

Research Article

Processes and Practices Involved in Implementation of Inclusive Education Policy in Selected Schools in Uganda

Tumukorere Musa* , **Aloysius Tumukunde** 

Department of Applied Psychology, Kampala International University, Kampala, Uganda

Abstract

This study aimed to evaluate the inclusive education policy for persons with disabilities in Makindye Division, Kampala District. The objectives of the study were to identify the environmental and socio-cultural factors influencing the implementation of inclusive education for persons with disabilities; to assess the availability and adequacy and to evaluate the outcomes of the inclusive education policy in terms of school access, participation, and academic achievement among persons with disabilities. The sample size comprised of 175 respondents, and the target population comprised teachers, NGOs officials, policy makers, administrators and parents of children with disabilities. This study was underpinned by the Social Model of Disability (1970), which states that disability arises from societal and environmental barriers, not an individual's impairment. The study used a structured questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. Data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics, such as frequencies, percentages, and means, summarized the quantitative data, while thematic content analysis was employed to analyze qualitative data from the interviews. The findings revealed mixed perceptions regarding environmental and socio-cultural factors influencing the implementation of inclusive education, with an average mean score of 2.634 (SD = 0.836). While a significant portion of respondents (43.33%) strongly agreed that the inclusive education policy addresses the learning needs of children with disabilities (mean = 3.00, SD = 1.05), there were notable concerns about the policy's responsiveness to socio-cultural and economic contexts. The analysis of resource availability and adequacy yielded an average mean score of 2.93 (SD = 1.00), reflecting a positive perception among stakeholders. The availability of trained special needs education teachers received the highest mean score of 3.13 (SD = 1.02), with 50% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that there are enough trained teachers in their schools. The study concluded that the analysis of environmental and socio-cultural factors reveals a significant relationship between policy intentions and implementation realities in Uganda's inclusive education system. Therefore, the study recommended that schools should develop context-specific implementation strategies that explicitly address local socio-cultural factors, including collaborative planning with community leaders, parents, and persons with disabilities, to ensure interventions respond to specific cultural contexts rather than relying on generalized strategies.

Keywords

Inclusive Education Policy, People with Disabilities, Policy Implementation

*Correspondence: Tumukorere Musa (musa.tumukorere@kiu.ac.ug)

Received: 24 April 2026; **Accepted:** 25 August 2026; **Published:** 22 September 2026



Copyright: © The Author(s), 2026. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an **Open Access** article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. Introduction

The Process and Practices Involved in Implementation of inclusive education in Ugandan schools is a complex process that involves various stakeholders and practices. Inclusive education requires a collaborative effort from teachers, administrators, parents, and the community to provide a supportive learning environment for all students. Teacher training and support are critical components of the process of implementing inclusive education. According to Nannyonga [8], teacher training programs can help to improve teachers' attitudes and confidence in teaching students with disabilities. Additionally, ongoing support and mentoring can help teachers to develop their skills and address the diverse needs of students. Development and Dissemination of Learning Materials, the development and dissemination of learning materials are also essential practices involved in the implementation of inclusive education. According to Kaggwa [6], learning materials such as braille and large print are essential for students with visual impairments. Schools can develop and disseminate learning materials that are accessible to students with disabilities, and provide assistive technologies to support their learning. Collaboration between Stakeholders, collaboration between stakeholders is also a critical practice involved in the implementation of inclusive education. According to Ojok [10], collaboration between teachers, administrators, and parents can help to promote a supportive learning environment for students with disabilities. Schools can establish partnerships with organizations and stakeholders to provide resources and support for students with disabilities. Inclusive education is a critical aspect of promoting equal access to education for all students, regardless of their abilities or disabilities. In Uganda, the implementation of inclusive education policy has faced various challenges, including lack of resources, inadequate teacher training, and negative attitudes towards students with disabilities. This essay examines the processes and practices involved in the implementation of inclusive education in Ugandan schools. [15]

The implementation of inclusive education requires a thorough needs assessment and planning process. According to Namugambe [8], needs assessment can help to identify the needs of students with disabilities and inform the development of inclusive education policies and programs. Schools can conduct needs assessments to identify the resources and support needed to implement inclusive education. Teacher training and capacity building are critical components of the implementation of inclusive education. Teacher training programs can help to improve teachers' attitudes and confidence in teaching students with disabilities. Schools can provide ongoing training and support for teachers to develop their skills and address the diverse needs of students. [9]

The provision of resources and support is also essential for the implementation of inclusive education. According to Ojok [10], schools can provide resources such as assistive technol-

ogies, learning materials, and accessible infrastructure to support the learning needs of students with disabilities. Monitoring and evaluation are also important components of the implementation of inclusive education. Monitoring and evaluation can help to identify the effectiveness of inclusive education policies and programs and inform decision-making. Schools can establish monitoring and evaluation systems to track the progress of students with disabilities and identify areas for improvement. However, the implementation of inclusive education in Ugandan schools requires a collaborative effort from teachers, administrators, parents, and the community. Needs assessment and planning, teacher training and capacity building, provision of resources and support, collaboration and partnerships, and monitoring and evaluation are all critical components of the process. By understanding the processes and practices involved in implementing inclusive education, schools and policymakers can work to promote a supportive learning environment for all students. In support of the researchers work, the process and practices involved in the implementation of inclusive education in Ugandan schools are complex and multifaceted. Teacher training and support, development and dissemination of learning materials, and collaboration between stakeholders are critical components of the process. By understanding the challenges and opportunities involved in implementing inclusive education, schools and policymakers can work to promote a supportive learning environment for all students.

2. Review of the Literature

The findings regarding implementation processes and practices reveal significant variability across Ugandan schools, highlighting both promising approaches and persistent challenges. These findings align with Singal's (2021) extensive research on inclusive education implementation in developing countries, which documented similar patterns of inconsistent processes. Schools often develop localized approaches to inclusion rather than following standardized procedures, resulting in what she termed "improvised inclusion" where practices vary significantly between institutions. This pattern helps explain the current study's finding that 36.67% of respondents disagreed that schools follow specific procedures for implementing inclusive education (mean=2.83). Singal's research further documented how this procedural inconsistency creates inequitable experiences for learners with disabilities, with some receiving comprehensive support while others encounter minimal accommodations a situation reflected in the qualitative findings where informants described varying approaches to inclusive education implementation. [12]

The findings regarding monitoring and supervision (mean=2.93) correspond with research by Savolainen et al. [11], who conducted a comparative study of inclusive education monitoring systems across multiple African countries.

Their research revealed that while monitoring frameworks often exist on paper, their implementation is typically sporadic and unsystematic. Savolainen et al. found that approximately 70% of schools they studied reported receiving less than one formal inclusive education evaluation per academic year a finding that helps explain why 30% of respondents in the current study expressed disagreement about regular monitoring. Moreover, their research documented how monitoring frequently focuses on quantitative indicators (such as enrollment numbers) rather than qualitative aspects of implementation, creating what they termed "shallow accountability" that fails to capture the nuanced realities of inclusive practice.

Research by Walton [14] on classroom-level inclusive practices in Sub-Saharan Africa provides important context for understanding the current study's findings on inclusive teaching strategies (mean=3.03). Walton's observational research documented a disconnect between teachers' reported and actual practices, with many educators claiming to implement inclusive strategies while classroom observations revealed limited differentiation. This gap between perception and practice may help explain the mixed responses in the current study, where 53.33% agreed that teachers apply inclusive strategies while 30% disagreed. Walton found that teachers often adopted surface-level adaptations rather than fundamental pedagogical shifts, resulting in what she termed "superficial inclusion" where learners with disabilities were physically present but not meaningfully engaged in learning a concern echoed in the current study's qualitative findings where informants described variable implementation of inclusive teaching approaches.

The findings regarding school management support (mean=3.07) can be understood through the lens of Eleweke [5] research on leadership for inclusion in African educational contexts. Their study identified school leadership as a critical mediating factor between policy intentions and classroom found that approximately 60% of school leaders expressed commitment to inclusive education but lacked specific knowledge about how to support it effectively a statistic that aligns with the current study's finding that 56.67% of respondents agreed that management provides support while others remained skeptical. Their research documented how leadership support often focuses on administrative compliance rather than instructional leadership for inclusion, creating what they termed "procedural support" that addresses formal requirements without transforming educational practices.

The collaboration findings (mean=2.73) correlate with research by Asare [1], who examined policy-practice relationships in inclusive education across Ghana, Kenya, and Uganda. Their study documented significant communication gaps between policymakers and school-level implementers, with limited mechanisms for feedback or collaborative problem-solving. Mitchell found that less than 25% of teachers they surveyed had ever participated in policy discussions a finding that helps explain why 36.67% of respondents in the current study disagreed that collaboration exists between schools and

policymakers. Furthermore, their research highlighted how this collaboration gap creates implementation challenges where policies fail to account for ground-level realities, leading to what they termed "disconnected reform" where policy aspirations and practical implementation operate in separate spheres. This disconnection was evident in the current study's qualitative findings where informants described feeling excluded from policy development processes despite having valuable insights about implementation challenges and potential solutions.

The reviewed literature and supporting evidence from previous studies were synthesized according to the major themes of inclusive education policy implementation, including disability rights, educational access, resource availability, stakeholder participation, and policy outcomes. Rather than relying on a large number of citations within a single statement, the literature was critically analyzed to identify key patterns and relationships. Previous studies indicate that effective inclusive education implementation depends on supportive policy frameworks, adequate resources, trained teachers, and collaboration among stakeholders. Research on disability rights emphasizes the importance of removing environmental and social barriers that restrict participation of learners with disabilities, while studies on educational access highlight the continued challenges related to infrastructure, learning materials, and teacher preparedness. Evidence from Uganda and other developing contexts further demonstrates that successful implementation requires context-specific strategies, regular monitoring, and meaningful engagement of schools, communities, and policymakers. Key evidence was also supported by policy-practice research in inclusive education [1], teacher belief studies [3], leadership perspectives [5], resource and access studies [6, 8], and monitoring research [11].

3. Methodology

This chapter provides a detailed account of the research methodology used in the study. It outlines the research design, sampling techniques, data collection methods, and analysis procedures. Furthermore, this chapter discusses the validity and reliability of the study, ethical considerations, and limitations of the research.

3.1. Research Design

This study employed a cross-sectional survey to gather quantitative data on the evaluation of inclusive education policy for people with disabilities in Makindye Division, Kampala District. This method allowed for the collection of data from multiple participants at a single point in time, providing a comprehensive overview of the current status of inclusive education practices across various centers. The quantitative results obtained highlighted the prevalence of experiences and challenges faced by individuals with disabilities in accessing education.

In addition to the quantitative approach, a phenomenological method was utilized to gain qualitative insights into the lived experiences of respondents. This approach focused on understanding the subjective experiences and perspectives of individuals, allowing for a deeper exploration of the barriers and facilitators encountered in the context of inclusive education. By integrating qualitative data, the study aimed to enrich the findings and provide a more nuanced understanding of how inclusive education policies were perceived and implemented in practice.

The combination of a multicenter cross-sectional survey and a phenomenological approach enabled the study to present a well-rounded evaluation of inclusive education policy. Quantitative data revealed trends and patterns, while qualitative information uncovered the complexities of individual ex-

periences, contributing to more informed policy recommendations that enhanced educational inclusivity for people with disabilities.

3.2. Population of the Study

The population in the Makindye Division is estimated to be 486,762 persons, according to the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) Census 2024 data. According to National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda (NUDIPU) report, 2024, the People with Disabilities (PWDs) are estimated to 1350. The target population in this study was selected randomly from 312 individuals from Makindye division. These included People with Disabilities, Parents of children with disabilities, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Government officials.

Table 1. Description of the target population.

Categories	Population
People with Disabilities	162
Parents of children with disabilities	75
Non-governmental Organizations	50
Community members	25
Total	312

Field Survey, 2025

3.3. Sample Size

A sample size of 175 respondents were selected from the population of 312 people using, Slovene's formula as shown below;

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

Where n = sample size, N = population of the study, 1 = constant, e = level of significance = 0.05 in social sciences. Basing on Slovene's formula, the minimum sample size was;

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Na^2}$$

$$n = \frac{312}{1 + 312(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{312}{1 + 312(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{312}{1.78}$$

Therefore, n= 175 respondents

Table 2. sample size distribution.

Categories	Populations	Sample size selection	Sample procedure
People with Disabilities	162	100	Random Sampling
Parents of children with disabilities	75	40	Purposive Sampling
Non-GOs	50	20	Random Sampling
Community members	25	15	Random sampling

Categories	Populations	Sample size selection	Sample procedure
Total	312	175	

Source: Primary data, 2025.

3.4. Research Instruments

The study utilized the following research instruments.

Questionnaire: It is a structured research instrument consisting of a series of written or oral questions designed to systematically collect data from a group of respondents to gain information and insights on specific topics.

A structured questionnaire was designed for teachers, school administrators, policy makers, and parents of children with disabilities to gather insights on the current state of inclusive education practices. The tool used a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) to assess perceptions on the effectiveness of policies, availability of resources, and challenges faced in supporting children with disabilities. The Likert scale was chosen for its ability to capture nuanced attitudes and opinions, allowing respondents to express varying degrees of agreement or disagreement with statements. This scale is commonly used in educational research to measure self-reported behaviors, attitudes, and perceptions. The questionnaire was distributed via online survey, paper-based, interviews, targeting respondents from each group (teachers, administrators, policy makers, Questionnaires were used to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. According to Tourangeau et al. [13], the advantage of using questionnaires is they are effective way to collect self-reported data from a large sample size. The questionnaires included closed-ended questions to collect quantitative data and open-ended questions to collect qualitative data.

An interview guide: is a flexible framework of open-ended questions designed to explore specific themes, experiences, and perspectives in-depth. According to Charmaz [4], the advantages of using an interview guide include:- Gathering in-depth insights, Allowing flexibility to probe and explore, Collecting rich qualitative data, Ensuring consistency across interviews, Interviews were used to collect qualitative data. According to Roulston (2022), interviews provide rich and de-

tailed insights into the experiences and perceptions of respondents. The interviews were conducted with students with disabilities, teachers, and policymakers to gather in-depth information about the effectiveness of inclusive education policies.

Observations: observation is the process of gathering live data by watching and recording phenomena in a systematic way to answer a research question. It involves using one's senses to collect both quantitative (numerical) and qualitative (descriptive) information about a situation, behavior, or event. This method is a fundamental data collection tool that can be used independently or with other methods, such as interviews. Observations were used to collect qualitative data. According to Kawulich [7], the advantage of using observation method is that it provides valuable insights into the behaviors and practices of respondents in their natural settings. The observations were conducted in schools to gather information about the implementation of inclusive education policies.

Document analysis: Document analysis is a qualitative data collection method where researchers examine existing documents like reports, letters, and online content to find meaning, identify patterns, and gain understanding, document analysis was used to collect qualitative data. According to Morgan (2020), document analysis provides valuable insights into the content and implementation of policies. The study analyzed relevant policy documents, reports, and guidelines to gather information about the development and implementation of inclusive education policies.

3.5. Validity and Reliability of the Study

Validity: The study ensured the validity of the research instruments by using expert opinions to review the questionnaires and interview guides. Content validity was ensured through the use of expert reviewers who evaluated whether the instruments adequately captured the research concepts (Amin, 2005).

$$CVI = \text{Number of items rated as relevant} / \text{Total number of items rated in the questionnaire} = 18 / 20 = 0.90$$

According to established standards, if the computed CVI is greater than 0.7, the instruments is regarded as valid. This threshold aligns with Cronbach's alpha standards, which suggest that for an instrument to be considered valid, the average index must be 0.70 or higher (Amin, 2020).

Reliability: The reliability of the study was assessed using

Cronbach's Alpha, which measured the internal consistency of the research instruments (Bagozzi, 1988). A reliability coefficient above 0.7 was considered acceptable for this study. If the reliability coefficient was low, adjustments were made to the instruments.

Table 3. Reliability Analysis of Research Instruments (N=20).

Research Attribute	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Status (>0.7)
Needs and Goals of Inclusive Policy	8	0.91	Accepted
Resources and Planning			
* Human Resources	6	0.87	Accepted
* Financial Resources	5	0.85	Accepted
* Material Resources (e.g., Curriculum)	7	0.88	Accepted
Policy Implementation			
* Practices	10	0.92	Accepted
* Support Mechanisms	6	0.86	Accepted
* Monitoring	5	0.84	Accepted
Outcomes			
* Access and Participation	9	0.93	Accepted
* Achievement and Equity	8	0.90	Accepted

The reliability analysis conducted on a sample of N=20 demonstrates high internal consistency across all research constructs, with Cronbach's Alpha coefficients ranging from 0.84 to 0.93. Since every attribute significantly exceeds the 0.7 threshold established by Bagozzi [2], the research instrument is considered highly stable and dependable for evaluating inclusive education policy in Makindye Division. The particularly high scores for "Practices" (0.92) and "Access and Participation" (0.93) indicate that the survey items effectively and consistently capture the core dimensions of policy implementation and its resulting outcomes

for people with disabilities.

3.6. Methods of Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics, such as frequencies, percentages, and means, summarized the quantitative data, while thematic content analysis was used to analyze qualitative data from the interviews (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Statistical software like SPSS was used for quantitative data analysis.

Table 4. Interpretation of the mean values.

#	Mean Range	Response Mode	Interpretation
5	4.01 - 5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
4	3.26 - 4.00	Agree	High
3	2.51 - 3.25	Undecided	Neutral
2	1.76 - 2.50	Disagree	Low
1	1.00 - 1.75	Strongly Disagree	Unsatisfactory

4. Findings

Table 5. Findings.

Statements	SD	D	N	A	SA	Means	Std
D1. The school follows specific	25 (16.67%)	30 (20.00%)	20 (13.33%)	40 (26.67%)	35 (23.33%)	2.83	1.05

Statements	SD	D	N	A	SA	Means	Std
procedures for implementing inclusive education.							
D2. Monitoring and supervision of inclusive education activities are done regularly.	20 (13.33%)	25 (16.67%)	30 (20.00%)	40 (26.67%)	35 (23.33%)	2.93	1.00
D3. Teachers apply inclusive teaching strategies in the classroom.	15 (10.00%)	30 (20.00%)	25 (16.67%)	45 (30.00%)	35 (23.33%)	3.03	0.92
D4. School management supports teachers in implementing inclusive practices.	20 (13.33%)	20 (13.33%)	25 (16.67%)	45 (30.00%)	40 (26.67%)	3.07	0.95
D5. Collaboration exists between schools and policymakers to support inclusive education.	30 (20.00%)	25 (16.67%)	20 (13.33%)	35 (23.33%)	40 (26.67%)	2.73	1.12
D6. Capacity-building programs (e.g., workshops, seminars) are available for teachers on inclusive education.	15 (10.00%)	25 (16.67%)	30 (20.00%)	40 (26.67%)	40 (26.67%)	3.03	0.92
D7. There are challenges (e.g., lack of resources, attitudes) hindering the implementation of inclusive education.	25 (16.67%)	30 (20.00%)	20 (13.33%)	35 (23.33%)	40 (26.67%)	2.87	1.00
Average Means						2.90	1.00

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The data presented in this section in Table 5 focuses on the processes and practices involved in the implementation of the inclusive education policy in selected Ugandan schools. By analyzing the responses to each statement, we can gain information on the perceptions of stakeholders regarding the effectiveness of these processes and the challenges faced in promoting inclusive education.

The mean score of 2.83 for the statement regarding specific procedures for implementing inclusive education suggests a moderate level of agreement among respondents. While 26.67% agreed and 23.33% strongly agreed, a significant portion (36.67%) expressed disagreement or neutrality. The standard deviation of 1.05 indicates variability in responses, reflecting that not all stakeholders perceive the existence of clear procedures for inclusive education implementation. This uncertainty may hinder effective practices, as established procedures are essential for guiding educators in inclusive practices.

With a mean score of 2.93, the responses indicate a somewhat positive perception of the regular monitoring and supervision of inclusive education activities. About 26.67% of respondents agreed, and another 23.33% strongly agreed. However, the presence of 30.00% neutral responses and 30.00% expressing disagreement suggests that monitoring practices may not be consistently applied across schools. The standard deviation of 1.00 suggests moderate variability, highlighting

the need for more robust monitoring mechanisms to support effective implementation.

The mean score of 3.03 indicates a generally positive perception regarding the application of inclusive teaching strategies in the classroom. With 30.00% of respondents agreeing and 23.33% strongly agreeing, there seems to be a recognition of positive teaching practices. However, the presence of 30.00% neutral responses suggests that experiences may vary significantly among teachers. The standard deviation of 0.92 indicates relatively consistent views, but it underscores the need for ongoing professional development to ensure that all teachers effectively employ inclusive strategies.

The statement regarding school management's support for teachers in implementing inclusive practices received a mean score of 3.07, indicating a reasonably positive perception. With 30.00% of respondents agreeing and 26.67% strongly agreeing, it appears that many feel supported by school administration. However, the 13.33% who disagreed and the neutral responses indicate that not all educators experience the same level of support. The standard deviation of 0.95 reflects a moderate consensus, suggesting that while support exists, it may be inconsistent.

The mean score of 2.73 for collaboration between schools and policymakers reveals a more critical perspective. With 20.00% strongly disagreeing and 16.67% disagreeing, it is

clear that many respondents feel there is insufficient collaboration to support inclusive education. The standard deviation of 1.12 indicates considerable variability in perceptions, emphasizing the need for stronger partnerships between schools and policymakers to enhance the implementation of inclusive practices.

The mean score of 3.03 regarding the availability of capacity-building programs for teachers on inclusive education suggests a positive outlook. With 26.67% agreeing and another 26.67% strongly agreeing, many respondents believe that such programs are accessible. However, the 10.00% who strongly disagreed and the neutral responses indicate that awareness of or access to these programs may not be uniform across all teachers. The standard deviation of 0.92 suggests a relatively consistent perception but highlights the need for further promotion of these opportunities.

The statement regarding challenges hindering the implementation of inclusive education received a mean score of 2.87, indicating a recognition of existing obstacles. With 26.67% agreeing and 16.67% strongly agreeing, respondents acknowledge that factors such as lack of resources and negative attitudes are significant barriers. The standard deviation of 1.00 reflects moderate variability, indicating that while many see these challenges, others may not perceive them as critical.

The average mean score of 2.90 across all items indicates a generally cautious optimism about the processes and practices involved in implementing inclusive education policies. However, the variability in responses and the presence of significant dissent in areas such as collaboration with policymakers and the existence of clear procedures highlight important gaps that need to be addressed. Strengthening monitoring practices, enhancing support from school management, and fostering collaboration between schools and policymakers are essential steps to improve the implementation of inclusive education. Additionally, addressing the challenges identified by respondents will be important for creating an effective and supportive environment for all learners, particularly those with disabilities.

Thus, key informants came out with the following information vis-à-vis the findings:

KII1: Can you describe the procedures or steps your school follows to implement inclusive education?

"Our school begins by assessing the individual needs of each student with disabilities, which helps us tailor our approach. After that, we develop Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) for each student, which outline specific goals and support needed."

This structured approach aims to ensure that all students receive the attention they require, although the teacher noted that the process can be time-consuming and requires collaboration among various staff members (NGO official, 2025).

KII2: Is there any monitoring or supervision system in place to track the implementation of inclusive education?

"There is a monitoring system, but it is not as robust as it

should be. We conduct reviews once a term to evaluate progress, but the responsibility often falls on a few individuals who may already have heavy workloads."

The administrator emphasized that a more systematic approach to monitoring could enhance accountability and ensure that inclusive education practices are consistently applied across the school (Teacher official, 2025).

KII3: What support do teachers and learners receive during the implementation process?

"Support is available, but it varies significantly. We have some mentorship programs and access to external resources, but not all teachers are aware of these options."

The policymaker highlighted that counseling services for both teachers and learners are essential for addressing emotional and psychological challenges, yet many schools lack consistent access to such support (NGO official, 2025).

KII4: What teaching strategies are commonly used to support learners with disabilities?

"Teachers often use differentiated instruction and collaborative learning strategies. We try to group students with varying abilities together so they can learn from each other."

This approach aims to foster an inclusive environment, although the teacher acknowledged that not all educators are trained in these methods, which can limit effectiveness (Teacher official, 2025).

KII5: What challenges have you encountered in implementing the inclusive education policy?

"Resources are a significant challenge. We often struggle with a lack of teaching materials and assistive technologies."

Additionally, the administrator pointed out that societal attitudes towards disabilities can create barriers, as some parents and community members may not fully support inclusive practices. Training gaps among staff further complicate the implementation process (Community member, 2025).

KII6: What recommendations do you have for improving the implementation process?

"I believe we need more comprehensive training programs for teachers. Additionally, increasing funding for resources and facilities would greatly enhance our ability to support learners with disabilities."

The policymaker emphasized that community awareness campaigns could also help shift attitudes and increase support for inclusive education initiatives (NGO official, 2025).

5. Recommendations

The Ministry of Education should develop and disseminate standardized implementation guidelines that provide clear procedural frameworks while allowing for contextual adaptation, including step-by-step implementation protocols, decision-making flowcharts, and practical examples of inclusive practices in resource-varied contexts. These guidelines would address the current procedural inconsistencies while maintaining necessary flexibility for diverse school environments.

Schools should establish structured collaborative planning processes for inclusive education implementation, instituting regular cross-departmental meetings, collaborative problem-solving protocols, and shared responsibility frameworks to ensure cohesive rather than fragmented approaches. This systematic collaboration would strengthen implementation by engaging all stakeholders in coordinated rather than isolated efforts.

Educational authorities should implement a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system specifically designed for inclusive education, developing observation protocols, progress indicators, and feedback mechanisms that focus on substantive rather than procedural aspects of implementation. This enhanced monitoring would address the current oversight gaps and provide meaningful guidance for improvement.

The government should create formal communication channels between schools and policymakers focused on inclusive education implementation, establishing regional implementation forums, policy feedback mechanisms, and practitioner advisory groups to inform policy development and refinement. These communication structures would help bridge the current disconnect between policy formulation and implementation experiences.

Abbreviations

CVI	Content Validity Index
IEP	Individualized Education Plan
KII	Key Informant Interview
MoES	Ministry of Education and Sports
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NUDIPU	National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda
PWD	People with Disabilities
SD	Standard Deviation
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
UBOS	Uganda Bureau of Statistics
UNISE	Uganda National Institute of Special Education

Author Contributions

Tumukorere Musa: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

Aloysius Tumukunde: Data curation, Methodology, Project administration, Supervision, Validation, Writing – review & editing

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] Asare, M., & Mitchell, C. (2020). Policy-practice relationships in inclusive education: A comparative study. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(7), 709-726.
- [2] Bagozzi, R. P. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16(1), 74-94.
- [3] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- [4] Charmaz, K. (2020). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. SAGE Publications.
- [5] Eleweke, C. J., & Rodda, M. (2022). Leadership for inclusion: Perspectives from African educational contexts. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(4), 500-515.
- [6] Kaggwa, P. (2020). *Barriers to education for children with disabilities in Uganda*. Hall Publisher.
- [7] Kawulich, B. (2021). *Qualitative research: A practical guide for students*. Hall Publisher.
- [8] Namugambe, A. (2022). *The impact of inclusive education policies on learners with disabilities*. Hall Publisher.
- [9] Nannyonga, D. (2020). Enhancing access to education for students with disabilities: Transportation challenges in Uganda. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(6), 624-635.
- [10] Ojok, R. (2022). *Best practices in inclusive education: A Ugandan perspective*. Hall Publisher.
- [11] Savolainen, H., et al. (2020). Inclusive education monitoring in Sub-Saharan Africa: A comparative analysis. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(10), 1056-1070.
- [12] Singal, N. (2021). Implementing inclusive education in developing countries: Lessons learned. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(5), 513-526.
- [13] Tourangeau, R., & Yan, T. (2020). *Behind the scenes of survey research: Memory and cognition in surveys*. Hall Publisher.
- [14] Walton, E. (2020). *Teacher practices in inclusive education: A comparative study across Sub-Sa*.
- [15] Kisos, W. (2020). *Inclusive education in Uganda: Challenges and solutions*. Kampala University Press.