teachers and parents in establishing and maintaining relationships with team members while developing IEPs. Some of the highlighted challenges are involved around issues of power and equity, culture, roles of team members and their ability to overcome barriers to forge partnerships.

The review of the literature shows that parents and student participation in the IEP process continues to be problematic. Studies that have been conducted show that parents are not keen in IEP meetings and often viewed themselves as being exploited because they saw that the responsibility of IEP rests with the teachers (Valenzuela & Martin, 2005). Branding et al., (2009) report that most parents believe their children’s IEP goals are appropriate, are satisfied with their amount of involvement in IEP
decision making and view the services and support in the IEP as being very individualized for their children. Though teachers are the most knowledgeable resource in programming for IEP, the quality of the teacher’s relationship and other team members has a major impact on the overall outcomes for students (Snyder, 2002).

The literature on the involvement of students in their IEP meetings suggests that students have limited role and input in the IEP process. The efficacy and effectiveness of the IEP process is questionable not only in the short-term but in the long-term for students with disabilities. Mattie and Kozen (2007) argue that the students themselves might find it difficult to participate in IEP given that they are the beneficiaries and have varying disabilities, including cognitive disabilities. Although the IEP process is viewed as a means by which guardians and parents can be engaged in their children’s education so as to foster a good relationship between parents and professionals in IEP, other studies have shown varying and limited amounts of collaboration in development of IEP between parents and teachers (Mattie & Kozen, 2007).

In a study carried out by Rehfeldt, Clark and Lee (2012) on the management of special education resources in Ibadan, the results reveal that special education resources are not adequate in schools. Additionally, they are not evenly distributed and the few available resources are not efficiently used, while others are often diverted to regular students. Rehfeldt, Clark and Lee (2012) have also noted that special schools or centres managed by private individuals or religious bodies provide better services than those established by government.
Wrong information given during identification and referral stage can be detrimental to developing and implementation of IEP for the learner. Obiakor & Mukuria, (2006) state that the process of identification and referral has not been without fault particularly in USA and further shows that research has shown that when identification and referral are poorly and prejudicially administered, the other process of assessment, categorization, and instruction usually yield prejudicial results. Consequently, when students are not identified properly, they do not receive instruction congruent to their intellectual abilities after being placed in large classroom environment.

Heward (2006) poses that lack of communication among team members can create a major challenge to development and implementation of IEP. Communication is important because the team communicates their content to everyone who should have the information. Too often teachers do not know what the students IEP comprises, and at the secondary level, many general education teachers of specific students with disabilities do not even know that they have an IEP that spells out accommodation and modifications that should be met (Bateman, 1996; Lovitt, Cushing & Stump (1994). This situation leaves one to ask: How can appropriate education be delivered when educators who interact with students with disabilities do not even know what services, goals and objectives their education should include.

Another area of criticism widely discussed is the lack of research evidence on the effectiveness of IEP for improving the outcome of students despite the accepted logic and purpose of IEP (Mattie & Kozen, 2007). In all the studies mentioned, no study has been done on the development and implementation of IEP by Special Needs
Education teachers. Therefore, there was a gap that needed to be investigated, hence the concern of this study. When looked alongside the synthesis of the literature from Rehfeldt, Clark and Lee (2012), it is evident that common issues exist which are the basis for current study on the IEP process and which generate questions for further inquiry to provide a better understanding of the means by which the IEP process can be improved. Thus the need for local studies on evaluation of competency of special needs teachers in developing and implementing IEP with learners who are intellectually disabled.

Since inception, the IEP process has been problematic (Huefner, 2000; Yell & Drasgow, 2000). More than 20 years ago, Gallegher (1984) wrote that the IEP is “probably the single most unpopular aspect of the law, not only because it requires a great deal of work, but also because the essence of the plan itself seems to have been lost in the mountains of paperwork” (p.2828). Studies of actual IEPs seen to support Gallegher’s contention (Smith, 1990a, 1990b; Smith & Brownerll, 1995) Smith & Simpson (1989), for example, evaluated the IEPs of 214 students with behavioral disorders and found that one-third of the IEPs lacked necessary mandated components. The study examined IEPs for high school students found that transition – related goals included vague outcomes (e.g. “will think about best place to live, “will explore jobs”), no evaluation procedures, and very few adaptations in activities or materials (Grigal, Test, Beattie & Wood, 1997). But properly including all of the mandated components in an IEP is no guarantee that the document will guide the students learning and teachers teaching in the classroom, as intended by IDEA. Although most educators support the idealized concepts of the IEP, inspection and evaluation of IEPs often reveal inconsistencies between what is written on the
document and the instruction that students experience in the classroom (Smith & Brownell, 1995).

**2.6 Summary of Literature Reviewed**

Studies on criteria for IEP development and implementation of IEP revealed that although there have been major education reports; none gives focus to IEP policy in terms of its development and implementation. The studies reveal that the criteria for formation of an IEP involve seven steps: pre-referral, identification, eligibility, development, implementation and evaluation. There was limited knowledge of criteria among teacher concerning IEP development and implementation. Therefore, this study is to establish the criteria followed by teacher in developing and implementing IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities in special schools and units. Studies done on involvement of multidisciplinary team in IEP development reveal that the multidisciplinary team must make a coordinated effort to decide about critical areas such as assessment procedures, instructional objectives, educational placement, instructional strategies and evolution. The present study was to establish the involvement of multidisciplinary team in developing and implementing IEP. Studies done on availability of resource material reveal that special education resources are not adequate in schools. Studies done on the challenges of developing and implementing IEP reveal that parents are not actively involved in the IEP process and the parents perceived IEP meeting as traumatic, confusing and complicated.

No studies have been carried out in Kenya on the evaluation of the Individualized Education Programme with learners who are intellectually disabled by special needs teachers. A study by Ndanu (2012) investigates the influence of IEP on learners with
learning difficulties in public primary schools. The present study related to all studies reviewed as they all conducted research on an Individualized Education Programme. However, it differed significantly with all of them because it focused on special needs teachers’ competency in developing and implementing IEP to learners who are intellectually disabled and sought to find out challenges these teachers face.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter presents research design, variables, location of the study, target population, sampling procedures and sample size. Also it discusses; instruments, pilot study, validity, reliability, data collection techniques, data analysis, logistical and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research Design
The study used a descriptive survey design which is a method of collecting information by interviewing or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals (Orodho, 2003). Gravetter and Forzano (2009) maintain that descriptive research involves measuring a variable or set of variables as they exist naturally.

The descriptive survey research was appropriate for this study because it describes respondent’s responses to questions about behavior and attitudes. It also allows the researcher to collect information concerning criteria for developing and implementing IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities, involvement of multidisciplinary team in IEP development, availability of resources and materials and challenges faced by teachers in developing and implementing IEP in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties in Kenya.
3.3 Variables

Variables are characteristics or attributes that can assume different values. Variables can be classified as quantitative or qualitative. In addition to being classified as qualitative or quantitative, variables can be classified by how they are categorized, counted or measured.

3.3.1 Independent Variables

In this study, the independent variables were strategies, multidisciplinary team and material resources.

3.3.2 Dependent Variable

Dependent variables are observed and measured by changing independent variables. These variables determine the effect of the cause (independent) variables when changed for different values. The dependent variables are the outcomes of the experiments determining what was caused or what changed as a result of the study. The outcome variable in this study was the development and implementation of IEP.

3.4 Location of the Study

The study was carried out in special units attached to regular schools and special schools for the learners with intellectual disabilities in Nairobi and Kisumu counties in Kenya. The reason for carrying out the study in the two counties was that they have the highest percentage of special needs teachers. Teacher’s population in Kisumu was 288 while in Nairobi was 945 (Ministry of Education, 2014).
Nairobi and Kisumu Counties (Appendix D and Appendix E) were selected as an area of study because of their high population thus more learners with intellectual disabilities were more likely to be found. The studies reviewed showed that no research on IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities had not been carried out in Nairobi. It has a total population of 3,138,369; 985,016 households. The population density is 4,515 per sq. km and 22% of the population live below the poverty line.

3.5 Target Population

The target population comprised of 14 sub-counties, 6 special schools and 41 units attached to regular schools. Forty seven (47) headteachers and 993 teachers totaling 1040 in both Kisumu and Nairobi counties as shown in the Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Sub-county</th>
<th>Special School</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>HeadTeachers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisumu</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Sampling Technique and Sample Size

3.6.1 Sampling Technique

In both counties, 6 special schools, 41 units and 47 headteachers were purposively selected while stratified random sampling was used to select 993 teachers.
According to Wallen and Fraenkel (2003), purposive sampling is when researchers use own judgment to select a samples that they believe, provides the data that is required based on prior information.

### 3.6.2 Sample Size

The sample size comprised of 9 head teachers, 18 male teachers and 87 female teachers (Table 3.2). Gay (1992) suggests that at least 10% of the population is good representation where the population is large and 20% where the population is small. In Kisumu County the target population was small, therefore 20% was used to select the sample whereas in Nairobi County the target population was large so 10% was used to select the sample.

**Table 3:2: Sample size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Special School</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>Teachers Male</th>
<th>Teachers Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kisumu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 9 | 9 | 18 | 87 | 105 |

### 3.7 Research Instruments

The researcher developed questionnaires for teachers, interview guides for headteachers, observation checklist and document analysis.
3.7.1 Questionnaire for Teachers

The questionnaire was used in this study to collect information from teachers. According to Gravetter and Forzano (2009) the questionnaires are used extensively in the behavioural sciences as relatively efficient ways to gather large amounts of information.

The questionnaire had five sections: Section A had five items which were used to capture demographic information. Section B had three items which contained criteria for IEP Development and Implementation. Section C had three items which were used to capture the involvement of the professionals in IEP development. Section D captured the resources and materials in developing IEP. Section E had challenges faced by special needs teachers in developing and implementing IEP with learners who were intellectually disabled. The Likert scale of five point response was used. The resources from rating scales were treated as interval measurements, where strongly agreed had the highest score and strongly disagree had the lowest score. (see table 4.6).

3.7.2 Interview Guide for Head Teachers

There were 10 items on rapport statement to gather information that was useful in building up a general awareness of headteachers on the importance of IEP development and implementation (Appendix B). Interviews are reserved for a very small group of special selected individuals called key informants. According to Gravetter and Forzano (2009), an interview provides an opportunity for follow-up questions, and it is possible to explore complex issues more fully than could be done with questionnaires (Appendix B).
3.7.3 Lesson Observation Checklist

The observation check list contained information about the activities that are required in the IEP as components. The purpose of the observation checklist was to confirm whether teachers know what IEP should contain as the components such as long term objectives, short term objectives, strength and weaknesses, related services, signatories, duration of IEP, evaluation and date of IEP.

3.7.4 Document Analysis

Document analysis was used to confirm whether lesson plans, IEPs, schemes of work record of work and class register were in the teaching file.

3.8 Pilot Study

The pilot study was conducted in Jacaranda Special School for learners with intellectual disabilities in Nairobi County. The school was selected because it had similar characteristics to the study population and could therefore give an accurate feedback of the actual study. The pilot school did not participate in the main study. The piloting of the instrument enabled the researcher to validate the instruments by making corrections based on the observation made. The respondents were one (1) headteacher and 10 teachers. The results of the Pilot study indicated that the questionnaires were clear and the headteachers and teachers responded to all items well and completed as expected.

3.8.1 Validity of the Instrument

Gravettes and Forzeno (2009) state that validity of measurement procedure is the degree to which the measurement process measures the variable it claims to measure.
The researcher sought expert opinion in assessing content validity of the instrument. Experts included the researchers’ supervisors who assessed the instruments and found them appropriate to represent the concept of the whole study.

3.8.2 Reliability of the Instrument

A particular measuring procedure is said to have reliability if it produces identical results when it is used repeatedly. According to Gravetter and Forzano (2009), reliability of measurement procedure is the stability or consistency of the measurement. The researcher carried out a pilot study where the questionnaires were administered to ten (10) teachers in Jacaranda Special School for learners with intellectual disability and one head teacher was interviewed using interview guide. The pilot study enabled the researcher to assess the appropriateness and clarity of questionnaire items and interview guide. The items of questionnaire were modified to improve the quality of the research instrument.

The researcher used test-retest reliability where the exact same measurement procedure was used for the same head teacher and teachers at two different times at interval of two weeks. Test-retest reliability is established by comparing the scores obtained from two successive measurements of the same individuals and calculating a correlation between the two sets of scores (Gravetters and Forzano, 2009). The researcher obtained the reliability by computing the correlation between the two sets of scores. A correlation of 0.75 was considered high enough to judge the instrument as reliable for the study. The calculated reliability was 0.85. The researcher obtained the reliability by computing the correlation between the two sets of scores.
3.9 Data Collection Techniques
The researcher visited the two counties to obtain research authorization from country commissioners. After discussing the purpose of the research with both county commissioners, permission was granted to visit special schools and units within those counties. The researcher then travelled to the designated schools and created rapport with the headteachers and teachers. The researcher agreed with the head teacher when to start. First, the researcher interviewed the head teacher in his office using the interview guide; the interview took ten (10) minutes. After interviewing the head teacher, a questionnaire was administered to teacher in their various classes when the learners had gone out for break. The researcher first called all the teachers with the permission of the head teacher and briefed them about the questionnaires. The researcher then visited every teacher in his/her own class and gave the questionnaire. While the teachers were responding to the questionnaires, the researcher using observation check list and document analysis recorded the observed items like activities involved in IEP development and implementation. The document analysis was used to confirm whether the lesson plans, IEP, schemes of work and record of work and class register were in the teaching files. Out of 9 sampled schools, the researcher received back all the interview guide sheets from the head teacher (100%) response. Teacher’s response was 100%. The whole data collection period took three months.

3.10 Data Analysis
The qualitative data from the interviews and observations were analyzed using descriptive and thematic text (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2016). Data from the field was
organized and transcribed by tying text from observations and interviews into a word processing document.

A preliminary analysis of the data was conducted by reading through it to obtain a general sense of data. The data was then coded and codes were used to develop themes in the context of the research questions. Coding is a major analysis of qualitative data. The process of coding is one of the reducing text database to descriptions and themes. Data was transformed into a simplified form that could be understood in the context of the research questions (Krathwohl, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994, Flechtling Sharp, Westat (1997). The data was grouped into themes using content analysis and thematic analysis. Content analysis involves coding the data for certain words or content. Thematic analysis is grouping the data into theses that will help answer research questions (Taylor-Powell Renner, 2003). After identifying themes the data was organized in tables.

Enumeration is the process of quantifying data which is helpful in clarifying words that the researcher used in the report such as many, some or few. The number helped to clarify what frequency meant. This way the data helped to identify systematic patterns and interrelationships across themes or content (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Flechtling et al, 1997).

The finding were reported in narrative discussions or commentary quotes and descriptive examples from interviews and observations were used to illustrate the points and bring data to life (Asmussen & Gesswell, 1995).
The quantitative data from the questionnaire with a Likert Scale was analyzed using descriptive statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics involve tabulating, graphing and describing data (Orodha, 2005; Kothari, 2004). Included in the descriptive statistics are frequencies which showed the number of teachers that responded at each level of the Likert scale, the percentage of the teachers in each item and the maximum possible score in the form of means and standard deviations.

The Researcher using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer programme, standard version 22. Calculated the mean and standard deviation which were relevant to the research study so as to compute verifiable findings. According to Kombo & Tromp (2006) data analysis is complete only when respondent’s views and opinions have been incorporated. Data from the observations were analyzed descriptively and interpreted based on the study objectives. The information from the qualitative and quantitative data was then integrated in the interpretation of the overall results (Careswell, 2009).

3.11 Logistical and Ethical Consideration

The researcher got a research authorization from the Dean, Post Graduate School and Ethics Committee (Appendix F) then collected a letter of authorization and research permit from National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) (Appendix G). After that, the researcher visited Nairobi City County, Education Department to get research authorization to use the special schools ad units for learners with intellectual disabilities (Appendix J). Finally, the researcher travelled to Kisumu County and visited the County Director of Education to get research authorization (Appendix I). After the permit letter from the County Education office
(Appendix K) which was copied to all headteachers in the sampled schools and asked for permission. The researcher then created rapport with the headteachers and explained the purpose for the visit. The head teacher then called his/her teachers and the researcher explained to them the intended research mission. Respondents were instructed not to write their names on the research instruments to ensure confidentiality.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the research findings, interpretations and discussions according to the findings of the study which was done by focusing on research objectives that the study addressed. The main purpose of the study was to evaluate the development and implementation of the individualised educational programme by teachers of learners with intellectual disabilities in selected special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties in Kenya. The systematic presentation and findings and interpretation of data are organised based on the general demographic data and the themes derived from the research objectives highlighted in chapter one. The gender distribution was 87 females and 18 males. The response rate for women was 82%.

The research objectives designed to guide the study were:

i. Establish the criteria followed by teachers in developing and implementing Individualised Education Programme (IEP) for learners with intellectual disabilities in special schools and units.

ii. Establish the involvement of multidisciplinary team in developing and implementing IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities in special schools and units

iii. Investigate the availability of resource materials for developing and implementing IEP for Learners with Intellectual disabilities in special schools and units.
iv. To explore the challenges encountered by teachers of learners with intellectual disabilities in developing and implementing IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities in schools and units.

4.2 General Information

(a) General Information

Out of the target population comprising of 993 teachers, 47 headteachers in both Kisumu and Nairobi Counties, 105 respondents were sampled of which 9 were head teachers, 18 were male teachers and 87 female teachers. This represented a 100% response rate.

It was a stratified random sample whereby the researcher did not seek to control the gender balance. Research scholars attest to this as a general trait of sit-in surveys and suggest that such surveys should be “fairly short since respondents tend to be impatient if the survey lasts for more than just a few minutes” (Haigh, 2009). Such impatience was not detected when pre-testing the questionnaire in the pilot study. Results of research could also implicate that female teachers were more committed to schools with IEP services than male teachers. It also showed that female teachers had furthered their education with special needs more than male teachers.

Table 4.2(a): Education level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teacher</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All head teachers had attained degrees which therefore implied that the respondents were literate and could, thus read and understand the strategies required in IEP implementation. Hence, the respondents would contribute constructively to the study. This finding was encouraging for teachers who had taken heads positions to have such qualifications which helped to avoid inferiority complex and added efficiency in management.

**Table 4.2(b): Teaching experience of teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience (Years)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and above</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in Table 4.2 (b) indicate that majority of teachers selected for the study had 16 years and above experience in teaching with (33.4%) and were followed by those who had between 1 – 5 years and 11 – 15 years of experiences with 23.8% respectively. Teachers of experience 6 – 10 years were the least with 19%. The results demonstrated that most teachers working with learners with intellectual disabilities had experience of over one year in the service. It is fundamental to note that such experience would add value to the learners because much of their challenges could be easily be understood and acted upon accordingly.
Table 4.2(c): Duration of head teacher experience (Years):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and above</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 4 100

Table 4.2 (c) indicates that 75% of the headteachers had an experience between 11 and 15 years while one head teacher had an experience between 1 – 5 years which was 25%. The research findings confirmed that most headteachers were experienced, and therefore, an experienced administrator would easily handle staff well and justly especially when leadership and administration are required in the schools. Moreso should there be the occurrence of eventualities; experienced teachers would be in a better position to handle them. It is an encouragement to learners who would enjoy proper supervision due to the handful experience of the administrator.

4.3 Criteria Followed by Teachers in Developing and Implementing IEP

Objective One: Sought to explore the criteria followed by teachers in developing and implementing IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities in special schools and units in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties. Teacher’s responses are given in the following tables:
4.3.1 Assessment of learners’ academic skills

Table 4.3a: Teachers responses on whether they assessed learners in academic skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic skills assessed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading skills</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling skills</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3(a) indicates that 67.6% (71) of teachers did assess learners on writing skills, 59% (62) on reading skills while 40% (47) of teachers assessed learners on spelling skills. The data showed that teachers assessed learners in all skills expected from these learners with intellectual disability. The researcher observation schedule guide did confirm the same assessments were being done to those learners with intellectual disability. Most of past researches (Reeves & Kleinert, 2006) and policies of different countries like Turkey and Taiwan emphasize that these assessments should be frequently done to those learners with intellectual disability (Ministry of Education in Taiwan, 2006).

4.3.2 Assessment of learner’s adaptive skills

Table 4.3b: Teachers responses on whether they assessed learners in adaptive skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptive skills</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour skills</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal skills</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3(b) shows that all teachers agreed that learners with intellectual disability were assessed on adaptive skills. About 90.5% (95) of teachers showed that learners were assessed on social skills while 82% (86) indicated that learners were assessed on behaviour skills, 75.2% (79) on communication skills while 66.7% (70) of teachers revealed that learners were assessed on personal skills. Ministry of Education in Taiwan (2006) supports the assessment of learners with intellectual disability to establish the extent of progression of skills. When headteachers were interviewed about their role in intellectual disability development majority of them stated that their major role in IEP development was checking what teachers had planned, appraised teacher on the achievement of goals and objectives of IEP. Headteachers have been said to be key custodians of any programme within school jurisdiction.

MacNamera and Hollinger (2003) pointed out that proper supervision and assessment is needed when IEP is being developed; especially by headteachers in schools where the actual programme would be implemented. Heward (2003) also showed that the head teacher is a vital participant in the IEP meeting because he represents the school system. Carter and Wilson (2011) add that the head teacher knows a great deal about special education service and talks about the necessary school resources and materials.

However, in Kenya situation the pre-referral, referral, eligibility and placement is done at the Education Assessment Resource Centres (Nyakundi 2015). Thorough assessment takes place in the special school where the learner is placed. The teacher then assesses the learner to find the level of academic and adaptive skills based on normal development before he starts teaching him/her. In this study, these learners
have gone through assessment, referral, eligibility which is part of the criteria for IEP developments. Therefore the special education teacher will have to do thorough assessment to get the level of their performance in academic and adaptive skills to allow him or her to develop an Individualized Education Programme that suites their unique needs and also implement the programme.

4.3.4 Involvement of professionals in developing of IEP

Table 4.3(c): Teachers responses on whether they involve the professionals when developing IEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional involved</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapists</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3(c) demonstrated that teachers had the highest number of involvement in developing IEP with 81% (85), headteachers were second with 43% (45), occupational therapist were third with 38% (40), physiotherapist had 26% (27), social workers were rated fifth with 19% (20), nurses had 9.5% (10), school psychologist had 6% (7) while lastly, EARC had 0.95% (1).

After thorough completion of the pre-referral, referral, evaluation, and eligibility steps of the IEP process, the actual development of IEP for the learner who has qualified for
special education commenced. The next step required that parents and the IEP team make decisions about appropriate education, other related services and placement. According to Algozzine, Ysseldyke and Christenson; (1983) development ideas can come from many different sources: from parents, a social service agency, public health nurses, a doctor, etc. Therefore, there is need to involve all these professionals.

The category engaged in developing IEP was quite encouraging. However, their efforts of involvement should be enhanced more especially the participation of EARC, school psychologist, nurses, social workers, physiotherapist and occupational therapist. Headteachers participation was not encouraging, and hence their participation needs to be improved. Additionally, more stakeholders need to be put in the exercise like parents of the learners with an intellectual disability and the learners themselves especially when they grow up. Fish (2011) and CASA (2013) support the involvement of professionals in developing IEP.

4.3.5 Involvement of professionals in implementation of IEP

Table 4.3(d): Teachers’ responses on whether they involve the professionals when implementing IEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementing professionals</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapists</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapist</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 (d) displays how different categories of professionals were engaged in implementing IEP. Teachers had 77% (81) the level of involvement, headteachers were second in involvement with 38% (40), physiotherapist and occupational therapists were third with 23.8% (25) each of them, social workers had 9.5% (10) level of involvement while nurses and school psychologist each had 4.8% (5) respectively. The data indicates that different professionals were involved in implementing IEP, but the level of engagement was quite discouraging because each category of professional plays a big role in contributing to the betterment of this learner with intellectual disability. In this case teachers and headteachers were well represented but other professions were not.

Once the IEP was developed, there was a need for a systematic method of implementation so as to provide the learner with the special education and related services as listed in the IEP. This includes all supplementary aids, programme accommodations that the learner receives both for instruction and for testing and the multidisciplinary services from related service providers that support the learner’s educational program. According to Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, (2007); observation for the learner to advance appropriately towards his or her IEP goals, he/she must be involved in, progress in the general curriculum and participate in other school activities.

Every individual involved in the provision of services to the learner should know and understand his or her responsibilities while carrying out the IEP. Fish (2011) and CASA (2013) insist that various categories of stakeholders need to be in place for this
programme to kick off well. The two emphasise that multidisciplinary team would do well when engaged in implementing this programme of IEP.

4.3.6 Review of the IEP by Teachers

Table 4.3 (e): Teachers’ responses on whether they review the IEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often reviewed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termly</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research findings on table 4.3 (e) revealed that most of the teachers have indicated that the IEP was reviewed termly 57% (60), about 19% (20) of teachers implied that IEP was reviewed monthly 14.3% (15) showed that IEP was revealed yearly while 9.7% (10) of teachers indicated that IEP was reviewed weekly. The data demonstrated shows that learners with intellectual disability need a periodic review of IEP to meet their unique needs as they crop up.

The evaluation results are very useful in determining how the child is currently doing in school and what areas of need the child has. This is one of the evaluation’s explicit purposes as reflected in IDEA’s definition of evaluation. For each IEP developed, accountability is required (IDEA 2004) because it measures and determines whether the learner is making progress, educators are careful to describe expectations for tasks and skills the learner needs to learn in terms that can be evaluated. The purpose of the IEP review meetings is to ensure that the learner is meeting his/her goals and making
educational progress. To assist in accountability process it is recommended that frequent assessments of the individual's performance occur, even if major IEP reviews occur once a year or only every three years. The purpose of such measurements of progress is to guide instruction and be sure those interventions scheduled are effective. It is important to know if the learner is not making the expected progress or if he/she has progressed much faster than expected.

Out of the target population comprising of 993 teachers, 47 headteachers in both Kisumu and Nairobi counties, 105 respondents were sampled of which nine were head teachers. Out of the nine teachers only four participated in this question (3 were male teachers and one female). This represented a 44% response rate. The four headteachers of special primary schools who were selected for the study indicated that IEP was reviewed termly an opinion that was supported by most of the teachers who were selected for the study.

4.4 Involvement of Multidisciplinary Team in Developing and Implementing IEP

Objective Two: Sought to establish the involvement of multidisciplinary team in developing and implementing IEP. This represented a 44% response rate. All the respondents did point out that an assessment team was formed which created multidisciplinary team.

When headteachers were interviewed on what they assess (100%) agreed that they did assess learners on academic skills and what teachers assessed. The respondents pointed out that teachers did asses the following: adaptive skills, reading skills,
writing skills, spelling skills, motor skills and social skills. Norlet and McLaughlin (2005) support this assessment by noting that these are the main components to be checked in the assessment of learners with intellectual disability. All the headteachers (100%) responded that teachers did assess learners for adaptive skills, social, behavioural and communication skills. This study finding concurred with Ministry of Education, Taiwan (2006). Nine out of nine (100%) headteachers when they were interviewed pointed out that multidisciplinary team did the assessment of the child. This was clear indicator that all headteachers were committed to the programmes. This idea was supported by CASA (2013) and Heward (2003) who point out that interdisciplinary team of professionals should be formed to work with parents and families of children with special needs.

Martin, Marshall and Sale (2004) also state that parents are key members of the IEP team. They know their children very well and can talk about their strengths and needs as well as offer ideas for enhancing their children’s education. They can offer insight into how their children learn their interests and other aspects known by only parents. These professionals would be school psychologists, counsellors, social workers, nurses and classroom teachers. According to Smith et al., (1994) the team could increase depending on the intensity of learner’s disability.

The multidisciplinary team according to the headteachers reported on how IEP was being developed. They said that learners came to their school after EARC personnel had done their assessment and children were brought to their school for placement. However, teachers still assessed the learners to establish their present functioning in academic and adaptive skills. This is supported by Fish (2011) and CASA (2013) who
stated IEP needs. Interdisciplinary team is comprised of different lines of professionals for the programme to kick off well. This is supported by Griffin (2011) who states that an interdisciplinary team should be charged with the task of providing comprehensive, appropriate educational programmes for all learners with disabilities. The team members are composed of a group of individuals who have vested interest in the learners’ educational programme. Smith et al., (1994) add that team members should be teachers, psychologists, school administrators, parents, learners, advocates, nurses, social workers, occupational/physiotherapists, speech and language therapists. According to Heward, (2003) every team member conducts assessment, plans interventions and delivers services. He further shows that the headteacher/administrator is a vital participant in the IEP meeting, this individual represents the school system. This person knows a great deal about special education services and educating learners with disabilities (Carter & Wilson, 2011). He or she can talk about the necessary school resources and materials. This individual has the authority to commit resources and materials and be able to ensure that whatever services are set out in the IEP will actually be provided.

The study sought to find out whether the Educational/Assessment and Resource Centre and Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development liaised with them in the development and implementation of IEP. The two bodies (the Educational/Assessment and Resource Centre and Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development) have been mandated by government to develop and implement programmes. Headteachers interaction with them was good because they oversaw the implementation of all programmes in schools.
4.5 Availability of Resource Materials for Developing and Implementing IEP

Objective Three: Sought to establish the availability of resource materials for developing and implementing IEP. This represented a 44% response rate. Findings are presented in Table 4.5 (a).

4.5.1 Availability of resources and materials in the school

Table 4.5 (a): Teachers responses on resources and material school have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources And materials</th>
<th>Available Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Adequate Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Inadequate Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crayons</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molding clay</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toys</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattress</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manilla papers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle tops</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. (a) demonstrates the level of resources and materials in schools according to teachers; crayons were indicated to be available in schools with 38.1% (40), 35% (37) were adequate while 24.9% (28) were inadequate in schools. The data here shows that although crayons were available in schools, the percentage was a bit low and hence something needs to be done to make them more available to learners.

Molding was available in schools according to the teachers at 43% (45), was adequate at 28.5% (30) and was inadequate at 28.5% (30). Molding has to be available in schools because the level indicated is still minimal to the learners with intellectual disability. Toys availability level was highest with 40% (42) as per teachers’ responses, followed by inadequate level with 36.2% (38) while the adequate level was
23.8% (25). These data indicates that toys need to be added to schools for learners with intellectual disability.

Mattress were rated by teachers as being inadequate with 39% (41), availability of mattress to schools was rated with 38.1% (40) while the adequate level was rated with 22.9% (24). This rating should create concern to stakeholders because mattress to these learners with intellectual disability is a necessity for resting, relaxing and comfortability due to their life styles created by deformity (disability).

Manilla paper availability according to teachers was 43% (45), followed by inadequate level with 29.4% (31) while adequate level had 27.6% (27). As much as Manilla paper was handful to some schools, but the level was quite below average and hence its availability needs to be improved in schools. Bottle tops were rated as adequate to schools with 57.1% (60) by teachers; availability was rated at 38.1% (40) while inadequate was rated with 4.8% (5). This resource material was at reach to many schools which was quite encouraging.

Beirne-Smith et al., (2006) states that policy makers must identify the most beneficial set of goals and allocate the necessary resources those IEP goals that might require resources in terms of human, money and materials should be addressed. According to Dabkowski (2006), some goals may require resources in terms of clerical support or supplies.

In a study carried out by Rehfeldt, Clark and Lee (2012) on the management of special education resources in Ibadan, the results reveal that special education
resources are not adequate in schools. Additionally, they are not evenly distributed and the few available resources are not efficiently used, while others are often diverted to regular students. Rehfeldt, Clark and Lee (2012) have also noted that special schools or centres managed by private individuals or religious bodies provide better services than those established by government.

It is important that the team identifies such resources at the time they generate goals. The individuals being supported under the IEP programme require school to provide accessible versions of instructional materials to learners’ with special needs. Students with disabilities should receive study materials in appropriate formats at the same time as their typical peers receive their textbooks. Resources and material availability for the schools selected for study have to do something so that the learners with intellectual disability can benefit by gaining adaptive skills. Most of past researches do hold some opinion on making resources and materials available to these learners.

4.5.2 Resources and materials needed

Table 4.5 (b): Head teachers’ responses on what resources and materials they need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources And materials</th>
<th>Available Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage Adequate Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage Inadequate Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crayons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molding clay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toys</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manilla papers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle tops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to table 4.5b Crayons were indicated inadequate to schools that were selected for the study. This was confirmed by the researcher during her observation that crayons were minimal in many schools.

Molding clay was rated by headteachers as adequate with 50% (2) while the other half of headteachers rated it as inadequate that 50% (2). This situation was observed by the researcher during her observation schedule. Toys were rated by headteachers as inadequate with 75% (3) while 25% (1) head teacher indicated that toys were adequate. This rating was also implicated by researcher observation and teachers rating too. Mattresses were indicated by headteachers as available with 50% (2) while the other 50% (2) rated mattresses as inadequate. Researcher observation confirmed that some schools had them while others did not.

Manilla papers were indicated by headteachers as available with 50% (2) while the other 50% (2) indicated that Manilla papers were adequate. This situation was also confirmed by teachers selected for the study and researcher observation in the field. Bottle tops according to headteachers were available to schools with 50% (2) while the other headteachers indicated the item as adequate with 50% (2). Teachers’ rating of the same item was encouraging too. The researcher observation in the field did see the item quite available to many schools she visited.

According to Sudhalter (2007) Administrative mode include planning, organizing, staffing, directing and coordinating which embodies supervising, reporting and budgeting. Staffing explains how the administrators arrange for the regular supply of personnel, staff training through workshops, seminars, teachers’ meetings and
conferences, interest study groups, exchange visits, classroom visits and demonstration lessons to meet the needs of special needs individuals in relation to IEP implementation. Staffing is the procedure through which the regular employment of the proper kind and number of staff necessary to accomplish the goals of the school or organization is achieved. Thus, the morale of the staff in the school will be raised for higher productivity.

The research findings showed that learners with intellectual disability need more resources and materials in their schools since the data collected from head teacher prove that schools have no enough materials for those learners with intellectual disability. The research findings demonstrated that schools had a teacher aides who had different roles as per responses indicated by teachers. About 43.8% (46) teachers showed that teacher aides worked with individual children; the teachers went on to say that a teacher aide was also in charge of organizing the classroom and cleaning. They rated the two roles with 38.1% (40) while 15.2% (16) indicated that a teacher aide took errands for learners. About 14.3% (15) indicated a teacher aide implemented IEP with the learners. Most studies which have been carried out previously have shown that a teacher aide is important since handling these learners with intellectual disabilities is quite involving. Thus, their presence eases the responsibilities bestowed upon different stakeholders.

4.6 Challenges Encountered by Teachers of Learners with Intellectual Disabilities in relation to IEP implementation

Objective Four: Sought to establish the challenges encountered by teachers of learners with intellectual disabilities. Findings are presented in the table 4.6:
### 4.6.1: Challenges encountered by teachers

#### Table 4.6: Teachers’ responses on the challenges encountered by teachers when developing and implementing IEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are not actively involved</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents perceive IEP meeting as traumatic and confusing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate teaching aids</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners Absenteeism interrupts IEP implementation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents are not co-operative to implement IEP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time limitation to call for meeting with multidisciplinary team</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers do not feel competent in developing and implementing IEP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School administration not supportive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of cooperation from other stakeholders</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial resources for communication</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to develop the IEP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to implement the IEP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the argument that IEP lacked adequate teaching aids, 42.9% (45) teachers strongly agreed while 33.35% (35) agreed on the same. About 9.5% (10) did disagree and strongly disagreed with the declaration while 4.75% (5) remained undecided on the same. According to Beirne Smith et al., (2006) IEP needs necessary resources and materials for its development and implementation. The data demonstrates a situation that is quite discouraging because programme effectiveness requires resources. This situation was affirmed by the researcher’s observation schedule. Thus, it requires a quick response from governments.

The other statement was that learner absenteeism interrupted IEP implementation. About 47.6% (50) of teachers agreed while 33.35% (35) strongly agreed with statement. 9.5% (10) did disagree on the same while 4.75 (5) remained undecided and strongly disagreed with statement respectively.

Moreover, on the question of whether parents were not co-operative to implement IEP. 42.9% (45) of teachers agreed with the statement while 19.1 (20) strongly agreed and disagreed with statements respectively. About 9.5% (10) did remain undecided and strongly disagreed with statements respectively. The data demonstrates a situation where parents were uncooperative which indicates that there was failure to initiate them well to IEP process. The statement that there was time limitation to call for a meeting with the multidisciplinary team was responded to differently by teachers. About 38.1% (40) agreed with this statement while 28.7% (30) strongly agreed on the same. 14.2% (15) of teachers strongly disagree while 9.5% (10) of teachers remained undecided and disagreed with statement respectively. Heward (2003) concurs that a multidisciplinary team is vital for IEP to be implemented. He is
further supported by Dart, Didimalang and Pipeline (2002). Generally, all stakeholders involved in IEP have to create time for the programme if it has to bear fruits in schools.

The statement that teachers do not feel competent in developing and implementing IEP had diversified views. 78.7% (30) teachers agreed and strongly disagreed with statements respectively. About 19.1% (20) did strongly agree and disagreed on the same respectively. Only 4.75% (5) remained undecided. The data indicates that half respondent did feel that they were not competent and the other half felt they were.

The argument that school administration was not supportive to teachers was also responded to. About 28.7% (30) agreed with the statement while 23.8% (25) strongly disagreed on the same. 19.1% (20) of teachers strongly agreed and did not agree with statement respectively. It was only 9.5% (10) who remained undecided.

Lack of co-operation from other stakeholders was another challenge teachers cited. 38.1% (40) of teachers agreed with the statement while 23.8% (25) strongly agreed and disagreed on the same respectively. About 9.5% (10) strongly disagreed with the statement while 4.75% (5) remained undecided. Fish (2011), CASA (2013) and Heward (2003) state that co-operation among stakeholders is key for IEP to be done well in schools. The statement that there was a lack of financial resources for communication was responded to. About 33.35% (35) of teachers strongly agreed and agreed with the statement while 19.1% (20) disagreed on the same. About 9.5% (10) remained undecided while 4.75% (5) strongly disagreed.
Generally, the data reveals that government involvement is essential in supporting the IEP in schools for them to bear fruits. The statement that teachers lacked time to implement the IEP was another challenge that the teachers faced. About 33.35% (35) of teachers agreed on the statement while 28.7% (30) disagreed. 19.1% (20) strongly disagreed while 14.2% (15) strongly agreed on the same. It is only 4.75 (5) who remained undecided. As revealed from the data, teachers displayed diversified views. However, researches have shown that for IEP to be well implemented all stakeholders must create time for it and teachers being key in the team should be able self-sacrifice. Additionally headteachers also need to create a good environment for teachers and other stakeholders to implement the IEPs.

Childre and Chambers (2005) describe that context and school culture have significant effects on IEP practices and importantly influence the nature and level of collaboration between teachers, parents, students and other stakeholders when developing and implementing IEPs. Ronaldi (1976) cautions that: staff development must take place first. He warns that teachers may end up with paperwork compliance rather than real exemplary implementation. Smith (1990) argues that developing, writing, and monitoring IEPs is quite time consuming, and some teachers report that the burden of the paperwork outweighs the usefulness of the document.

However, the study of Abosi (2003) show that, the individuals with special needs are not well catered for by the government. He laments that teachers’ training and general development, for those with special needs is lacking, especially in Africa. Furthermore, he emphasizes that planning, organizing and management of special education have been characterized by poor vision and commitment, inadequate
funding, selfish interest among experts and negative attitudes as a result of negative African values, tradition and culture.

Harry, Allen and McLaughlin (1995) note that parents are typically not actively involved in the IEP process. According to Stoner, Cocks, Thomson, Angel, Heyl and Crouley (2005), parental perceptions on IEP meeting is traumatic, confusing and complicated. Lee-Tarver (2006) point out that IEP is perceived as necessary tool for planning, preparing and implementing educational goals and curriculum. A study by Salas (2004) shows that, parents of children with special needs input is frequently not respected during IEP meetings.

The review of the literature shows that parents and student participation in the IEP process continues to be problematic. Studies that have been conducted before 2000 which show that parents are not keen in IEP meetings and often viewed themselves as being exploited because they saw that the responsibility of IEP rests with the teachers (Valenzuela & Martin, 2005). However, Branding et al., (2009) still reports that most parents believe their children’s IEP goals are appropriate, are satisfied with their amount of involvement in IEP decision making and view the services and support in the IEP as being very individualized for their children.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Introduction
This study analyzed the development and implementation of individualized educational programme by teachers of learners with intellectual disabilities in Kisumu and Nairobi counties. Conclusions, recommendations and areas for further study are provided in addition to the key findings of the study.

5.2 Summary of the Findings
The findings of the study are summarized based on professional qualification and research questions that guided the study. The study interrogated the development and implementation of individualized education programme by teachers of learners with intellectual disabilities in Kisumu and Nairobi Counties.

The research findings revealed that most teachers had degrees at 61.9% while those who had diplomas were 27.6%. About 19% had masters while 0.95% had P1 certificate. The findings further showed that the respondents were literate and could therefore read and understand the strategies required for IEP implementation.

5.2.1 Professional Qualification
The research findings revealed that most teachers who had degrees was at 61.9% while those who had diploma were 27.6%. About 19% has Masters while 0.95% had P1 certificate. The findings further showed that the respondents were literate and could therefore read and understand the strategies required for IEP implementation.
5.2.2 Criteria Followed by Teachers in Developing and Implementing IEP

Research question 1: What criteria is followed by teachers in developing and implementing IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities?

The study findings in table 4.3 (a) and 4.3 (b) revealed that all teachers agreed that they assessed the following skills: adaptive skills, academic skills, motor skills and social skills.

5.2.3 Involvement of Multidisciplinary Team

Research question 2: What is the involvement of the multidisciplinary team in developing and implementing IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities in special schools and units?

The data analysis revealed that different professionals were involved, but the level of engagement was quite discouraging teachers and headteachers were well represented than other professionals.

5.2.4 Availability of Resource Materials

Research question 3: What materials were available for IEP development and implementation for learners with intellectual disabilities in special schools and units?

The data analysis revealed that the level of resource materials in schools according to teachers were relatively low. The resource materials include crayons, toys, moulding clay, Manilla paper, bottle tops and mattresses. The head teacher’s views were sought on resources and materials for the schools. The data revealed that there were no crayons in their schools.
5.2.5 Challenges Encountered by Teachers of Learners with Intellectual Disabilities

Research question 4: What are the challenges facing teachers of learners with intellectual disabilities when developing and implementing IEP?

The data analysis revealed that the challenges encountered by teachers in developing and implementing IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities included the following:

Lack of adequate teaching aids, absenteeism of learners, lack of cooperation from parents, limited time for meetings of multidisciplinary team, lack of teachers confidence in developing and implementing IEP, lack of administrative support, lack of financial resources for communication and lack of adequate time to implement the IEP. Headteachers also need to create a good environment for teachers and other stakeholders to develop and implement IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities.

5.3 Conclusions

On the basis of the findings of this study, the researcher concluded that special education teachers’ competencies in developing and implementing IEP was not satisfactory. In line with their training, the special education teachers are expected to assess the individual child’s needs and develop the IEP for that particular child. Evidently, a child with intellectual disabilities when not given individual instruction to meet his/her unique needs will perform poorly in both academic and adaptive skills area.

Although IEP is carried out in schools, it encounters many challenges. These challenges include: lack of good-will from parents and sometimes from teachers, as
well as lack of support from headteachers and other stakeholders. IEP also lacks resources and materials, sufficient funds and time for its implementation. The government too has failed in terms of policy, monitoring and implementation through the Ministry of Education.

Teachers were key players for IEP to be developed and implemented in schools. Maximum encouragement, motivation, good environment and support should be given to them in order to have good will to develop and implement IEP well in schools. Government should remain faithful to her policies so as to avoid lip services to stakeholders for IEP.

5.4 Recommendations

5.4.1: Recommendations to headteachers/teachers on development and implementation of Individualized Education Programme

On the basis of findings from this study, head teachers need to make sure they have enough resource materials available for IEP development and implementation. Head teachers also need to support teachers and provide financial resources for communication, they need to create a good environment for teachers and stakeholders to develop and implement IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities.

5.4.2: Recommendation on the criteria followed

Teachers should assess learners in academic and adaptive skills frequently as part of evaluation to find out the strength and weaknesses of learners.

5.4.3: Recommendation on involvement of multidisciplinary team

The educational/assessment and resource centre personnel and parents need to be involved in development and implementation of IEP
5.4.4: Recommendation on availability of resource materials

Head teachers also need to support teachers and provide financial resources for communication, they need to create a good environment for teachers and stakeholders to develop and implement IEP for learners with intellectual disabilities. Ministry of education to increase funding for IEP development and implementation.

5.4.5: Recommendation on challenges in development and implementation of IEP

Teachers need to have adequate teaching aids. They need to be confident in IEP development and implementation. The cooperation from parents is required and is necessary for proper development and implementation of IEP. More time is needed by teachers in developing and implementing IEP with learners with intellectual disabilities.

5.4.6: Policy Recommendations

- Government policies need to be reviewed periodically in order to establish appropriate IEP goals and objectives tailored to the needs of learners with intellectual disability. In this way, IEP will be focused on the real needs of its beneficiaries.

- Ministry of Education needs to put in place a policy of Individualized Education Programme (IEP) development and implementation with all learners with special needs.

- Ministry of Education needs to put more effort in ensuring all stakeholders are well engaged in developing and implementing this programme.

- Ministry of Education has to put a policy on Quality Assurance Personnel to assess teachers who work with learners with intellectual disabilities regularly.
to enhance the proper development and implementation of IEP in special schools and units all over Kenya.

5.5 Further Research

- To investigate the appropriate professional level for teachers to work with learners with intellectual disabilities and develop and implement IEP.
- To find out the development and implementation of IEP by teachers of learners with intellectual disabilities in other counties in Kenya.
- To establish the role of quality assurance personnel in the supervision of development and implementation of IEP in special schools and units for learners with special needs.
- More research needs to be done to determine attitudes of teachers and parents towards IEP development and implementation.
- Finally there is concern for further research to find out the role of Ministry of Education in policy decision in IEP development and implementation by teachers of learners with intellectual disability.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

This questionnaire is intended to gather information that will be useful in evaluating the development and implementation of IEP by teachers in special schools and units. Please give your answers as honestly as possible. This information will be treated confidentially.

Instruction: Put (✓) in the appropriate box where applicable

A. General Information
1. Name of School: ____________________________
2. County: ____________________________
3. Gender: A. Male  B. Female
4. Professional Qualification
   A. P1  B. S1  C. Diploma
   D. Approved Teacher  E. University Graduate
   F. Masters
   G. Any other, please specify _________________________________

5. Years of teaching experience with learners who are intellectually disabled
   1-4 years  5-10 years
   11-15 years  16-20 years
   21-25 years  above 26 years

B. Criteria for IEP developmental and implementation:
   (i) Do you assess learners in academic skills?
      Yes  No
      If yes exactly what do you assess?
      a) Adaptive Skills  (b) Writing skills
      c) Reading skills  (d) Spelling skills
      e) Motor skills  (f) Social studies
      g) Any other specify______________________________
(ii) Do you assess learners on adaptive skills?
Yes □ No □
If yes, what do you assess?
Social skills □ Personal skills □
Behaviour □ Communication Skills □
Any other, please specify______________________________

C. (i) Do you involve the professionals when developing IEP?
Yes □ No □
If yes who are they?
Teachers □ Nurses □
Social workers □ School psychologists □
Physiotherapist □ Occupational therapists □
Head teacher □
Others please specify______________________________

(ii) Do you involve the professionals when implementing IEP
Yes □ No □
If yes, specify
Teachers □ Nurses □
Social workers □ School psychologists □
Physiotherapist □ Occupational therapists □
Head teacher □

(iii) Do you review the IEP?
Yes □ No □
If yes, how often?
Weekly □ Twice a week □ Monthly □
Termly □ Yearly □
Other times specify______________________________
D. **Resources and Materials in developing and implementing IEP.**

What resources and materials do you have in the school or unit? Tick in the appropriate spaces provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources and materials</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crayons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molding clay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manilla papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle tops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the school or unit have a teacher aide

Yes ☐ ☐ No ☐ ☐

If yes, what is his/her role in the class?

- Works with individual children ☐ ☐
- Goes on errands ☐ ☐
- Cleans the class ☐ ☐
- Organizes the classroom ☐ ☐
- Implements IEP with the learners ☐ ☐
- Feeds the learners ☐ ☐

Any other activity please specify____________________________________

E. **Challenges Teachers Face in IEP Development and Implementation with Learners who are Intellectually Disabled**

*Instructions:* In this section you are given a series of statements with five possible answers: Strongly Disagree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (V), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD). Tick (✔️) any of these which closely approximate your opinion regarding each statement on challenges
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Likert Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Parents are not actively involved in IEP process</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Parents perceive IEP meeting as traumatic and confusing</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Parents perceive IEP meeting as a waste of time</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Lack of adequate teaching aides</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Learner absenteeism interrupts IEP implementation</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Parents are not cooperative to IEP implementation</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Time limitation to call for meeting with multidisciplinary team</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Teachers do not feel competent in developing and implementing IEP</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) School administration is not supportive</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Lack of cooperation from other stakeholders</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Lack of financial resources for communication</td>
<td>SA A U D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR HEAD TEACHERS

This interview guide is intended to gather information that will be useful in evaluating the development and implementation of IEP by teachers in special schools and on it. Please give your answers as honestly as possible. This information will be treated confidentially.

Instruction: Put (√) in the appropriate box where applicable

### Section A: General Information

1. **Name of School:** ________________________________
   **County:** ________________________________

2. **Gender:**
   - A. Male  
   - B. Female  

3. **Professional Qualification**
   - A. P1  
   - B. S1  
   - C. Diploma  
   - D. Approved Teacher  
   - E. University Graduate  
   - F. Masters  
   - G. Any other, please specify ________________________________

4. **For how long have you been a head teacher?**
   - 1-4 years  
   - 5-10 years  
   - 11-15 years  
   - 16-20 year  
   - 21-25 years  
   - above 26 years  

### Section B: IEP development and implementation

5. **What is your role in IEP development?**
6. **What is your role in IEP implementation?**
7. **What learners academic skills do you oversee?**
8. **What do you assess?**
9. **Do you assess learners on adaptive skills?**
10. **Do you involve other professionals when developing IEP?**
11. **What other professionals are involved in implementing IEP?**
12. **How often do you review IEP?**
13. **How do you coordinate the process of involvement of multidisciplinary team in IEP development?**
14. Do quality assurance personnel check the IEP development and implementation?

15. Which of the following government department liaise with you in IEP development and implementation?

Section C: Human Resources and Materials

1. How many learners with intellectual disability are in your school/unit?

2. How many teachers deal with children with intellectual disabilities in your school?

3. What are the related services learners in your school require?

4. What kind of professionals you have in your school to work with learners with intellectual disabilities?

5. What resources and materials do you have in the school or unit?
# Appendix III

## Lesson Observation Checklist/Document Analysis

### Observation Checklist

This questionnaire is intended to gather information that will be useful in evaluating the development and implementation of IEP by teachers in special schools and units. Tick (✓) where appropriate in the response column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Background information of the child indicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The IEP is incorporated in schemes of work and lesson plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) IEP shows strength and weakness of the learners in academic and adaptive skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Annual goals and objectives stated in IEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Related special services indicated for the learners’ needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Signatories of multidisciplinary team available in IEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Duration of IEP indicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Review date FOR IEP indicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Document Analysis

Schemes of work_____________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

Lesson plan_____________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

IEP files_____________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

Record of work_________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

Class register__________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________
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