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Abstract

This study aimed at assessing the implementation of school improvement program and analyzes the practices, challenges and opportunities in Addis Ketema Sub-city, Addis Ababa City Administration. The research design was descriptive in nature and the quantitative method supported by qualitative approach.
Data was generated via questionnaire, interview, and focus group discussion and observation checklist. Accordingly, data was collected from eighty seven randomly selected teachers, thirty six school leaders on the basis of availability sampling techniques. The data obtained from questionnaires were analyzed using statistical tools such as frequency count, percentages, mean score and standard. On the other hand, the data obtained through Interview, FGD, Observation checklist and Document review were analyzed qualitatively to substantiate the result of quantitative analysis. The findings of the study showed a significant number of teachers and school leaders were qualified in the position they hold currently. In addition, the findings of research indicated that training given on SIP was not satisfactory and less consistent. The allocated budget in the study area was not sufficient to promote teaching and learning process in line with the intended education policy. With regard to teaching learning domain there were moderate evaluation of curriculum, conduct of action research, practical work in laboratory and use of instructional media. There was also a reference books, computers, laboratories with moderately adequate equipment and chemicals. Hence, from the result of study, it was concluded that since most of activities across the four domains of SIP implementation were implemented well and School improvement program in the study area was implemented relatively as indicated in the framework. The study has also recommended integrated efforts of all stakeholders mainly, the school community, parents, school principals in collaboration with Woreda Education Office, sub city Education office and the Federal Ministry of Education to implement the desired objectives of the school improvement program.

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction
This part of the research deals with a brief background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, its significance, delimitation and limitations of the study, definition of key terms and organization of the study are included in this section of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

Education is a basic human need and a key factor for all development. In relation to this Verspoor (1991, P: 50) state that “Education is a corner stone of economic and social development. It improves the productive capacity of societies and their political, economic and scientific institution”. Education is an important instrument for development and many nations are exerting their efforts on quality to get the best out of it. Nowadays Quality of Education is an important component of any education system. Thus the issue of quality Education in general has become a major concern of countries all over the world. Accordingly, quality education has gained increasing prominence as the provision of education throughout the world and has expanded rapidly (UNESCO, 2004).

School improvement program is not an overnight task. It requires time, resources and relentless effort. It is difficult to take everything at once and improvement never ends (Frank, 2004). John, et al. (1995) on the other hand, notes that the improvement of schools takes place over extended periods. Estimates by school improvers of time needed vary, but often spans of three to five years are mentioned. It is undeniable fact that school improvement affects the lives of children and it must become a permanent part of school practice, not one –time or occasional event. In strengthening this point, Hopkins, et al. (1994) implies school improvement as “a distinct approach to educational change that enhances student outcomes as well as strengthening the school’s capacity for managing changes. In this sense school improvement is about raising student achievement through focusing on the teaching-learning process and the conditions which support it.”

According to the report of Anderson, (2014), global efforts to improve the quality of education in developing countries include the adoption and implementation of system-level policies promoted by international donor agencies as a condition of external aid; as well as local and district-level school improvement projects (SIPs) designed and supported by international non-governmental institutions (NGOs) with the financial assistance of foreign aid agencies.
According UNESCO (2013/14) education for all (EFA) Global Monitoring Report, financing remains a significant challenge for all educational systems in the developing countries. Even among countries which presently spend 20 percent or more of the governmental budget on education, per capital expenditure on schooling is still low to provide all aspect of quality learning. School improvement is a key component of strengthening education system in Africa providing school communities with a particular process that empower them to realize challenges and barriers to school effectiveness, identify workable solutions prioritize problem and agree on roles &responsibilities to bring about change.

According to MOE (2007), the objective of school improvement program are: to improve the capacity of schools to prioritize needs and develop a school improvement plan; to enhance school and community participation in resource utilization, decisions & resource generation, to improve government’s capacity to deliver specified amount of schools grant at Woreda level; and to improving the learning environment by providing sufficient resources to school.

School improvement program was established in 1999 E.C & it has objective of improving students learning achievement SIP is aimed to address the following four school domains: - teaching learning, school leadership and management, parents-community school relationship and safe and healthy school environment. Each of their domain is equally important thus the school should give due emphasis for each domain. Assessing the practices and challenges of school improvement program implementation in the schools with different school domains and self-assessment, help to improve the inputs and process of schools this facilitate the teaching learning process of the school to promote academic performance of the students. One of the issues stressed in the School Improvement Program document is the fact that, school improvement program must be a continuous and cyclical process through its implementation that involves SIP activities such as planning; implementing, evaluating and reporting all these activities should be implemented continuously at school level (MoE, 2007).

According to Plan International (2004), school improvement means making schools better places for learning. This relies on changes at both school level and with classroom, which depends on schools be committed to fulfilling the expectations of children and their parents. In this context school improvement refers to systematic approach that improves the quality of schools and hence
the quality of education. As to Hopkins assertion (1989), SIP is a plan of initiated education program based on successful experience of improving quality of education which has to follow an approach of collaborative responsibility and shared achievement. According to Estyn (2001), school improvement plan is a road map that sets out the changes a school needs to make improve the level of student achievement and shows how and when this change is made. In this regard, it is believed that schools are the formal agencies for education where the future citizens are shaped through the process of teaching and learning that promote all students develop their potentials to a great level (Aggrawal, 1996; Dodd and Kontal, 2002).

In Ethiopia, the school improvement program was launched in 2006 to improve the quality of education through enhancing students learning achievement and outcomes (MOE, 2006). This requires the effectiveness and commitment of all the stakeholders, particularly teachers and the school leadership and management. However, Harries in Hopkins (2002:19) has noted the difficulty to change school management, arrangement and working culture as a challenge to implement school improvement program in developing countries. Thus, for the success of school improvement, it needs to identify the barriers so as to take corrective measures on time. The above idea initiated the researcher to investigate the practices, challenges and opportunities in implementing school improvement program in government secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city, Addis Ababa City Administration.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The education system in Ethiopia has been suffering from access, equity, quality and relevance, efficiency, educational leadership practices and organization problems (MOE, 2005:1). The above problems caused dissatisfactions from stakeholders and suggestions and recommendations should be forwarded from educators for change in the education system. This condition in turn calls for reform or improvement at schools. MOE, (2007), suggested that it is widely acknowledged that in general, achievements in access have not been accompanied by sufficient improvements in quality-in fact in some areas quality has deteriorated at least partly as a result of rapid expansion. In response to this MOE (2010) stated that schools to experience sustained improvement, it is probably necessary that school staff and their surrounding communities take responsibility for their own improvement. But for schools to be able to take such improvement actions they need to be supported by experts and supervisors in administration and they need to receive some funds (MOE,
Now a day’s quality of education has been found to be the challenges of many, especially in developing countries including Ethiopia. Undertaking different educational initiatives is an important dimension to assure the quality of education. Hence, School improvement becomes one of the major educational initiatives that many countries have developed and implemented to realize the provision of quality education (Plan international, 2004).

The school improvement program required schools to do the major activities such as: preparation and collecting of information, system survey, deciding performance level of school, designing SIP plan, and implementation of the plan, monitoring and evaluation as well as reporting (MOE, 2007). Mesele (2011) conclude that, lack of awareness on the program, poor level of participation of stakeholders from planning to evaluation of the program and also inadequate of educational finance, lack of furniture and other facilities and inadequate competency of leadership were influencing factors of SIP implementation. In supporting this Frew (2010) also stated that, the major problems that affected the implementation of SIP are: insufficient budget, lack of school facilities, limited support of community, and lack of the necessary awareness of stakeholders.

The Ethiopian Federal Ministry of Education (MoE) has currently become aware of the problems that hinder the provision of quality education and has become cognizant of the importance of launching the improvement program (SIP). The Ethiopian school improvement program (SIP) was introduced in 2007 as one component of six pillars identified for the general education quality improvement package (GEQIP), when a new program is introduced it may face many challenges in its implementation since SIP is also a new program under implementation, we cannot say that it is being implemented perfectly. Even if we assume that it is being implemented perfectly, an assessment of the achievements, challenges and prospects is essential. Above all, SIP is a dynamic process that involves many stakeholders and resources as its input, process, output, outcome, and impact. Besides, order to ensure the effective and efficient implementation of the program, it is necessary to identify its strengths, weakness, threats and opportunities through research; and then to propose possible scenarios of retaining the achievements, for correcting the weaknesses/challenges for preventing possible threats and for harvesting the opportunities.

Therefore, based on the above information, shortage of textbooks, classroom, lack of qualified teachers, lack of awareness in implementing the program, shortage of educational finance, limited support to the implementation of SIP and low participation of stakeholders are challenges of
school improvement in secondary schools indicate quality as one of the major problems of secondary schools of the region. However, this study was conducted in three secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city, Addis Ababa City Administration.

Hence, gaps were identified from previous studies and this study emphasized on investigating the extent to which the implementation of SIP helped to realize its objectives and how sufficient supportive conditions have been put in place to implement SIP. The study also gave attention to the opportunities gained through SIP and Challenges that encountered while implementation of SIP. Finally, much focus was given to investigate major challenges encountered school improvement program implementation.

To achieve this purpose, the researcher specifically formulates the following basic research questions:

1. To what extent the practices of school improvement program implementation in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city?
2. What are the major challenges that hamper the implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city?
3. What are the opportunities of school improvement program implementation in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city?
4. To what extent stakeholders’ participation in school planning development and implementation of SIP in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city?
5. What are the possible measures that shall be taken to tackle the challenges in the implementation of SIP?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objectives
The general objective of the study is to assess the Practices, Challenges and Opportunities in Implementing School Improvement Program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city, Addis Ababa City administration.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

1. To assess the practices of school improvement program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city.
2. To identify the major challenges that hampered the implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city.
3. To point out the opportunities gained in the implementation of the school improvement Program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city.
4. To analyze the extent of stakeholders’ awareness about school improvement program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city.
5. To examine how adequate supportive conditions have been put in place to implement SIP.
6. To identify the major challenges those encountered in implementing SIP.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The prime purpose of this research is to assess Practices, Challenges and Opportunities in Implementing School Improvement Program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city, Addis Ababa City administration. To this end, the study aimed at analyzing how stakeholders understand school improvement program, to identify the actual practices and challenges and to assess the extent of the implementation of school improvement program as well as opportunities gained during the implementation.

Hence, the researcher believes that the finding of the study might be important for the following reasons:

1. The study may help teachers, principals and other concerned stakeholders to understand more about the implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools.

2. It may help in identifying challenges of school improvement program in secondary schools of the sub-city and create awareness among the major stakeholders, which in turn enable them to strive honestly to tackle the problem.
3. Provides valuable feedbacks regarding implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Addis ketema sub-city from the key stakeholders.

4. The study might be used as stepping-stone for different bodies to facilitate the proper functioning of school improvement program and can be a source of immediate problem solving, further research, policy, institutional development as well as development of personal career.

5. Researchers might also use the research results as springboard for further investigation that could lead to the improvement of various programs in secondary schools of Addis Ababa City Administration.

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

The researcher has found that it is very important to delimit the scope of the study to a manageable size in order to investigate the issue thoroughly. This research was confined only to government secondary schools in a single Sub-city for the sake of in-depth analysis with genuine investigation on Practices, Challenges and Opportunities in Implementing School Improvement Program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city.

Addis Ababa is classified in to ten sub-cities; out of these sub cities the researcher selected Addis Ketema Sub-city purposely. According to Addis Ababa Education Bureau Annual Abstract for the year 2015/2016 quick data/information book Addis Ketema sub-city has five the highest government secondary schools and the researcher had ample experiences and served the sub-city in many leadership roles, secondly, it would be impossible and difficult to conduct a research on school improvement program issues in secondary schools at all levels of the school system on citywide (in all ten sub-cities) within such a short period of time together with limited financial resource owned by student researcher. Hence the focuses of this study is “The Practices, Challenges and Opportunities in Implementing School Improvement Program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city.

1.6 Definition of Key Terms
School improvement program: is a concept focused in increasing the academic performance of students by conducting self-evaluation on various school domains by improving learning input and the following process (MOE, 2006).

School Improvement Committee: is the officially organized committee, which consists of the school principal and representatives of teachers, students, parents, and the community, and formulated to plan, monitor and evaluate the SIP (MoE, 2007b).

Secondary Schools: It is a school of four years durations consisting of two years general secondary education (grade 9-10) and two years of preparatory education (11-12).

Stakeholders: Are principals, teachers, Students, PTA members, school management communities and so on in secondary schools.

1.7 Organization of the Study

The study will be organized into five chapters. The first chapter deals about background of the study, the nature of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study and definitions of operational words. Chapter two, deals with a review of the related literature. Chapter three explains the research design and methodological framework upon which the study will be conducted. Moreover, a detailed protocol addressing procedures, participant selection, data collection and analysis techniques as well as issues related to ethical considerations will also be discussed intensively. Chapter four was dedicated to presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data. The last chapter consists of summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Review of Related Literature
In consideration of the research questions that guided this study, a review of related literature and selected studies are presented in this chapter. The literature review examines theoretical prospective concerning the concept and nature of SIP, the evolution of SIP, and rationale of SIP, assumptions and principles of SIP, domains of SIP, importance of SIP, the SIP Cycle, SIP planning, Stages of SIP, countries experience, challenges for SIP and the so on.

2.1 Concept and Nature of School Improvement Program

School improvement became a dominant feature of educational reform and has gained prominence and recognition on the international stage. The pressure up on schools to improve performance has resulted in a wide range of school improvement programs and initiatives. Schools must improve their basic functions of teaching and learning process aiming at helping and empowering all students to raise their broad out comes through school improvement program. Different scholars define school improvement in various manners. Among these, Fullan (1998) defined school improvement program as systematic, planned and lasting process of change school – based, in order to achieve concrete educational aims in a more effective way by identifying, reformulating and optimizing basic school elements and their interrelations. Moreover, the majority of the educational community is involved in the program. From the definition we can understand that, school improvement programs are planned change, long - term action, the process of change occurs in a systemic way, oriented towards educational objectives and so on. School improvement program can be defined also as a systematic and sustained effort aimed at change in learning conditions in one or more schools, with ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively (vanvelzenet al., 1995). The definition highlighted that school improvement is a change process which involves a rigorous planning that focuses on teaching and learning as well as creating supportive internal conditions. In addition, it was seemed to be explained in the definition that the improvement should not be only in individual school; rather it focused on successful efforts at systemic improvement of schools reform at large scale. John et al., (1999) stated school improvement as “an improving school… may be defined as one which increases in its effectiveness over time, where effectiveness’ is judged in a value- added terms … one which secures year- on- year improvements in the outcomes of successive cohorts of similar pupils.”
The basic idea behind school improvement is that its dual emphasis on enhancing the school capacity for change as well as implementing specific reforms, both of which have their ultimate goal of increasing in student achievement. Hence, school improvement is about strengthening schools organizational capacity and implementing educational reform. Another major notion of school improvement is that, school improvement cannot be simply equated with educational change in general. Because many changes, whether external or internal, do not improve students’ outcome as they simply imposed. They should rather focus on the importance of culture and organization of the school (Hopkins, 1994 as cited in Frew, 2010).

With this regard, Plan International, (2004) stated the following:

*School improvement means making schools for learning. This relies on changes at both school level and within classroom, which in turn depends on school being committed to fulfilling the expectations of the children and their parents. In other Words, school improvement refers to a systematic approach that improves the quality of schools (p, 1).*

Conceptualization of schools and school system is the fundamental issues to be discussed in the context of school improvement. Schools are institutions that can prepare children to contribute to the better of society in which they operate, by equipping them with knowledge, attitude and skills important to society. They are essentially places where all students to learn. Schools therefore, are charged with responsibilities for delivering more effectively the most important educational services teaching and learning (Dimmock, 2000).School system is a dynamic system where input, throughput, and output process are continually. This continually changing feature of school system demands it for continuous improvement. In many literatures different authorities come up with different definitions of school improvement. For example, for Barens (2004) quoted in MOE (2006:3) school improvement is explained as “the process of altering specific practices and policies in order to improve teaching and learning” office of standard education (1995), on the other hand defines school improvement as means by which schools promote learner moral, social and cultural development through the process of socially up their standard, quality and efficiency. Hopkins, 1994). This definition has also got recognition by ministry of education guide lines those further emphasizes school improvement as timely essential concept which stressed self-evaluation of schools against each issue of concern and improvement of educational input to enhance student achievement (MOE, 2006 b and MOE, 2002 a-c) in general, the main essence of the concept is
geared to general effort to make schools better places for enhancing quality teaching and learning process with the ultimate goal of maximizing the level of learners achievement. In general, the central idea of SIP is a process of sustained activity intended to improve Students’ learning achievement through different strategies and capacity building efforts.

2.2 The Historical/Evolution of School Improvement

A review of the last two and a half decades of school improvement suggests that the field has evolved in a number of distinctive phases as practitioners and researchers gained experiences in implementing and studying school change. Hopkins (2001) has provided a powerful analysis of the field and has identified three phases of school improvement. However, Hopkins himself put an overview of five phases of school improvement later. Accordingly, these phases discussed below.

I. Phase One

Although the intellectual background to school improvement can be traced back to Kurt Lewin, it was in the first phase in the late 1970’s and early 1980 are that the field took shape as a distinct body of approaches and scholars/practitioners. In its early phase, school improvement tended to be mainly practitioner-oriented. So, School improvement was often defined as implementing an innovation or engaging in action research projects. This ‘bottom up’ approach to change in schools manifested itself in small-scale program or projects focused sometimes only on select groups of students, individual schools or groups of teachers.

In the United States, toward the end of this phase, the emergence of the effective Schools Research (ESR) began to inform the work of many local school improvement efforts (Chris peels, 1989). In addition to providing funding for individual school improvement efforts, state and national governments played an interesting role in this phase. They enhanced the power of individual schools by diminishing the power of intermediate or local educational authorities and agencies. According to Hopkins (2001), the first phase of school improvement was encapsulated by the holistic approaches of the 1980s and was epitomized by the International School Improvement Project (ISIP). However, this first phase of school improvement tended to be ‘loosely conceptualized and under-theorized. It did not represent a systematic, programmatic and coherent approach to school change’. There was also in this phase an emphasis upon organizational change, school self-evaluation and the ownership of change by individual schools and teachers, but once again these initiatives were not strongly connected to student learning outcomes. They tended to be variable and fragmented in conception and application.
Consequently, these improvement practices struggled to impact significantly upon classroom practice (Hopkins, 2001).

II. Phase Two

The second phase of development began in the early 1990s. In these years, the school improvement tradition was beginning to provide schools with guidelines and strategies for implementation to promote classroom level change. This approach resulted from more systematic interaction between the school improvement and the school effectiveness research communities (Vinovskis, 1996; Desimone, 2002). There was a greater focus upon organizational and classroom change reflected in approaches to staff development premised upon models of teaching (Joyce, 1995).

Furthermore, a desire to link school improvement to student learning outcomes was the main goal during this phase, which was pursued with varying degrees of intensity. In addition, there were two trends that emerged during this phase. The first trend was the expansion of site based management within schools, which resulted in the reduction in power of local authorities and local boards of education. In England, New Zealand, Australia and the United States, national and state governments started to play a more active and central role in school improvement. The second trend during this phase was the growth, especially in the United States, of comprehensive models of school reform that could be adopted by individual schools. This ‘whole-school design’ approaches combined elements from the school effectiveness and school improvement research bases to focus upon curriculum and instruction as well as management and organizational variables. Some of these approaches were designed to meet particular curriculum needs, which have subsequently been adopted in many other countries.

III. Phase Three

In many countries numerous resources have been targeted at programs and projects aimed at improving schools and raising standards of performance. The evidence supporting the relationship between school improvement and increased student achievement remains weak and contestable. As Hopkins (2001) noted ‘the achievement gap between pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds that seemed initially to narrow in the late 1980s, stayed the same or widened again in the 1990s, raising alarm among national governments in Canada, England, and the United States’.

The third phase of school improvement has arisen because of the relative failure of existing school improvement approaches to make a difference to school on a large scale. In response to previous
limitations, the third phase of school improvement attempted to draw upon its most robust evidence and to produce interventions that were solidly based on tried and tested practices. Programs such Improving Quality of Education for All (IQEA); High Reliability Schools (HRS), the Manitoba School Improvement project (MISP) and the Dutch National School Improvement project were all examples of projects in this third phase(Reynolds et al.,1996; Hopkins, 1994).

Nevertheless, if one were to look at these exemplars of third wave school improvement as a group, it is clear that there has been an enhanced focus upon the importance of pupil outcomes. Instead of the earlier emphasis upon changing the processes of schools, the focus is now upon seeing if these changes are powerful enough to affect pupil outcomes. And hence, the learning level and the instructional behaviors of teachers have been increasingly targeted for explicit attention, as well as the school level.

**IV. Phase Four**

Harris (2008) have argued that the fourth phase of school improvement is largely concerned with system level changes through collaboration and networking across schools and districts. Moreover, they further suggest that district reform and network building (including professional learning communities) need to occur side by side, and they need to be linked.

A desire to link school improvement to student learning outcomes was the main goal during this phase, which was pursued with varying degrees of intensity. This has included a much richer and deeper appreciation of what the transition from a system based on teaching to one that embraces learning actually implies (Stoll et al, 2003). Such a system doesn’t neglect the achievement of learning outcomes, but provides evidence that learning about learning can make a difference to school improvement (Watkins, 2010).

This phase reflects the growing recognition of the nested nature of school in systems and the frustration, especially of policy makers, of scaling –up and transferring more quickly the touted success stories of individual school reform. To speed the school improvement process, system changes are occurring at two levels. (1) System changes at national or state level, and (2) renewal and redefinition of the role and work of local education authorities.
V. Phase Five
This phase of school improvement focuses on systemic improvement. In the last decade, we have begun to learn far more about the features of an effective educational system, but are now only beginning to understand the dynamics of improvement at system level. It is this progression that enhances the appearance of this phase, the one most recently entered. The review of the broader international school improvement experience is intended both to confirm the trends identified in the previous phases and also to highlight the importance of international comparisons and learning from international experience that is at the heart of the fifth phase.
Two points are critical here; the first is the move from individual to local and now to systemic approaches to school improvement; and second the evident proposition that we can only learn about system change by studying systems and working on how to improve them. This is from secondary analyses such as Fenton (2009) Lessons Learned: how good policies produce better schools and the McKinsey (2010) studies how the World’s Most Improved School Systems Keep Getting Better.

2.3 Rationale of School Improvement Program
According to the Plan International (2004), the school improvement supports the program initiatives of government and others in achieving the goals of education for all by2015. Specifically, this program aims to: support school based improvement plans, enhance the quality of children’s basic education, achieve the enrollment, attendance and completion rates that meet the Education for All goals, achieve equality of access to school for both girls and boys, to achieve better prospects for completing school. Therefore, to achieve such aims of school improvement program, Plan International (2004) has also suggested core elements which have greater implication by the program elaborating that the program aims to support schools in addressing core elements such as:

*Ensuring teachers are competent and motivated, promoting active learning methods supported by appropriate teaching and learning aids, promoting the active participation of children and parents in schools governance, ensuring a safe, sound and effective learning environment establishing a relevant Curriculum, ensuring empowered and supporting school leaders and advocating for supporting supervision(p,2).*
Each of the core elements is equally important; if any one becomes weak, the strength and the success of the whole will be affected. Therefore, the school should give greater attention for each of the core elements to attain the purpose of the school improvement.

Furthermore, School Improvement Program (SIP) has special importance in our country. Implementing school improvement program helps in different ways. Firstly, the teachers to be responsive to diverse learning need of students in their teaching and learning approaches; secondly, It enhances the involvement of parents and community in school affairs. Third, the program improves initiation, capacity and efficiency of school leadership and helps to create learning environment that is conducive for students’ better achievement. Finally, the SIP helps to mobilize community and NGOs for support to meet the need for educational inputs so as to insure quality education (ACT government, 2004; MOE, 2006a and MOE, 2007b). In short, school improvement helps realize the provision of quality education needed to enhance student’s achievement by making all practice and functions.

2.4 Assumptions and Principles of School Improvement Programs

The school is the center of change. This means that external reforms need to be sensitive to the situation in each individual school, rather than assuming that all schools are identical. It also implies that the school improvement efforts need to adopt a ‘classroom-exceeding perspective’, without ignoring the classroom. Another assumption of school improvement is that, there is a systematic approach to change. The school improvement is not a haphazard activity but it is a carefully planned and managed process that takes place over a period of time. In addition to the above assumption, Hopkins and Largerweij said that the “internal conditions” of schools are a key focus for change. These include the teaching and learning activities in the school, the schools’ procedures, role allocations and resources uses that support the teaching learning process.

School should employ a set of goals and missions which are easy to understand, schools need to help the entire student’s especially low achievers to be tutored and enriched programs should be appended for highly talented students, principals and other staff members should be actively involved in continuous capacity building to update their knowledge, develop positive thinking for instance, every teacher needs to contribute to the successful implementation of the SIP, teacher must involve actively in staff development by planning and implementing the SIP, school
environment has to be safe and healthy, school community relationship should be strengthened so that community and parents need to involve in school improvement program implementation and school leadership should be shared among staff, students, parents and the so on.

2.5 **Domains of School Improvement**

It serves as a frame of reference coordinating activities, planning, monitoring and evaluation etc of school tasks. The domain of SIP is varying from country to country based on their priorities. For instance, MOE (2006) and ACT (2009) divided school domains into four categories. According to ACT the four domains of the school includes; learning and teaching, leading and managing, conductive environment and community involvement. The domains represent the four key areas in which school improvement takes place. They describe the essential characteristics of an effective school.

**Figure 1: Domains and Elements of SIP**

1. **Learning and teaching**
   - Teaching task
   - Learning and evaluation
   - Curriculum

2. **Learning student environment**
   - School facility
   - Empowerment of students
   - Support for students

3. **Leadership and management**
   - Strategic vision
   - Leadership behavior
   - School management

4. **Community participation**
   - Cooperation with parents
   - Community participation
   - Promoting education

**Source:** MoE (2011) School Improvement Guidelines
2.5.1 Learning and Teaching Process Domain

Quality learning and teaching is evidence based features oriented, creating an empowered community of learners in which teachers and students are challenged to pursue excellence and realize their potential. Hopkins (1994:74-90) specifically pointed out the main focus for school improvement action should be on teaching and learning process in the classroom. It is also further noted such classroom practices can be sustained through ongoing staff development on areas such as teaching skill and knowledge of curriculum content. It also stressed on collaboration as necessary condition for implementation to occur when group of teachers adopt education ideas to their own context and professional.

Fulan (1999) in Harris, A. (2002) have stated that school improvement research highlights the center of teaching learning in the pursuit of sustained school improvement. Curriculum is the issue that should be taken into account in the process of teaching-learning process. In development and implementation of curriculum, teachers are the fundamental agents and direct in an institutional delivery and evaluation of the curriculum.

2.5.2 Safety and Conducive Learning Environment Domain

The student environment describes the promotion of positive and respectful relationships which are stable, welcoming and inclusive in safe and productive learning environments students willingly engaged and participate in the broad range of learning opportunities. They contribute to decisions about their learning and their contributions are valued. Safe school is secure and disciplined environment personal and school property are not subject to theft, destruction, students and staff respect each other and behave in ways that contribute to effective teaching and learning.

Hence, safe conducive climate and health school environment plays significant role for school improvement. (MoE, 2006) states school environment consists of students focus, students empowerment and students support and decisive domain for the implementation of school improvement program.
2.5.3 Community Involvement Domain

The community involvement domain describes the development quality, ongoing, community partnerships and networks. Schools are responsive to community expectations, suitable environment for learning, school administration and community participation. Community involvement in educational affairs is one of the most over used but least understood concepts in developing countries. Community participation is a process through which stakeholders’ influence and share control over development initiatives and the decision and resource which affect them.

Kruger, (1996:83), has also indicated the following activities as a means for parents to get involved in schools, helping children with homework, fund raising, maintenance building and grounds, transporting of pupil’s. Organizing functions at school helping with extracurricular activities and supporting school activities. Several reports on community involvement indicate that the school in general and teachers and students in particular benefit a lot from the involvement of the community in the issue of schools.

2.5.4 Leadership and Managing Domain

The leadership and management domain is concerned with communicating a clear vision for a school and establishing effective management structures. Leaders set directions and guide the school community in alignment of its purpose and practice. Effective leadership within the school is collegial, student centered and teacher focused, promoting a collective responsibility for improvement. The elements of this domain are: strategic vision, leadership behavior & school management. The elements describe how:

- School vision is collaboratively developed to be realistic, challenging, and futures oriented
- Leaders use reflective practices to appropriately manage people to achieve improvements
- The school’s leadership team demonstrates effective resource management to achieve results.

School improvement needs strong commitment and sense of ownership on the part of all the concerned bodies. Besides, school leadership plays a great role in implementing school improvement programs. To implement school improvement programs effectively and sustainably school leadership capacity has to be enhanced. Hopkins et al, (2001) in Harries et al. (2003:122) point out that school capacity is the collective competency of the school to bring about effective
change in four components namely, knowledge, skills and dispositions of individual staff, a professional learning community in which staff work collaboratively, program coherence, and technical resource.

School principals empower others to lead and the serves as catalysts for changes (Harris and Linda Lambert, 2003:38-39). Hailer and Heck, 1996 (in Harris et al.2003) indicate four areas in which head teacher influences the school. The first is through establishing and conveying the purposes and goals of the schools. Secondly, through the interplay between the schools’ organizations and its social network. A third is through influence over people and fourth is a relation to organizational culture. As to my experience, a successful change leader articulates a vision for their schools so that everyone articulates a vision for their school. So that everyone understands the vision shares authority, responsibility and accountability to accomplish it.

2.6 Importance of School Improvement Program

The importance of implementing SIP as indicated in school improvement guide line are: it will enable to improve the teaching-learning process by systematically increasing the competency, efficiency and motivation of teachers and the management through various techniques(mutual teaching, by correcting weakness as well as self-evaluation and developing strong unity by exchanging experiences together with realistic practical training...etc).Second, increases students for education and improving the necessary resources for education and to create suitable condition for learning. Third, it increases the participation of parents, community and their feeling of responsibility by increasing their awareness regarding education. The last but not the least, it provides quality of education by providing the necessary resources through the coordination of the community, non-governmental organizations, humanitarian agencies and religious organizations, in addition to assistance provided by the government (MOE, 2006). Besides, effective school improvement program minimizes wastage of educational resources by reducing class repetition, dropout and improving the learning capacity and academic achievement of students (MOE, 2006).

In generally, school improvement helps to realize the provision of quality education for all children by making the overall practices and functions of schools more responsive to the diverse needs of students.
1.7 The School Improvement Cycle

In the first year of the SIP such major activities as: preparation, collection of information, system survey, deciding performance level of the school, designing SIP plan, implementation of the plan, monitoring and evaluation as well as reporting are conducted by participating all stakeholders (parents, students and teachers etc.). In the second year, schools evaluate the improvements achieved in line with the goals set and priorities identified. To this end, new issues or priorities that might be considered will be identified and modification of the plan will be made. Besides, standards on which self-enquiry was not conducted in the first year will be selected and finally, report will be prepared and presented. In the third year, while the implementation is on effect, schools monitor those improvements observed through self-enquiry. Moreover, external bodies evaluate the performance of schools and provide them with the feedback. (MOE, 2010).

1.7.1 School Improvement Planning

Planning for improvement is a disciplined process through which a school communities and board reflect on relevant information about both context and achievement and design strategies for enhancing those areas that can be positively influenced. The true measure of improvement planning effectiveness, of course, is the degree to which improvement planning, implementation and monitoring produce positive change in student achievement and growth over time (EQAO, 2005). When board and school staff develops improvement plans collaboratively with representatives of their school communities and school councils, they are more likely to engender a sense of shared responsibility and shared commitment to bringing about the required changes. Thus, the school plan will include the following elements such as: a statement of school context, purpose and profile, identified priorities, improvement targets, whole school strategies, a timeframe; and expected outcomes of the school.

An annual operating plan sets out how the school plan will be progressed in that year. The operating plan is developed after reviewing the school plan and identifying the priorities and objectives that will be the focus for the year. Operating plans are internal to the school and should be developed by school staff. Typically, they include: the priorities and improvement targets in the three-year plan being addressed that year, specific strategies that will be employed, the responsible body for implementing the strategies, timeframe, allocating resources to the strategies implementation and the ways that the implementation will be evaluated. Planning should also
occur at the classroom level. Classroom planning is central to school improvement as it is what teachers do in their classrooms that impact most directly on student achievement (MOE, 2007).

1.7.2 School Planning Process
The planning process allows schools to identify its priorities and targets over each year cycle. The school plan also describes how progress is monitored and how achievement will be measured, including the evidence that will be gathered. Through planning, a school embeds into its processes and practices a capacity to meet internal and external demands. So, schools typically prioritize their strategic intentions in ways that provide the best balance between available resources (including human, physical and financial resources) and competing demands of stakeholders across the school. It is important that schools set an achievable number of priorities, at the same time providing the school with a broad range of significant challenges for each year of the cycle (MOE, 2007). Schools should ensure that their processes allow planning to evolve to meet changing needs and circumstances. Schools will establish a school improvement committee to work with the principal to develop and monitor the school’s planning and improvement processes. In devising a planning process the school’s improvement committee should ensure: full and open consultation with the school community, strategies for improvement, data sources and monitoring processes, communicating the process of improvement to key personnel, the availability of documentation to support the improvement process and future plans are informed by what has been learned (ACT, 2009).

1.8 The Stage of School Improvement
To attain high student achievement level, schools set goals for improvement and make decision on how and when this goal may be achieved, create positive environment for learning and increase the degree to which parents are involved in their children’s learning at school and in home (EIC, 2000). School improvement by its nature is continuous process that can systematically put in to the reality. Formerly the ministry of education SIP training manual (2006) outlined different stages that the school need to pass through to realize the improvement effort. Latter both the framework and the blue print clearly identified key steps in the school improvement process. This comprises of preliminary stages such as formation of school improvement team, understanding the context and setting issue of concern and other phases like, preparation of school improvement plan implementation, follow up and monitoring the implementation as well as Evaluation (MOE, 2007b and MOE, 2007c).
1.8.1 School Improvement Plan Development

School improvement planning is considered as road Map that sets out change school needs to make improve the level of student achievement (EIC, 2000), it is a continuous process that brings improvement in schools. Others consider it both as a mechanism to measure improvement and document for monitoring progress. Plan is a corner stone for any effective implementation. This happens when plan preparation is governed by leading principles. In this regard MOE, 2006(b) indicated the following key principles in school improvement plan preparation.

Based on principles, school which implements school improvement programs pay attention to the following six issues for plan and implement (MoE, 2006, 2007b). These are contextual understanding, collecting, and organizing, analyzing, setting goals prioritization and issue of concern, selecting best practice, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Throughout the process without active involvement of key school improvement stakeholders such as parents, community members, principals, teachers and students; attainment of the objective of the school improvement is unthinkable. In strategic and the annual preparation all the concerned need to work collaboratively with strong sense of team. Strategic planning is the central role of school. Hence, participatory sense of ownership, clear understanding of the process and commitment are among factors that need to deserve attention during strategic plan preparation on the part of school improvement plan.

1.9 Implementation of School Improvement Program

Schools are required to ensure the availability of important inputs for the provision of education and improve their result and revise the learning teaching process in order to get students relevant and standard education (MoE, 2011). Teachers are key to school improvement. The more teachers now and the more skilled they are in teaching the more successful schools may be in advancing learning. Whether teachers know more and become more skilled depends upon the support they get from policies and contexts (Sergiovanni, 1999) described academically able teachers know the subject they teach at a depth that allows them to draw on their knowledge base presentations to their students. Thus, instructional strategies and capacities of the teacher are the major teachers’ related factors that affect success of school improvement program implementation and facilitate the learning of students.

Students feel that they are the school and that they own and makes the school. They found classrooms to be student centered and students to have a string voice in their own learning.
To them “the most critical factor in defining the classroom culture is the teacher-student relationship”. At school the relationship between learner and student is friendly, open, relaxed and caring (Sergiovanni, 1999).

MoE (2005) described that communities, parents and teacher association are active in raising the awareness of the general community on the benefits of education and in encouraging parents to send their children to school so as to increase access and reduce dropout. In addition, they are involved in school management, preparing annual plans and follow up of disciplinary cases. MoE (2011) identified that; school improvement could be realized through works in schools. In this regard, they establish school improvement committees to undertake this task. School improvement committees are accountable to directors of schools and have three years term of office. Members of this committee are drawn from teacher, administration staff, students, parents and the community chaired by the director of each school.

1.9.1 School Improvement Committee

School improvement is work that requires collaborative efforts of stakeholders, form plan preparation through implementation and evaluation. To begin with school improvement process the first step should be establishing school improvement committee/team. Barnes (2004:5) suggest that the way to start school improvement is to create a school improvement team and the team is a group of people who work together to develop lead, and coordinate the school improvement process. Accordingly, he pointed out the characteristics of effective school improvement to be small size representative group, coordinate effort and commitment task. According to the same author the responsibility of school improvement team/committee includes: meet with each other members of the school community to inform them of self-study and its objectives and process: obtain the input of faculty and staff and incorporate in to self-study process, collect data, meet regularly to discuss progress, make preliminary conclusions and reflect on what data shows ,as well as on the process itself; assist with documentation and evaluation of self-study and assign and negotiate collection tasks with in school community.

The committee members are comprised of teachers, management personnel, students, parents and community and the principal of each schools works as the committee chairman (MOE,2006).The responsibilities of school improvement committee in the document includes; they prepare school improvement plan ,they out line strategies through which the school community contribute substantially to the school improvement; the organize a system which a school community
participates in the school improvement program starting from self-evaluation to implementation and assessment; and they implement such systems closely supervises school improvement plan provide the necessary assistance and support; and at the end of academic year present a report to the school community on the improvement activities carried out by the school. Based on the evaluation report they inform the schools status to the local community (MOE, 2006).

The school improvement team/committee conducts school self-evaluation that is the starting point to draft school improvement plan it gives direction to what issues should be addressed first and what follows based on the priority given by school leaders, students and parents. School can plan and implement their school improvement programs only when they are aware of their current status in respect to the four domains based on reliable and accurate information and when they design and perform their improvement plan (MOE, 2006).

2.10 Countries Experience

The United States of America and the United Kingdom were the pioneers of starting the school improvement programs. The international school improvement project (ISIP) under the coordination of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) also strengthened the practice in the 1980s uniting the 14 OECD countries (Reynolds, et al1996). Now days, many other countries are also implementing school improvement programs. For instance, since 2001, plan International has been implementing school improvement programs in hundreds of schools in 20 countries across Africa, Asia, and the Americans (Plan International, 2004). Experiences of a few numbers of the above mentioned school improvement program implementing countries are explained below in pursuit of lessons for Ethiopia.

**United Kingdom:** In the United Kingdom, improving the quality of education for All(IQEA)’is considered as one of the successful school improvement attempts in the world. The project was established initially based at Cambridge University. Since then it has operated in over fifty schools across England and Wales and additionally has incorporate schools in Iceland, Puerto Rico and South Africa in to the program. The project is currently led by staff at two Universities in the United Kingdom, Cambridge and northern kingdom. Both these Universities provide the academic leadership and vision for the program and represent the focal point for IQEA schools.

The IQEA model of school improvement is based up on for fundamental belief in the relationship between teacher’s professional growth and school development. It is the projects view that schools
are more likely to strengthen their ability to provide enhanced outcomes for all purples when they adopt ways of working that are consistent both with their own aspiration as school community with the demands of external change. As research evidence consistently demonstrates that successful schools use external change agendas for internal purposes. The project believes in harassing the possibility for internal change through external pressure. It is central promise is that without an equal focus on the development of capacity, or internal conditions of the school, innovative work quickly becomes marginalized (MOE, 1998 E.C). Research evidence consistently demonstrates that successful schools use external change agendas for internal purposes. The project believes in harassing the possibility for internal change through external pressure. It is central promise is that without an equal focus on the development of capacity, or internal conditions of the school, innovative work quickly becomes marginalized (MOE, 2006).

**Canada:** In Canada the Manitoba school improvement program (MSIP) was undertaken by charitable organization since 1991, and since emphasis on enhancing schools capacity for development by involving staff, students and the community at large. It also gave due attention to teacher development and professional growth (Harries, A 2001). Established initially with a very definite urban focus, the program has in recent years expanded to include some of the provinces rural and northern schools within its network. Just as internal and external evaluation processes are a key element of each MSIP schools program; it has been as central part of the whole MSIP endeavor, each MSIP School is assessed on a common set of criteria, and projects have to be school based and teacher initiated should focused on the needs of the adolescent students; have to address fundamental issues of educational improvement and students learning for at risk students; have to the potential for long term impact on the school and should be designed or developed to incorporate a collaborative and participatory approach with in the school and include an appropriate evolution component (Earl and Lee.1998).

**United States:** In the United States different states have been implementing school improvement programs. The Boston school improvement program is one such improvement initiative focusing on the six essential issues namely: School wide instructional focus; Student work and data; Professional development plan; Learning and best teaching practices and Alignment of resources with international focus and involvement of parents and community (MOE, 1998E.C)
Another example of school improvement program implemented in the United States is the Chicago school improvement program with focuses on five school domains in contrast to that of Ethiopia and Australia which have four domains. The domains are: School management; Community support; Student catered learning environment; Professional development and quality learning experience. Self-evaluation is conducted on the basis of the five domains (MOE, 2006).

Kenya: school improvement in Kenya is a program based on the assumption that effective change consists of a focus on the individual school, clinical methods of teacher development, and improved school management. An evaluation of this program by collecting data through classroom observation; semi structured interviews with project administrators, teachers and parents; informal interviews with project manager’s staff and teachers; surveys of teachers of parents; and pupil tests has shown that on the overall, the program was found to be highly successful. However, it was also recommended that the program need to ensure that professional development strategies remain in place, improve the cost effectiveness of clinical staff development, and provide more focused training of head teachers. The emphasis on individual schools and child – centered learning were effective. In addition, the new teaching strategies did not lead to lower standards of student attainment and facilitate student’s development of non-cognitive and social skills. (Kenya Education Portal).

To sum up the whole idea, the above listed countries have been positioned better in SIP implementation in their respective countries. This is therefore; our country Ethiopia can import a lot lesson from the experience and practices as long as effective school improvement program is concerned.

2.11. Practices of School Improvement Program

In Ethiopia with the intension of improving the quality of education, much effort has been exerted. For instance, during supervision of the program many efforts were made to assess the experience of the best promoting school with in the country and experiences of other countries. Different guidelines and frameworks were developed and awareness raising training was conducted at different level (MOE, 2007:47).

Thus the secondary schools are expected to successfully implement the school improvement program. However, SIP is a very wide spread phenomenon and a wide variety of improvement efforts can be found. School effectiveness and school improvement should use knowledge based
management and be directed to the application of this knowledge as focused intervention, emphasizing implementation, emphasis outcomes and evaluation techniques to practice school improvement program.

**Implementation in the first year:** preparation of the school improvement unit decides how to implement and guide the frame work. The school improvement committees and all stakeholders of the school will help for implementation of the framework and the school preparation; collect evidences regarding the school domains making system survey: regarding the current school work efficiency assess the views of stakeholders (students, parents and teachers). It is duties which school engage feedback regarding the four domains of schools using survey then decide and reach an agreement by investigating the collected data for school work efficiency. The key stakeholders (teachers, students and parents) should participate in the annual school evaluation. In this respect the school improvement framework implementation will relate with teaching & learning activities; and prepare plan of the school, the improvement unit using the result of evaluation will prepare plan for three years and annual plans respectively. The plan incorporates goals of objectives and priorities of the activities.

**Implementation of the school plan:** implementing the plan will start when the school improvement committee is believed that the plan prepared is ready for implementation. This means that using feedback transfer from the previous plan and the new improved plan, follow-up and controls the committee itself and other stakeholders will make followed up and control the system. And then the school improvement committee will present the annual report for the school community and for the responsible bodies. Implementation in the second year: - schools will evaluate their improvement regarding the goal sets and priorities differentiate where there are new priorities, select where there are standards which are not evaluated, lastly the committee will report the progress of the SIP.

Implementation of the third year: - schools will control then improvement through evaluation. Implementation of strategic plan will continue and making follow up then conduct evaluation. Schools activities and results will be evaluated and provided feedback by out of school unit using the concrete evidences of the schools by identifying their strengths as well as weaknesses then recommendation will be forwarded and feedback will be reported to the school (MOE, 1998:6).
2.12. Challenges for School Improvement Program

As school improvement manual (MOE, 2007:2-3) states about the obstacles of SIP implementation that includes lack of commitment to depart from traditional practices, absence of responsible and organized effort at all levels which could direct and monitor the program implementation, shortage of training, lack of initiative and good look on the part of some teachers and school leaders, absence of awareness creations among stakeholders and absence of clearly stated role about the participation level of each stakeholders. Similarly, Harris in Hopkins (2002:19) has noted difficult to change school management arrangement and working culture as challenge to SIP in developing countries. In our case here in Ethiopia, school improvement was challenged by lack of necessary input, lack of commitment, low level of motivation, poor leadership and so on are the expected challenges in the implementation of school improvement program.

School improvement program is very complex that might be hindered by various impediments that challenge the implementation (Stoll and Fink, 1996). These challenges include: “complexity of the program, mobility of teachers and principals, coordination problems (ineffectiveness of leadership) and sustaining commitment, low support from top level officials and lack of involvement of the stakeholders”.

According to Hussen and Postethwore (1994), Challenges to the school improvement may vary in accordance with the variations with the unique features of schools as well as with the external environment in which schools are operating. One simple example, the size of the school is associated with innovative behavior for that smaller schools apparently lack their sources to engage in significant change. However, there are common challenges that most school improvement programs facing. These are lack of schedules in schools that permit teachers to meet and work together for sustained periods of time, the demanding nature of teachers work as an increasing number of students arrive at school are being less “well-socialized” and less prepared to deal with materials, and more frequently from family settings that are not supportive, the aging and often demoralization of teachers due to declining resources, increasing levels of bureaucratization and the rapid and frequent demands for change that come from central authorities.

In addition, an organizational structure with in which teacher’s “the work is less autonomous and more integrated with that of other teachers” that affects the development of commitment to change. Moreover, the continues transfer of teachers, principals and educational administrators at the local
level puts pressure on the program to continuously train new staff who may not serve in schools for long (Plan International Sudan, 2006). Duffie and Balkon in Marzano (2003), also suggest that, in South Africa the initiatives of SIP was faced by lack of material resources, limited capacity of educational leaders, poor participation and lack of safe environment. Similarly, Harris (in Hopkins, 2002) has noted that the difficulty to change school management and working culture as a problem to the SIP in developing country.

In Supporting this, Havelock and Huberman (as cited in Rondinelli et al., 1990), described that promoting change is difficult under any circumstance, but it is especially challenging in developing countries with uncertain and unstable economic, social and political condition. Most developing countries lack the physical infrastructure and experienced and skilled professionals in order to ensure successful results.

In Ethiopia, the commitment of the country to improve access to education, the school improvement program has launched aiming at improving the quality of education through enhancing student learning achievement and outcomes (MOE, 2007). Hence, student achievement is a reason for any educational change. Unfortunately, because of the process of translating policy in to practice is so difficult to achieve. That is why, the implementing of school improvement program is challenging. Here under major challenges that seriously affects the implementation of school improvement program are:

2.12.1 Commitment of School Leaders
Most of the school principal who are in the leading position did not get adequate educational training on leadership. Even those who are trained do not have adequate knowledge and skill in leading the school. Due to this reason, they lack the ability to design vision and coordinate the school community so as to lead for the attainment of the goals (MOE, 2007).

2.12.2 Stakeholders Participation
Schools needs participation of all stakeholder in school plan (strategic and annual plan), but most of the time school plan is prepared by school principals. Therefore, the school mission and vision is not visible to all stakeholders and the intended student’s outcome and ethical centered activities are not achieved without participation of stakeholder (MOE, 2007).

2.12.3 Conducive Environment in School
If students feel safe they attend their schooling with interest. So, schools should be conducive for all students (male and female) ethical improvement and academic achievement. Therefore, schools
should be prepared based on the needs and interest of students and secured their school environment (MOE, 2007).

2.12.4 Educational Input
Due to the lack of commitment of the school community, other stakeholder and non-government organizations are not enough to solve the problem of the schools by providing instructional materials and other financial supporting. Besides, most of the current schools lack the required educational inputs (MOE 2007).

2.13 The School Improvement Program Initiatives in Ethiopia
In Ethiopia, with the intention to improve the quality of education, much effort has been exerted. Due to a great effort made to implement the education and training policy, various promising results were registered. For instance, during the first stage/beginning of the program many efforts were made to assess the experience of the best promoting schools within the country and the experience of the other countries. Different guidelines and frameworks were developed but, still there are problems related to access, quality, equity, relevance as well as leadership and management that require critical interventions, if the education is to be an instrument for the realization of the goals set by the ministry of education.

Accordingly, the MoE has developed the six general education quality improvement package (GEQIP) such as school improvement program (SIP), teacher development program (TDP), school management and school leadership, civic and ethical education program, curriculum improvement program and information communication technology (ICT) program. School improvement initiatives have developed as strategies to the strong government commitment to improve the quality of general education at all levels. Hence, the implication is that Ethiopia is to meet its EFL and MGD enrolment and completion targets, the quality of schooling must improve through employing different innovation strategies and the ministry of education, in collaboration with Regional Education Bureaus, to ensure the equitable provision of quality education (MoE, 2007).

Awareness raising training was conducted at different level (MoE, 2007). However, school improvement program is a very widespread phenomenon and a wide variety of improvement efforts can be created. To be of any importance for school effectiveness, school improvement should use the school effectiveness knowledge base, and be directed to the application of this knowledge as a focused intervention, emphasizing implementation, emphasis outcome, and
evaluation techniques to practices school improvement program. As already noted, though, significant improvement like access to education has been occurred. Different evaluations on the implementation of education sector development program have shown that Ethiopia made significant progress in education as a result of ESDP I II and III (MoE, 2005). As to the document, challenges are faced and lessons are learned at different levels of the implementation. MoE (2010) also points out that access at all levels of the education system increased at a rapid rate in line with a sharp increase in the number of teachers, schools and institutions.


CHAPTER THREE

3 The Research Design and Methodology

In this chapter, the method of the research design, source of data, sample and sampling techniques, data gathering instruments, data collection procedure and method of data analysis are intensively presented.

3.1 The Research Method

The method of the study was mixed. The quantitative method supported by qualitative approach and the research design will be descriptive in nature. Descriptive research design had been employed. The method is selected as an appropriate method to carry out the study as a whole (Best and Kahn, 1998). Accordingly, quantitative and qualitative approach will be employed throughout the study. In line with this, Bryman (1984) describes that the problem under investigation properly dictates the method of investigation.

Employing mixed approach enables the researcher to look from different perspectives and the context based practice from participants view. This method will be chosen with the assumption that helps to have data as it exists and to gather several information related to the problem under study. In support of this method, Sharma (2000:148) stated that descriptive survey method is appropriate to gather data from a relatively large number of cases at a particular time. In addition, descriptive survey methods are direct sources of valuable knowledge concerning issues related to the study.

Having both qualitative and quantitative data together provides a better understanding of the issue under investigation. This approach enables, encourages, and promotes each participant to reflect their views in their own words qualitatively and help them as stand point to answer with closed and structured questions quantitatively. The view they express is their hopes and concerns are important aspects of the inquiry and provide for a richer data set and a way of ensuring that they tell their own understanding rather than fitting their experience in a preconceived questionnaire only.
3.2 Sources of Data

Both primary and secondary sources of data were used. Based on the above assumptions, secondary school teachers, school principals and vice principals, secondary school supervisors, Sub-city as well as Woreda Education Office SIP focal person, School improvement committee parents and students from the members of school improvement committees in Addis ketema Sub-city will be considered as major sources of the primary data. Other essential secondary sources included in this study will be: school improvement related documents such as school strategic plan, report documents, school improvement manuals, laboratories, library, and ICT rooms. Besides, relevant books, academic journals, proceedings, articles contributed by deferent authors, internet based information which contains relevant information related to the subject under the study, policy documents, records and the like will be consulted thoroughly.

3.3 Sample and Sampling Techniques

There are 10 (ten) sub-cities in Addis Ababa City Administration. From these sub-cities, Addis Ketema Sub-City was selected using purposive sampling technique. Alternatively, purposive sampling method may prove to be effective when only homogenous sampling population and limited numbers of Sub-cities can serve as primary data sources due to the nature of research design and aims and objectives. Second, it was difficult and unmanageable to conduct a research on all of these sub-cities at a time.

According to the Addis Ababa Education Bureau statistics of the year 2015. There are five government secondary schools in Addis Ketema Sub-city. For the purpose of this study, sample schools were selected from government secondary schools. Out of the total government secondary schools 3 (60%) schools were selected on the basis of simple random sampling techniques. Simple random sampling gives each units of the population equal opportunity of being selected (Seyoum and Ayalew, 1989).
Table 1 Sample Schools and Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sample Schools</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Sample respondents</th>
<th>In (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Addis Ketemapreparatory School</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Heads</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dilachin secondary school</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Heads</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yekatit 23 secondary school</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Heads</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Heads</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Regarding the sample within the schools, Merriam (1998) asserts that since generalization in a statistical sense is not a goal of mixed research. The researcher arranged the sample individuals within the school based on the following attributes such as commitment of time (agreed to participate in the study), academic background (data collection is limited to few participants within the school), hence, their selection is based on field of study, experience (teachers and principals relatively having a better work experience will be selected), and gender (mixed sex oriented).

Teachers were selected using random sampling technique, which gives each of them an equal chance of being included in the study. Regarding school leaders (one main and three deputy principals in each sample schools, availability sampling techniques will be used. Accordingly, 87 teachers and 36 school leaders (12 principals and 24 department heads as school leaders) were
selected and participated in the study. The number of participants involved in the study and sampling proportion was statistically representative and adequate to the analysis as well as to make the inference. Besides, Sub-city as well as Woreda Education Office SIP focal person, School improvement committees’ parents and students from the members of school improvement committees will be treated on the basis of the following data collection techniques:

1. Three independent focus group discussions were held from three sample secondary schools. The FGDs was composed of School improvement committees’ PTA’s, Secondary school supervisors and students from the members of school improvement committees
2. Three two sub-city SIP focal persons were interviewed to provide necessary information for the research.
3. It is very important for this study to keep verity of sex and field of studies from all dimensions of the participants will be taken in to account.

3.4 Instruments of Data Collection

The data will be collected from primary sources through Questionnaire, FGDs, Interview and observation checklist which enable the researcher to gain first hand and genuine information. The checklist and the researcher note book will be used during observation on site (within the school compound) such as classrooms, libraries, science laboratories, ICT labs and the like. This is therefore; Questionnaire, FGDs, Interview and Observation Checklist will be the major data gathering tools.

3.4.1 Questionnaire

The questionnaire was used to collect data from the teachers and school leaders. The questionnaire consisted of both close and open ended questions. Due to this, four pages well-articulated questions prepared and used to collect pertinent information about the implementation of school improvement program and the practices, challenges and opportunities in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city. The questionnaire items was prepared in English and then translated in to Amharic language which is known to be the working language of the Addis Ababa city in general and for Addis Ketema Sub city in particular. Translation of language in to the working language helps to avoid communication and misunderstanding of the essence of the questions. The questionnaire has four sections. The first section includes the bio data of respondents, the second
section deals with the implementation of school improvement program, the third section presents the practices, problems as well as opportunities during the SIP implementation, and the last section was an open ended question that focuses on additional information other than mention in the above sections in these sample secondary schools. The total number of items included in the questionnaire was thirty-two. The respondents provided with 130 questionnaires (both close & open ended), 94 to teachers and 36 for principals and department heads as school leaders.

**3.4.2 Focus Group Discussion (FGDs)**

In order to gather relevant and adequate information needed for this research FGDs guide list will be prepared. The checklist has pertinent guiding questions. The questions focused on the implementation of school improvement program and the practices, challenges and opportunities in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city. Creswell, & Plano, (2011) suggests that FGD is very useful to understand issues with consensus among the participants within the group. On the other hand, data collection through focus group discussion so as to make the research more relevant and support the findings. In the course of this study, 3 FGDs sessions were conducted separately and a total of 18 Educational stakeholders were actively participated.

**3.4.3 Interview**

Semi structured interview which is the most common type of interview in social research (Dawson, 2002) will be used to collect data because this process allows the researcher to gain insights into others perspectives about the phenomenon under study and it is particularly useful for ascertaining respondent’s thoughts, perceptions, feelings, and retrospectives account of events. Marriam (1996) further explained that “interviewing is necessary when we cannot observe behavior, feelings, or how people interpret the word around them.

This is therefore; six independent and in-depth interviews were conducted with Wereda and Sub-city SIP focal persons.
3.4.4 Observation

Observation checklist was another data gathering tool that helps the researcher as an eye witnesses to the situation. The major points observed by the researcher during the survey period was, Cleanliness of the school, Space for school expansion, Availability of different services, Availability of notice board, Laboratories with adequate equipment’s, Libraries with adequate reference materials, First aid facilities, co-curricular and ICT, Staff rooms, staff launch and meeting hall, Latrines based on sex placement both for staffs and pupils, Counseling and guidance service, Availability of attendance format, Lesson plan and so on.

In addition, observation can help to consolidate the research with different techniques and to know what the situations look like in real life practices of the school system.

3.4.5 Document Analysis

Various documentary sources were included in the study. School improvement related documents such as school strategic plan, report documents, school improvement manuals, laboratories, library, and ICT rooms. Besides, relevant books, academic journals, proceedings, articles contributed by deferent authors, internet based information which contains relevant information related to the subject under the study, policy documents, records and the like will be consulted thoroughly.

3.5 Procedures of Data Collection

In order to gather the necessary data three groups of respondents actively involved in the study. To this effect, different data collection instruments were developed by the researcher based on the review of related literatures. School leaders and teachers in one hand were treated through questionnaire and a group of different stakeholders were treated through focus group discussion, and interview. Besides, observation was also intensively used throughout the study. The rationale behind selecting such variety respondents is perhaps to consolidate the reliability of information.

Obtaining the necessary information related to the subject under investigation is the first thing to achieve concrete findings and arriving at certain and relevant conclusion. Furthermore, pilot testing was conducted in two non-sample schools separately outside the sub city and able to obtain feedbacks from stakeholders. School leaders, teachers and department heads was involved in the
pre-test sessions as prime stakeholders of the school system. In addition, comments on validity and clarity of the proposed data collection tools will receive from the academic advisor. And then efforts were made to improve the data collection instrument based on the comment suggested by the academic advisor. Various documents pertaining to the issues of school improvement program in secondary schools will carefully investigated and discussed during the course of the survey period. Once finalizing all these activities, the data collection and data analysis will be undertaken according to the intended principles of the standard research undertakings.

In line with this, Bryman (1984) describes that the problem under investigation properly dictates the method of analysis. Using a single method of data analysis creates a significant limitation while interpreting the data. This is therefore; the focus of this research will be mixed where the two set of data’s treated equally rather than statistical analysis and fitting their experience in a preconceived questionnaire only.

3.6 Method of Data Analysis

In order to analyze the data gathered through different data collection tools and sources, the researcher first tallied, structured, organized and systematically framed the raw data collected from the field using tables. All the closed-ended questions of the questionnaire were quantitatively described by using Statistical Package for Social Science SPSS (frequency distribution, percentages, mean value, standard deviation) on the basis of response of the respondents together with descriptive statement, whereas data collected through open-ended questions of the questionnaire, interview and focus group discussion was analyzed qualitatively (Creswell.J. 2008). The qualitative data was analyzed by summarizing, producing cluster of texts with similar meanings, often searching for the central themes capturing the essences of the words of the interviewees, focus group discussion (FGDs) and results of observations to substantiate the findings obtained through questionnaire.

Both Agreement scale and Likert scale was applied and mean score for each statement was computed by using numeric scale, where values, very high, High, medium, Low, very low for Likert scale items and strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree for the later scale items respectively. The five-point scale of the alternatives represents a score of one being the lowest possible score and number five being the highest possible score for positive statements of
satisfaction from the list provided.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

Above all the student researcher try to conduct the study based on professional as well as the basic principles of research. The researcher will, as been identified or presented the respondents personal details and response without their consent and agreement. Ethical issues grouped into informed consent procedures, dishonesty, confidentiality towards participants or sponsors and protecting the anonymity and privacy of research participants (Sarantakos, 2005). Based on the basic principles, the researcher proposes a set of ethical and moral procedure and informed the participants just before in depth interview, focus group discussion and filling out the questionnaire. The participants will have informed that information obtained from them remain confidential. Besides the respondents further informed that their names will not be written or exposed on report and will ever be used in connection with any of the information they reveal.

The researcher was conveying the purpose of the study to the proposed respondents as per standard research requirements. The researcher will avoid deceptive practices, and respect indigenous cultures as well as discloses sensitive information. In sum, the researcher tried to be honest, genuine and free from unnecessary bias as long as problem solving and relevant research undertaking is concerned.

3.7.1 Validity and Reliability

Checking the validity and reliability of data collecting instruments before providing to the actual study subject is the core to assure the quality of the data (Yalew, 1998). To ensure validity of instruments, initially the instrument was prepared by the researcher with guidance from the advisor. The questionnaires were pilot tested at one government secondary school that was from the same sub city. Consequently, 6 School leaders, 12 teachers and 4 department head were also participated.
CHAPTER FOUR

4. PRESENTATION ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter has two parts: the first part deals with the characteristics of the respondents and the second part presents the analysis and interpretation of the main data. Objective of this study is to investigate the Implementation of School Improvement Program and Analysis of Practices, Challenges and Opportunities in Secondary Schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city, Addis Ababa City administration. To this end, both quantitative and qualitative data obtained through questionnaire, individual interviews and focus group discussion (FGDs) were used to answer the basic research questions. Besides, observation checklist also used in order to get insight about the whole picture of the sample schools.

For the consumption of this study, three groups of respondents were involved such as School Leaders, teachers on one hand, Sub-city SIP focal persons on the other hand and SIP improvement Committee, Parents-Teachers Associations and Students, were approached from the sampled secondary schools of Addis Ketema sub-city. A total of 130 questionnaires were distributed to a sample of three secondary school leaders and teachers respectively.

The rationales behind selecting such a variety respondent were perhaps to consolidate the reliability of information. The total sample population actually involved in the study was 123. Accordingly, 87 (70.73%) teachers and 36 (29.26%) school leaders were sample respondents of the study. Document analysis (lesson plans, statistical information) was made. Based on the data collected, analysis and interpretation are presented as follows:
Table 4.1 Characteristic of the Respondents

The following table presents respondents characteristics and deals with their sex, age, qualification, experience as well professional trainings the respondents took.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Type of respondents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers (N=87)</td>
<td>School Leaders (N=36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88.51</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48.27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51&amp;above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.A/BSC</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75.86</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A &amp; Above</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item one of table 1 shows that of the respondents, 77 (88.51%) of the teachers were males and 10 (11.49%) were females. Whereas 27 (70.27%) of school leaders were males and 9 (29.73%) of them were females. The above data indicates that females, let alone occupy managerial positions, their participation at school level is reasonably significant comparing to the previous trend. But, the proportion of female teachers and school leaders in the sample secondary school is
significantly less to that of male counterparts. This could be an indicator of less participation rate of female teaches as well as students at high school. Gender inequality is also observed in the sample secondary school and attention must be given to females in all aspects of the activities as long as the role of women’s are concerned and their contribution to the overall activities of education. Besides, this may possibly reveal that the number of females was very low. Hence, it needs effort to qualify and empower them in every aspect.

As can be observed from the above table of item two, only 5 (5.74%) of teachers and 1 (5.40) school leaders were above the age of 51 years while 33 (37.93%) of teachers and 8 (12.16 %) of school leaders were in the age of 41-50 years. Besides, the majority 42 (48.27%) of teachers and 16 (59.45%) of school leaders were in the age of 31-40 years. The above figure clearly shows that most of the school leaders and teachers were in the age of 31-40 years. Moreover, majority of school based supervisors and teachers were relatively energetic, matured and fit to take responsibilities. Having reasonably matured age significantly impacts on learner’s education because these people are ready and fit to take responsibilities as per needed. Consequently, this attempt may result with better performance of SIP implementation.

As to item 3 of the same table, only 7 (19.44%) of school leaders and 21 (24.14%) of teachers has second degree whereas, 66 (75.86%) of teachers and 29 (80.56%) of school leaders have first degree. From this result one can realize that significant number of teachers has fulfilled the minimum requirement of qualification needed at secondary school level, at least first degree. The low level of teachers and school leaders in academic qualification yields poor and unscientific management practices specifically from school leaders’ side and ineffective teaching-learning process from teaching personnel’s.
Characteristic of the Respondents (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Teachers (N=87)</th>
<th>School Leaders (N36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Service year</td>
<td>Below 10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 &amp; Above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Do you ever take any training on SIP?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data

Regarding item 4, as shown in the table above, 40 (45.97%) of teachers and 17 (47.22%) of school leaders were fall between 11-20 years of service and 11 (12.64%) of teachers and 14 (38.88%) of school leaders were fall between 21-30 years of service. Contrariwise, 33 (37.93%) of teachers and 5 (13.38%) school leaders were found below 10 years of service. Only 3 (3.44%) of teachers were found to have more than 31 years of experience. In general, the data illustrates that most of the teachers and school leaders have reasonably adequate experiences to carry out responsibility and to provide sufficient information about what is going on in their perspective schools and this may possibly imply that the principals and the education officers had better experience to help the schools in SIP implementation.

In item 5 of Table 4.1 respondents were requested about training taken directly related to SIP. Accordingly, a significant number of teachers 31 (35.64%) and the majority of school leaders 17
(47.22%) replied that they were taken short term training related to SIP. Conversely, the majority 56 (64.36%) of school leaders and 19 (52.77%) were not taken any kind of training about the SIP. It would therefore, be possible to infer that teachers with absence or limited training on SIP would face challenges on implementing learning and teaching domain which may ultimately hinder the smooth operation of SIP implementation in general and failed to realize its objectives as per needed and lack of training on SIP issues might affect SIP implementation process in secondary schools of study area.

**Table 4.2 SIP Implementation versus Teaching and Learning Domain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N / 0</th>
<th>Items/Issues</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>School Leaders</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SL</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proper implementation of continuous assessment in the school.</td>
<td>23 37 17 10</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>10 16 4 2</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Functional laboratories and instructional media to motivate practical</td>
<td>27 33 8 16</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>14 14 6 2</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teaching and learning process found in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Active participation of students in school clubs.</td>
<td>20 25 22 17</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>20 12 4</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Data

As shown in item 1 of table 3, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on the proper implementation of continuous assessment in the school. Accordingly, teachers with the (X=3.84, SD=1.27) were positive about the issue and school leaders with the (X=3.74, SD=0.92) were agreed that their school properly underway the implementation of continuous assessment. The majority of respondents agreed with the proper implementation of continuous assessment in their
school. This is, therefore, it can be said that both teachers and school leaders were relatively satisfied with the issue raised and it should be understood that continuous assessment is considered as an integral part of the learning process. In line with this Harris, 1996 (as cited in BEN-E, 2010) reflects that, ongoing assessment of student performance can provide teachers with the information they need to improve student learning.

With regards to item 2 of table 2, one of the questions raised to respondents about functional laboratories and instructional media to motivate practical teaching and learning process found in the school. Accordingly, teachers with the (X=3.74, SD=1.12) and school leaders with the (X=3.59, SD=1.18) were agreed about the functionality of laboratories and instructional media to motivate practical learning process in their perspective schools. Therefore, based on the majority of teachers as well as school leaders’ response, it is possible to conclude that respondents were confirmed that laboratories, instructional medias were functional and motivates practical teaching-learning process.

Item 3 of Table 2 of respondents were asked about active participation of students in school clubs. Accordingly, teachers with (X=3.59, SD=0.71) and school leaders (X=3.83, SD=1.12) mean scores respectively. In this regard, both respondents agreed that student are well participated in school clubs. From this one can concluded that respondents in the study area were agreed and student’s participation in school clubs is found in a good status.

In one of such explanations all of my discussants both from interview as well as focus group discussions had given the following account:

```
......SIP implementation can help in the realization of its objectives, but the main problem was on the school leadership and school SIP committee in playing their important role.”

INT #3 July 2016

...... there was no hesitation that SIP implementation helped in the realization of its objectives. The main point was how much all the concerned bodies and stakeholders contributed for the implementation of SIP as much as required.”
```

```
INT #3 July 2016
```
Interview sessions were held with Sub-City Education Office SIP Focal Persons. Respondents were asked whether or not their office assigned SIP focal person to secondary schools. Accordingly, the following account has been offered by one of the study participant.

.....Much has been done for SIP implementation and this helped in the realization of its objectives even though it didn’t succeed as much as expected. But, the officer argued that the schools should encourage all stakeholders to contribute their idea, experiences and best efforts for successful implementation of SIP and permanent focal persons are assigned........

INT #1, 2,&3  July 2016

Regarding the periodic evaluation of the curriculum by the teachers on table 2 item 4. Accordingly, teachers with the (X=3.19, SD=0.92) and school leaders (X=3.55, SD=1.29) mean and SD scores respectively. Both teachers as well as school leaders were sure about the issue raised above. From the above result one can possibly have concluded that periodic evaluation of
the curriculum by the teachers is relatively well practiced in the sample secondary schools. Besides, as to the above figure there is no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding the practice and teachers’ effort for curriculum evaluation.

Regard to item 5 of Table 2, respondents was asked to rate their agreement about teachers support to pupil’s classroom participation. Accordingly, teachers with the (X=3.02, SD=0.84) and school leaders with the (X=4.00, SD=1.25) were strongly agreed and sure about the issue raised. Based on the above result one can have concluded that teachers were strongly facilitated pupils’ classroom participation. Furthermore, there was no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding the issue raised above

Table 4.3 Practices of Learning Environment Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items/Issues</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>School Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The school has library with recent reference materials.</td>
<td>46 24 5 12 -</td>
<td>18 12 6 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Appropriate physical environment (safe, stable and positive atmosphere) in School compound.</td>
<td>8 10 19 25 25</td>
<td>4 8 12 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clear rules and policies of the school that are communicated by the school Community.</td>
<td>16 30 20 14 7</td>
<td>10 16 2 4 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the first item of table 3, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels about the availability of library with recent reference materials in these sample secondary schools. Accordingly, with the \((X=4.19, \text{SD}=0.76)\) and \((X=4.33, \text{SD}=1.05)\) teachers and school leaders based respectively. From the above figure one can concluded that the sample schools were well equipped with libraries with recent reference materials and there is no significance difference as well as great variation among the opinions of the two groups regarding the issue raised above.

As Table 3 item 2 indicates, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on the appropriateness of the physical environment (safe, stable and positive atmosphere) of the School compound. Consequently, teachers and school leaders with the \((X=2.42, \text{SD}=1.31)\) and \((X=2.72, \text{SD}=1.27)\) respectively. Thus, it can be concluded that these sample secondary schools’ physical environment were moderately appropriate to undertake effective teaching-learning process. Besides, having safe, stable and conducive atmosphere within the school environment defiantly calls for the delivery of effective learning and contribute the proper implementation of SIP as well.

Similarly, the result from interview indicates school environment were conducive and safe, no harassment besides during document analysis, there was minute in which they discussed about peacefulness of school compound.

```
......this showed that the school leadership was a key person to make school compound conducive and participatory for successfullness of SIP. From the discussion the researcher observed that there was a good attempt of the school leader who tried to make the school environment conducive and participatory....... INT # 1 & 3 July 2016
```

In line with this idea, one of the participant from the FGDs discussion underlined that “schools have limited resources and capacity. So, it is difficult for schools to put the necessary supportive conditions to implement SIP and this pull back SIP implementation.” But, two of the sub-city a education officers replied that “schools have shortage of capacity in mobilizing the resource but not inadequacy of resources to allocate for SIP implementation.” And similarly from the responses of the interviewees it may possible to say that the supportive conditions hadn’t adequately put in place at school level for SIP implementation.
As indicated in item 3 of the above table, teachers and school leaders were asked to rate their level of agreement about the rules and policies of the school that are communicated by the school community. Accordingly, with the \( (X=3.58, \ SD=1.32) \) and \( (X=3.66, \ SD=1.12) \) mean and SD scores respectively. This is, therefore, it is possible to conclude that these sample secondary schools have well organized school policy and regulations. Besides, there is no great variation as well as significance difference among the opinions of the two groups regarding the issue raised above.

**Practices of Learning Environment Domain (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Items/Issues</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequate teaching-learning materials found in the school.</td>
<td>Teachers:</td>
<td>School Leaders:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: 3.28</td>
<td>X: 3.66, SL: 1.35, T:1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SL: 1.35</td>
<td>T: 1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Access to standard latrines based on sex placement both for staffs and pupils.</td>
<td>Teachers:</td>
<td>School Leaders:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: 3.56</td>
<td>X: 4.05, SL: 1.30, T: 0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SL: 1.30</td>
<td>T: 0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Healthy as well as friendly relationship among all members of the school community.</td>
<td>Teachers:</td>
<td>School Leaders:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: 3.79</td>
<td>X: 3.55, SL: 1.20, T: 1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SL: 1.20</td>
<td>T: 1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be observed from Table 3 item 4, respondents were asked to rate their agreement levels on the availability of teaching-learning materials found in these sample secondary schools. Accordingly, with the \( (X=3.28, \ SD=1.02) \) and \( (X=3.66, \ SD=1.35) \) mean and SD scores respectively. Therefore, it can be concluded that these sample schools were well equipped with teaching-learning materials and satisfactory as well. Besides, there was no great variation and significance difference among the opinions of the two groups regarding the issue raised.
With regard to item 5 of table 3, question raised for respondents to rate their level of agreement about access to standard latrines based on sex placement both for staffs and pupils in these sample secondary schools. Accordingly, with the $(X=3.56, \text{SD}=0.99)$ and $(X=4.05, \text{SD}=1.30)$ mean and SD scores respectively. Thus, one can possibly conclude that access to standard latrines based on sex placement for staffs were satisfactory in the sample secondary schools. Here again, there was no great variation among respondent and no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding the issue raised.

With regard to item 6 of table 3, question raised for respondents to rate their level of agreement about healthy as well as friendly relationship among all members of the school community in these sample secondary schools. Accordingly, with the $(X=3.79, \text{SD}=1.19)$ and $(X=3.55, \text{SD}=1.20)$ mean and SD scores respectively. Thus, one can possibly conclude that the relationship among all members of the school community were healthy, friendly as well as satisfactory in the sample secondary schools. Here again, there was no great variation among respondent and no significance difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding the issue raised.

**Table 4.4 Leadership versus Management Domain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N / 0</th>
<th>Items/Issues</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>School Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shared Vision, Mission, Objectives and Goals to improve student learning.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>School management commitment for high student achievement.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As it can be observed from the above table for item 1, teachers and school leaders were asked whether or not shared vision, mission, objectives and goals are important to improve student learning. Accordingly, teachers with the (X=2.91, SD=1.33) and school leaders (X=3.61, SD=1.28) mean and SD scores respectively. This is, therefore, one can possibly conclude that the vision, mission, objectives and goals were very helpful to improve students’ learning in these sample secondary schools. There was a moderate variation among respondents and also there was relative difference between the opinions of the two groups regarding the issue raised. Two of the FGD participant offered the following account:

......agreed that leadership experience to realize shared vision, leadership dedication for SIP implementation and experience of good practices to promote transparency had been worked better in their school........

FGD # 3 July 2016

As depicted in Table of 4 items 2, teachers and school based leaders were asked about school management commitment for high student achievement. Accordingly, (X=3.35, SD=0.93) and school leaders with (X=3.94, SD=1.28) mean and SD scores respectively. Based on the above result one can conclude that school management commitment to student achievement was very remarkable and they strive to help students to become high achievers. Besides, the figure clearly indicates that there was no great variation and significance difference between the opinions of school leaders as well as teachers.

In the course of my discussion with Interview 1&3, they offered the following account

......Furthermore, interview was held with principals, PTA chairpersons and sub city education officers on this issue. According to one of the principals, “schools have experienced SIP implementation and this helped the realization of its objectives.......
Besides,

……He also added that the extent to which implementation of SIP helped in the realization of its objectives was still at medium level and need to work hard for better achievement”……..

And

……Another principal said that “schools have been started to give emphasis for SIP implementation and this supported the realization of its objectives in a way that students’ academic achievement showed certain improvement.”……..

INT #1,2& 3 July 2016

As to Table 4 of item 3 indicate that teachers and school leaders were asked about the consistency in implementation of school activities in their schools. Accordingly, teachers with the (X=2.73, SD=1.30) and school leaders (X=3.22, SD=1.39) mean and SD scores respectively. This is therefore, based on the above figure one can be said that teachers as well as school leaders consistently undertake the school activities in their perspective schools and they pay attention to implement the expected school tasks as per needed.

Leadership versus Management Domain. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N / 0</th>
<th>Items/Issues</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strong community mobilization for SIP support.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Practices of effective regular communication with all stake holders.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated on table 4, item 4, further question also raised for respondents to rate their agreement about the community mobilization for SIP support. Accordingly, both teachers and school leaders with (X=3.67, SD=1.18) and (X=3.88, SD=1.11) mean and SD scores respectively. The majority of respondents agreed on the point and it can be said that both teachers and school leaders’ involvement in community mobilization for SIP is very high and practiced in these sample secondary schools. Besides, this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of school leaders and teachers and no great variation.

As it can be seen in Table 4 of item 5 respondents were asked about the practices of effective regular communication with all stakeholders. Accordingly, with (X=3.24, SD=1.00) and (X=3.52, SD=1.32) respectively. Thus, based on the above figure and it is possibly to conclude that, the majority of both teachers as well as school leaders there is quite effective practices of communication with all concerned bodies in regular basis. Besides, there was no great variation among respondents and this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of supervisors and teachers.

As shown in the above Table of item 6 respondents were asked about continuous follow up, monitoring and support of student learning in the school. Accordingly, teachers with (X=3.63, SD=1.99) and school leaders (X=4.05, SD=1.05) mean and SD scores respectively. From the above result it is possible to conclude that the continuous follow up, monitoring as well as student learning in these secondary schools were very high and periodically implemented. Besides, the above figure indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of school leaders and teachers and relatively less variation as well.
The following excerpt is from what have been raised by FGD participants were:

......after the government launched SIP the parents and entire community got more opportunity to discuss on school improvement issues. So, this helped to made schools’ management a little bit decentralized……..

Besides

......He also added that previously they were wanted only for financial contribution. Generally, from the themes of responses of the interviewees it may possibly imply that the SIP implementation helped in the realization of its objectives……..

INT# 2 & 3 July 2016

As it can be seen in Table 4 of item 7 respondents were asked about whether the supervisors carry out classroom supervision periodically or not. Accordingly, with (X=2.91, SD=1.33) and (X=3.61, SD=1.28) respectively. Thus, based on the above figure and it is possibly concluded that, supervisors periodically conducted classroom supervision and offer feedback to teachers in the spot and that will be a sound input to teachers all and enables the school to perform better. Besides, there was no great variation among respondents and this indicates that there is no significance difference between the opinions of school leaders and teachers on the issue raised.

Table 4.5 Community Participation Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Items/Issues</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>School Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parent as PTA members actively participate in the school improvement programs.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parents have provided comments up on their children’s learning.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As it is indicated on item 1 of table 5, respondents were also asked whether or not parent as PTA members actively participate in the school improvement programs. Accordingly, with (X=2.41, SD=1.43) and (X=2.77, SD=1.09) mean and SD scores respectively. A significant number of the study participant agreed that parents are actively participated as PTA members in these sample secondary schools. This implies that a significant number of respondents agreed with the issue and confirmed that parents are moderately willing to participate and contribute what has been expected from them. Furthermore, there was no significance difference between the opinions of the study participant.

In the above table of item 2, respondents were asked whether or not parents have provided comments up on their children’s learning. Accordingly, with (X=2.44, SD=1.47) and (X=2.94, SD=1.32) respectively. Here again a significant number of respondents agreed that parents have provided comments in all aspects of their children’s learning periodically and that would create a conducive teaching-learning environment as well as helps the learners to perform better. Besides, there was a slight variation among respondents on the issue raised and it indicates that there is less difference between the opinions of supervisors and teachers as well.

As presented in Table 5 of item 3, teachers and school leaders were asked about the participation of all stakeholders in the decision making on their children as well as other school issues. Accordingly, with (X=3.63, SD=0.96) and(X=3.88, SD=0.98) mean and SD scores respectively. The majority of the respondents agreed on the point raised above. Thus, it is possible to conclude that stakeholder’s participation in decision making process as well as other school based issues were very high. Furthermore, there was no significance difference between the opinions of the study participant and great variation as well.

Similarly, all FGDs 1, 2 and 3 offer the following account:

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3 | All stakeholders are involved in decision making on their children as well as other school issues. | 16 | 19 | 18 | 21 | 13 | 3.63 | 18 | 16 | - | 2 | - | 3.88 | 0.98 | 0.96 |
Two of the interview and FGDs participants replied that “support from sub city education office for implementation of SIP was very low. Particularly, the two school principals said that the issue of SIP was left only for schools and the expertise from sub city education office come to school only for evaluation.”

**FGDs & INT # 1 & 3 2016**

With regard to this issue, three of the interview respondents seriously offered an account:

```
........ The support given from education office was not ample, because the experts mostly restricted to official activities rather than support for schools. Of course, I trust this situation should be changed.” Besides, one respondent again said that help from sub city education office particularly in mobilizing the wider community for SIP implementation was very low.
```

**INT # 3 2016**

Community Participation Domain (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N / 0</th>
<th>Items/Issues</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers periodically collect information about student’s progress and communicate parents regularly.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community members have been involved in school improvement programs.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the teachers and school leaders’ responses depicted in Table 5 of item 4, teachers periodically collect information about student’s progress and communicate parents regularly. Accordingly, with \( \bar{X}=3.59, \text{SD}=0.83 \) and \( \bar{X}=3.88, \text{SD}=1.29 \) mean and SD scores respectively.
The majority of respondents agreed that there is a periodic information exchange b/n parents and teachers about students’ progress and timely communicate with parents. Besides, there was no great variation and significance difference between school leaders and teachers on the issue raised. This is, therefore, based on the majority of respondents; it is possible to conclude that periodic and regular communication was undertaken in these secondary schools.

As it is indicated on item 2, Table 5, respondents were also asked whether or not community members have been involved in school improvement programs in schools. According to teachers and school leaders replied that (X=2.40, SD=1.46) and (X=2.50, SD=1.30) mean and SD scores respectively. A significant number of the study participant agreed that members of the community have been involved in school improvement program moderately. Besides, there was no significance difference between Supervisors and teachers on the issue raised above and relatively a slight variation as well. This is, therefore, a significant number of the study participants have agreed that community participation in SIP in these sample secondary school were promising and moderate.

Table 4.6 Awareness of Stakeholders on School Improvement Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N / 0</th>
<th>Items/Issues</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>School Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community members have adequate awareness on school improvement program implementations.</td>
<td>11 13 19 25 19</td>
<td>2.42 2 16 10 6 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>School leaders have adequate awareness on preparing school improvement program implementation.</td>
<td>12 19 16 23 17</td>
<td>2.49 8 18 - 10 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 of item 3, teachers and school leaders were asked whether or not community members have adequate awareness on school improvement program implementations. Accordingly, teachers with (X=2.42, SD=1.14) and school leaders with (X=2.38, SD=1.32) mean and SD scores respectively. Both teachers and the school leaders moderately agreed that community members have adequate awareness on school improvement program implementations in sample secondary school in the sub-city. Besides, there was a slight difference between the opinions of the study participant and have a bit variation as well.

With regard to item 4 of table 6, respondents were asked to rate their levels of agreement regarding school leaders’ awareness on preparing school improvement program implementation. Accordingly, teachers with (X=2.49, SD=1.45) and school leaders with (X=3.11, SD=1.41) mean and SD scores respectively. This is, therefore, based on the above data one can say that a significant number of the study participant agreed on the point and it can be possible to conclude that school leaders in sample secondary schools have moderate awareness about the preparation on school improvement program implementation. From the above result, one can realize that school leaders were moderately aware and have known how about the preparation of school improvement program.

Based on the teachers and school leaders’ responses depicted in Table 6 of item 3, supervisors have adequate awareness on school improvement program implementation. Accordingly, teachers with (X=3.97, SD=1.09) and school leaders with (X=4.44, SD=1.19) mean and SD scores respectively. This is, therefore, based on the majority of respondents; it is possible to conclude that
supervisors have adequate awareness about school improvement program in their perspective schools. Besides, there was no great variation and significance difference between school leaders and teachers on the issue raised.

With regard to item 4 of Table 6, respondents were asked whether or not students have awareness on the school improvement program implementation. Accordingly, with (X=2.45, SD=0.54) and (X=4.22, SD=1.23) mean and SD scores respectively. The majority of school leaders and a significant number of teachers are agreed that students have adequate awareness about school improvement program in their perspective schools. Besides, there was no great variation and significance difference between school leaders but, a slight variation as well difference among teacher’s respondents. This is, therefore, based on the above result; it is possible to conclude that student’s awareness about school improvement program implementation there in these sample secondary schools.

**Table 4.7 School Improvement Program Implementation Challenges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Items/Issues</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>School Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less committee men of local leaders to support SIP.</td>
<td>12 21 15 25 14 2.43 8 8 12 8 - 2.33 1.40 1.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less collaboration among stake holders in SIP implementations.</td>
<td>11 17 21 18 20 3.51 12 12 6 4 2 3.55 1.10 1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inadequate materials and financial resource in the school.</td>
<td>13 19 17 24 14 3.52 14 10 6 6 - 3.66 1.44 1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 7 of item 1, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreements regarding the committeemen of local leaders to support SIP. Accordingly, teachers with (X 2.43, SD 1.64) and school leaders with (X 2.33, SD 1.40) mean and SD scores respectively. Thus, a significant number of the study participant agreed that the commitment of local leaders was moderate and not as expected and slightly satisfied. Based on the above result one can possibly have concluded that the effort of local leaders to support SIP was not satisfactory and it need more attention as long as effective and relevant education is concerned.

With regard to item 2 of Table 7, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreements about the collaboration among stake holders in SIP implementations. Accordingly, teachers with (X=3.51, SD=1.09) and school leaders with (X=3.55, SD=1.10) mean and SD scores respectively. Based on the above figure, one can possibly have concluded that the majority of the study participant agreed on the point raised above and confirmed that there was less collaboration of stakeholders in SIP implementations in these sample secondary schools. Besides, there was no great variation and significance difference between school leaders and teachers on the issue raised.

As it can be seen from the above Table of item 3, concerning the inadequate materials and financial resource in the school. Accordingly, teachers with (X=3.52, SD=1.08) and school leaders with (X=3.66, SD=1.44) mean and SD scores respectively. As per the result obtained above, it revealed that the sample secondary school faces a serious challenge in terms of inadequate material as well as financial resource and that defiantly hinder the proper implementation of the school tasks as per needed. Besides, there was no great variation and significance difference between school leaders and teachers on the issue raised.

Two of the FGD discussant offered an account:

| 4 | Less practice of school leaders in searching external fund to promote SIP. | 21 | 26 | 18 | 13 | 9 | 3.64 | 10 | 18 | 2 | 6 | - | 3.88 | 1.21 | 1.02 |
....as far as the commitment of principals, even though a few of principals have positive attitude towards the administrative profession but, the majority principal have negative attitude towards their profession. Therefore, one can possibly say that principals were not motivated to aspire for better performance. As indicated by other discussant only about 20% of the school principals were trained in relevant discipline that is in school administration....

FGD# 1&2 Feb 24, 2015

It can be concluded that lack of training and awareness of the stake holders to participate in SIP implementation is one of the challenge that encountered in the study areas.

As depicted in Table 7 of item 4, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreements about the practice of school leaders in searching external fund to promote SIP. Accordingly, teachers with (X=3.64, SD=1.02) and school leaders with (X=3.88, SD=1.21) mean and SD scores respectively. Based on the above result, it is possible to conclude that school leaders were ineffective in promoting SIP and searching for external support to help the school improvement program and less devoted in creating relationship with any of the external funders to help the SIP. Besides, there was no great variation among respondent of the study.

School Improvement Program Implementation Challenges (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/0</th>
<th>Items/Issues</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Leaders</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Difficulties to change the existing school culture.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Less technical support from higher educational authorities.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Poor stakeholder’s participation in all</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning item 4 in the same table above, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreements about the difficulties to change the existing school culture. Accordingly, teachers with (X=2.45, SD=1.30) and school leaders with (X=2.94, SD=1.23) mean and SD scores respectively. A significant proportion of the study participant confirmed that there are a number of difficulties to change the existing school culture. Besides, there was no significant variation among respondent of the study. And significance difference between school leaders and teachers on the issue discussed above.

With regard to this issue here again, the following discussion offered an account:

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldotsOne of the FGD participant answered that “building effective school culture aided in decision-making, problem solving and other tasks of SIP implementation in our preparatory school.”}\]

\textit{Besides,}

\textit{The three participants from interview session told that having good school culture helped us in making the SIP implementation smooth. Therefore, it may possible to say that factors of school culture influenced the implementation of SIP\ldots\ldots.}

\textit{FGD and INT July 2016 respectively}

In the above Table of item 5, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement concerning the technical support from higher educational authorities. Accordingly, teachers with (X=3.60, SD=0.93) and school leaders with (X=4.05, SD=1.08) mean and SD scores respectively. Based on the above figure, one can possibly conclude that technical supports from higher educational
authorities have been very poor and inadequate. This is therefore; attention must be given to support the SIP. Besides, there was no significant variation among respondent of the study.

As indicated on the above table of item 6, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement about stakeholder’s participation in all aspects of SIP. Accordingly, teachers with (X=3.83, SD=0.54) and school leaders with (X=4.22, SD=1.03) mean and SD scores respectively. Consequently, the majority of teacher as well as school leaders confirmed their agreement and underlined that there were poor and inadequate stakeholder’s participation in all aspects of SIP in their perspective secondary schools. From the above result, it can be observed that there are poor and less stakeholders’ participation to support the SIP. Besides, there was no great variation and significance difference between school leaders and teachers on the issue raised.

As it can be seen from the above table 10 of item 2, teachers and school leaders were asked about the problem of qualified school leaders for the required position. Accordingly, teachers with (X=3.51, SD=0.97) and school leaders with (X=4.00, SD=1.43) mean and SD scores respectively. As to the above result one can possibly have concluded that the sample secondary school had face the problem of unqualified school leaders and poor leadership approach in order to run the school. Besides, there was no great variation and significance difference between school leaders and teachers on the issue raised.

In the interview held with participants, it is learned that finance (school budget and school grant) and technical supports given to secondary school to facilitate SIP implementation was very limited and needs strong attention to in order to implement SIP in sample secondary schools………..

INT# 1 July 2016

In the 7.9th set of the item in the questionnaire, the respondents provided a filing the blank question. Accordingly, the question was: If there are key possible problems your school encountered during SIP implementation? The response of the respondents to this question is shown below.

Both teachers as well as school leaders have voiced their opinion regarding the issues raised and the impediments faced during the implementation of the school implementation program. They said that there is shortage of training on SIP. There is also lack of science kits, laboratories,
internet, access and misbehaving of students. Moreover, there is lack of devoted stake holder in the implementation process and lack of external support to promote the program, poor collaboration among stakeholders and school to plan SIP implementation, lack of qualified (trained) principals in educational management, lack of encouragement for effective teachers, school leaders, parents and students and poor practice of school leaders in searching external funds to promote SIP and lack of committed principals to plan resources properly were among the challenges that need great attention.

Again another set of question was raised to the study participant. Accordingly, the question was: What possible solutions should be taken to improve the implementation and practices of school improvement Programs? The response of the respondents to this question is shown below.

The respondents were asked to list possible solutions through open ended questions in the questionnaire. Accordingly, assigning committed and qualified school principals, supervisors, WEOs required for the position, creating awareness for stakeholders, allocating adequate financial resources, training teachers, students and other stakeholders, creating partnership with NGOs and for all to work for SIP effectiveness were stated as possible solutions for the challenges faced while implementing SIP.

Interview sessions were held with Sub-City Education Office SIP Focal Persons. Respondents were asked whether or not their office assigned sip focal person to secondary schools. Accordingly, the following account has been offered by one of the study participant.

Four of the interview participants offered an account:

\[\ldots\text{Much has been done for SIP implementation and this helped in the realization of its objectives even though it didn't succeed as much as expected. But, the officer argued that the schools should encourage all stakeholders to contribute their idea, experiences and best efforts for successful implementation of SIP and permanent focal persons are assigned}\ldots\ldots\]
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter deals with the summary of major findings of the study, the conclusion drawn based up on the major findings and recommendation that forwarded based on the conclusions arrived at.

5.1 SUMMARY

This study was conducted aiming at assessing the Implementation of School Improvement Program and Analysis of Practices, Challenges and Opportunities in Secondary Schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city, Addis Ababa City administration. More specifically, the study intended to attain the following objectives:

1. To assess the practices of school improvement program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city.
2. To identify the major challenges that hampered the implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city.
3. To point out the opportunities gained in the implementation of the school improvement Program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city.
4. To analyze the extent of stakeholders’ awareness about school improvement program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city.
5. Identify the possible solutions/recommendations that address the school and concerned bodies to improve the implementation of SIP in school properly.
6. To suggest the possible measures that shall be taken to solve the existing problems that hinder the implementation of SIP in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city.

This study endeavored to explore the implementation of school improvement program and challenges as well as opportunities in Secondary Schools with the intention to understand the issue from school leaders, teachers, Sub-city Education officers and other stakeholders of the education sector perspectives. The study employed both qualitative and quantitative research design with the assumption that reality is socially constructed by participants and there are many truths. This research approach was appropriate as the researcher was trying to understand the complexity of the issue under investigation through the lived experience, perceptions and perspectives from a holistic standpoint.
For the purpose of this study, a descriptive survey method was employed to disclose the understanding of respondents on the issue under study. This method was chosen with the assumption that it helps to conduct data as it exists and to gather several data related to the problem under study. Both primary and secondary sources of data were used. Data were generated via Questionnaire, Interview, Focus Group Discussion and Observation Checklist. Accordingly, questionnaires were distributed and filled out by 87 teachers and 36 school leaders. The data secured through questionnaire are analyzed quantitatively and data secured through interview focus group Discussion and observation checklist techniques are thematically analyzed and organized in to themes to answer the research questions.

In attempt to answer the above basic research questions, a descriptive survey was preferred to serve the purpose. The study was conducted in six secondary schools of Addis Ketema sub-city. Questionnaire was developed and data also gathered based on the review of related literature. Interview and FGDs were also used to gather additional data. The questionnaire was distributed to thirty-six school leaders (Principals, Vice principals, and Department heads) and eighty-seven teachers. Out of the expected 130 questionnaires distributed exactly 123 (94.61%) were filled out and returned. The collected data were analyzed by descriptive statistics such as frequency count, percentage, mean and standard deviation.

5.1.1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS
To obtain information about the characteristics of respondents, six basic items in the first set of the questionnaire were provide to the sample respondents. Based on the responses of the participants indicates that females, let alone occupy managerial positions, their participation at secondary level is reasonably less to that of male counterpart 9 (29.73%) of school leaders and 10 (11.49%) of teachers were females. As can be observed from the analysis most of the respondents were in the age of 31-40 years 16 (59.45%) and 42 (48.27%) for school leaders & teachers respectively. Moreover, majority of principals and teachers were relatively energetic, matured and fit to take responsibilities.

A significant number of teachers 66 (75.86) have the minimum requirement of qualification needed at secondary school level, at least first degree and 24.14% of them have second degree. Besides, majority 29 (80.56%) school leaders have fist degree and 19.44% of them have second degree. Thus, both school leaders & teachers have fulfilled the required qualification needed at
secondary level. Furthermore, more than 58.61% of teachers and 86 % of school leaders have more than 10 years’ service and reasonably adequate experiences to carry out responsibility. Having relevant and adequate work experience defiantly attracts and contributes a lot for the delivery of quality education and practices effective instructional leadership in secondary schools.

5.1.2. MAJOR FINDINGS
Most of the data reported is based on the findings of the research. This was to ensure that their voices were not left out in the analysis and enable readers easily identify the unmodified responses and experiences of the respondents.

Although, there were no great and statistically significant differences observed as the computed mean and SD scores revealed, teachers and school leaders indicated that SIP implementation helped to improve and monitor students’ academic achievement, teachers to understand more how to improve students’ academic achievement and to give academic support for students based on their individual difference. The result also showed that SIP implementation helped the schools to develop good practices of school leadership and to decentralize school management. In addition to this, the interviewed principals, PTA chairpersons, Woreda and zone education officers also confirmed that realization of SIP objectives could become true through implementation of SIP. In fact, they didn’t deny that the extent was still at medium level and had to work for better achievement.

5.1.2.1. SIP Implementation and Teaching-Learning Domain
With regard to teaching and learning domain as frequency counts, percentages, mean and SD scores respondents replied that implementation of continuous assessment in the school, availability and functional laboratories and instructional media to motivate practical teaching and learning process found in the school, active participation of students in school clubs, teachers made evaluation of curriculum periodically and pupils classroom participation facilitated by teachers were fairly good and promising. The result of interview, focus group discussions and field observation also confirmed that the majority of secondary schools in Addis ketema Sub-city had relatively better laboratory room, on other hand, some schools had laboratories with enough equipment and chemicals, but moderately functional. This was because of absence of laboratory technician, fear of chemicals that stayed for long.
5.1.2.2. SIP Implementation and Practices of Learning Environment Domain

As to the practices of learning environment domain, teachers with \( X=4.19, \text{SD}=0.76 \) and school leaders with \( X=4.33, \text{SD}=1.05 \) mean and SD scores respectively confirmed that there were adequate libraries with recent reference materials. This result clearly showed that the school environment in these sample secondary schools were moderately conducive to implement the overall objectives of SIP. Consequently, respondents were expressed there is appropriate physical environment, adequate teaching and learning materials (text books, teacher guides) and relevant rules and policies of the school that are communicated by the school management. Interviews, FGD and observation checklist also suggested that there is relatively better and conducive learning environment for the proper implementation of SIP. But, in one of the sample schools toilet room are poorly available for female students and there is inadequate pedagogical center in all of the sample secondary schools, and all of the sample schools are found in the center of the market, this by implication mean that some classrooms were not conducive for teaching learning process.

5.1.2.3. SIP Implementation versus Leadership and Management Domain

With regard to school improvement program in terms of domain of leadership and management, teachers with \( X=2.91, \text{SD}=1.33 \) and school leaders with \( X=3.61, \text{SD}=1.28 \) mean and SD scores confirmed that schools effort in promoting shared vision, mission, objectives and goals to improve students’ learning, School management commitment for high student achievement, consistency in implementation of school activities, strong community mobilization for SIP support, practices of effective regular communication with all stake holders, continuous follow up, monitoring and support of student learning in the school and supervisors carry out classroom supervision periodically were fairly good and moderately effective.

5.1.2.4. SIP Implementation and Community Participation Domain

As to community participation domain, the study identifies tasks expected from community participation to the overall school improvement programs. A significant number of the study participant agreed that parents are actively participated as PTA members in these sample secondary schools. This implies that a significant number of respondents agreed with the issue and confirmed that parents are moderately willing to participate and contribute what has been expected from them.
Again a significant number of respondents agreed that parents have provided comments in all aspects of their children’s learning periodically and that would create a conducive teaching-learning environment as well as helps the learners to perform better. Besides, the majority of the respondents agreed that stakeholder’s participation in decision making process as well as other school based issues was very high and a significant number of the study participant agreed that members of the community have been involved in school improvement program moderately. Besides, there was no significance difference between Supervisors and teachers on the issue raised above and relatively a slight variation as well.

5.1.2.5 SIP and Awareness of Stakeholders on School Improvement Program

Concerning to the awareness of stakeholders on school improvement program teachers with (X=2.42, SD=1.14) and school leaders with (X=2.38, SD=1.32) mean and SD scores confirmed that community members have adequate awareness on school improvement program implementations in sample secondary school in the sub-city and similarly, teachers with (X=2.45, SD=0.54) and school leaders with (X=4.22, SD=1.23) mean and SD scores respectively confirmed that the majority of school leaders and a significant number of teachers are agreed that students have adequate awareness about school improvement program in their perspective schools. This is, therefore, based on the above result; it is possible to conclude that student’s awareness about school improvement program implementation there in these sample secondary schools.

5.1.2.6 School Improvement Program and Challenges while Implementation

Connected thoughts taken from the review of related literature and analyzed data of quantitative and qualitative part of the study helped to draw the following reasonable conclusions about the findings.

This study specifically focuses on school improvement domain related factors. Concerning the challenges encountered the effective implementation of SIP. The study shows there is inadequate technical support from highest organ, lack of training and awareness for stakeholders to participate in SIP implementation, difficulty to change the existing school culture, low commitment of local political leaders, shortage of materials and financial resource, poor collaboration among stakeholders and school to plan SIP implementation, lack of qualified (trained) school leaders in educational management, lack of encouragement for effective teachers, school leaders, parents and
students and poor practice of school leaders in searching external funds to promote SIP and lack of committed principals to plan resources properly were among the challenges that need great attention.

The respondents were asked to list out possible solutions through open ended questionnaire. Accordingly, assigning committed and qualified school leaders, supervisors, Wereda and Sub-city SIP focal persons and the like are among the most required for the position, creating awareness for stakeholders, allocating adequate financial resources, training teachers, students and other stakeholders, creating partnership with NGOs, agencies as well as international institutions and for all to work for SIP effectiveness were stated as possible solutions for the challenges faced while implementing SIP in these sample secondary school of the study area.

In general, the secondary schools under investigation have more to improve student academic achievement. Based on the data the researcher felt they had relatively worked much to improve community participation and learning environment domain and this by implication mean that the sample schools tried to use their efforts equally on the four domains. All the major challenges stated above were resulted from average or below expectation of the implementation of school improvement program.

5.2 Conclusion

The following conclusions were made based on the findings of the study together with the review of related literature and analyzed data of quantitative and qualitative part of the study helped to draw the following reasonable conclusion.

The critical role of SIP implementation in the realization of its objectives moderately underway and effective implementation of the School Improvement results with achieving and sustaining SIP objectives. Secondary schools which give focus for effective implementation of SIP are expected in performing better realization of its objectives than those schools that do not.

SIP implementation requires a supportive environment where conditions for school improvement adequately put in place. Excellent schools direct their energies and resources towards the implementation of school improvement program to maximize achievement and realize the potential of all students. Therefore, it may be possible to conclude that facilitating supportive conditions at school level and assistance from sub-city education office was relatively adequate enough to implement SIP as much as expected.
Besides, it was implied that there were many challenges that hinder effective implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Addis Ketema Sub-city. In order to implement the program effectively, enhancing the involvement of community and providing awareness for all stakeholders is most important. Accordingly, the findings of research indicated that training given on SIP was not satisfactory and less consistent. The allocated budget in the study area was not sufficient to promote teaching and learning process in line with the intended education policy. With regard to teaching learning domain there were moderate evaluation of curriculum, conduct action research, practical work in laboratory and use of instructional media. There was also a reference books, computers, laboratories with moderately adequate equipment and chemicals.

Furthermore, the study revealed that there was also relatively better school management commitment for student achievement, community mobilization by school leaders, occasional communication with stakeholders, and average practices of community participation in SIP plan implementation. The study also shows most of educational leaders were qualified in an area of educational leadership as well as with school management skill. Therefore, based on findings, it is possible to conclude that the implementations of school improvement program have moderately done much as indicated in SIP frame work in the sample secondary schools. As a result, this clearly indicated that the school are relatively addressing the needs of the learner. Generally, secondary schools of the study area were moderately satisfactory in implementation of school improvement program.

5.3 Recommendations

The findings of this study are believed to have some recommendations for practice. The implication might show areas of intervention to improve the most wanted quality of secondary education and the proper implementation of school improvement program. As we think of improving the implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools, we need to look in to the recommendations involved. So, Addis Ketema Sub-city and Woreda education offices as well as all concerned bodies of the education system need to develop certain mechanisms to make the schools successful in this regard. The recommended mechanisms could be:
1. Schools with high experience of implementation of SIP may have better opportunities for success in the realization of its objectives than those with low or no experience in implementing SIP. Sub-city education offices ought to be a catalyst for effective implementation of school improvement by understanding and acting as the prim stakeholder of the SIP.

2. Secondary schools need to put students learning first and focus on improvement of students’ academic achievement in their plans and process of implementation.

3. Secondary schools should emphasize on fostering good practices of leadership (transparency, participatory approach & accountability) and decentralization of school management by participating the staff in every school activity.

4. In order to implement SIP in line with the frame work, creating awareness and provide sufficient training for all stakeholders by Sub-city Education office to carry out their responsibilities and to implement effectively school improvement program.

5. To implement teaching learning process in line with the standard set in the SIP frame work, the school leaders discuss with all stakeholders (School community, parents, teachers, principals) regularly on implementation of school improvement program.

6. Effective implementation of SIP required having supportive conditions in place; so that schools can cope up the challenges, adopt new ways of solving SIP problems and can provide support to all stakeholders. Accordingly,

- Sub-City education offices should focus on schools’ capacity building through continuous training and professional consultation.
- Sub-city education offices need to help the schools in mobilizing the wider community through the government structures: Woreda& local kebele administrations.
- Schools should work to capacitate the staff, monitor the implementation of SIP on regular basis, facilitate best practice during the implementation and provide opportunities to staff for communicating by using SIP committee of the school and Schools should give emphasis to allocate resources (money, equipment and materials) by discussing with school board and PTA.
- The staff should get continuous shared & common understanding about the four domains of SIP, the practices and its implementation through regular discussions with experts.
The schools should encourage teachers to be committed to collaborate participate as decision makers and leaders of efforts of SIP implementation and solve SIP problems by giving responsibility and reward for better performance and

Students, teachers, school leadership, parents and the wider community should have common continuous discussions about SIP & its implementation to solve the challenges on spot.

7. The last but not the least, revisit the alignment among policy innovations specifically on SIP, strategies and their implementation vis-à-vis school capacity needs to be carried out periodically at all concerned levels across the system of education. This needs to be accompanied by making necessary adjustments as deemed appropriate.
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Addis Ababa University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire for School Principals and Teachers a study on Implementing School Improvement Program and Analysis of Practices, Challenges and Opportunities in Addis Ketema Sub-city, Addis Ababa City administration.

Dear Respondents

This questionnaire is designed to collect data for the study aimed at assessing the Implementation of School Improvement Program and Analyzing the Practices, Challenges and Opportunities as an input for the fulfillment of M.A Degree in Educational Leadership and Management. Thus, all the information you will provide have indispensable contribution to the success of my study. Your responses are kept confidential and used only for academic purpose. Therefore, for all efforts made and time you scarify to secure relevant, genuine and reliable information. I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation, in advance. Please respond to each of the information by writing or putting an “X” mark in the space provided.

Section 1. General information

1.1 Name of the School ________________________

1.2 Sex Male [ ] Female [ ]

1.3 Age

(1) Below 20 years

(2) 21-30 years

(3) 31-40 years

(4) 41-50 years

(5) 51 and above
1.4 Academic Qualification

Certificate ☐  Diploma ☐  First Degree ☐  MA/MSC and above ☐

1.5 Experience on current position.

(1) Below 10 years

(2) 10-20 years

(3) Above 20 years

1.6 Do you ever take any training on SIP? 1=Yes  2= No

Section II. SIP Implementation versus Teaching and Learning Domain

**Direction**: Please rate the following questions on this questionnaire by putting the “√” mark in the space provided. Accordingly rate as follow 1.Strongly agree 2.Agree 3.Undecided 4. Disagree 5.Strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Proper implementation of continuous assessment in the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Functional laboratories and instructional media to motivate practical teaching and learning process found in the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Active participation of students in school clubs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Teachers made evaluation of curriculum periodically.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Pupils classroom participation facilitated by Teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section III. Practices of Learning Environment Domain

**Direction**: Please rate the following questions on this questionnaire by putting the "√" mark in the space provided. Accordingly rate as follow 1.Strongly agree 2.Agree 3.Undecided 4. Disagree 5.Strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>The school has library with recent reference materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Appropriate physical environment (safe, stable and positive atmosphere) in School compound.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Clear rules and policies of the school that are communicated by the school Community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Adequate teaching-learning materials found in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Access to standard latrines based on sex placement both for staffs and pupils.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Healthy as well as friendly relationship among all members of the school community towards SIP implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section IV Leadership and Management Domain.

**Direction**: Please rate the following questions on this questionnaire by putting the “√” mark in the space provided. Accordingly rate as follow: 1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Undecided 4. Disagree 5. Strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Shared Vision, Mission, Objectives and Goals to improve student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>School management commitment for high student achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Consistency in implementation of school activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Strong community mobilization for SIP support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Practices of effective regular communication with all stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Continuous follow up, monitoring and support of student learning in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Supervisors carry out classroom supervision periodically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section V. Community Participation Domain**

**Direction:** Please rate the following questions on this questionnaire by putting the" √" mark in the space provided. Accordingly rate as follow 1.Strongly agree 2.Agree 3.Undecided 4. Disagree 5.Strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Parent as PTA members actively participate in the school improvement programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Parents have provided comments up on their children's learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>All stakeholders are involved in decision making on their children as well as other school issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Teachers periodically collect information about students progress and communicate parents Regularly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Community members have been involved in school improvement programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section VI. Awareness of Stakeholders on School Improvement Program

**Direction:** Please rate the following questions on this questionnaire by putting the "√" mark in the space provided. Accordingly rate as follow 1.Strongly agree 2.Agree 3.Undecided 4. Disagree 5.Strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Community members have adequate awareness on school improvement program implementations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>School leaders have adequate awareness on preparing school improvement program implementation strategic plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Supervisors have adequate awareness on school implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Students have awareness on the school improvement program implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section VII. School Improvement Program Implementation Challenges

**Direction:** Please rate the following questions on this questionnaire by putting the " √" mark in the space provided. Accordingly rate as follow 1.Strongly agree 2.Agree 3.Undecided 4. Disagree 5.Strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Less committeemen local leaders to support SIP.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Less collaboration among stake holders in SIP implementations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Inadequate materials and financial resource in the school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Less practice of school leaders in searching external fund to promote SIP.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Difficulties to change the existing school culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Less technical support from higher educational authorities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Poor stakeholder’s participation in all aspects of SIP.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Lack of qualified school leaders for the required position.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.9. If there are key possible problems your school encountered during SIP implementation?

a) _____________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________

b) _____________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________

c) _____________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________

7.9in teaching-learning in respect to SIP implementation?

   ______________________________________________________________________________________

7.10 What are the strengths of your school in relation to establishing attractive teaching-learning environment?

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

7.11 What are the key strategies to increase stakeholder’s awareness about SIP?
   ________________________________________________________________

7.12. What possible solutions should be taken to improve the implementation and practices of school improvement Programs?

   (a) ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

   (b) ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

   (c) ________________________________________________________________

   Thank you for your cooperation!
Annex B

Addis Ababa University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interview Questions for Woreda and Sub-city Education Office SIP Focal Persons on Implementing School Improvement Program and Analysis of Practices, Challenges and Opportunities in Addis Ketema Sub-city, Addis Ababa City administration.

Dear Respondents

This interview guideline is designed to collect data for the study aimed at assessing the Implementation of School Improvement Program and Analyzing the Practices, Challenges and Opportunities as an input for the fulfillment of M.A Degree in Educational Leadership and Management. Thus, all the information you will provide have indispensable contribution to the success of my study. Your responses are kept confidential and used only for academic purpose. Therefore, for all efforts made and time you scarify to secure relevant, genuine and reliable information. I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation, in advance.

Section I. General Information

1.1 Name of the School _______________________

1.2 Sex   Male               Female   

1.3 Age

(1) Below 20 years(2) 21-30 years(3) 31-40 years(4) 41-50 years      (5) 51 and above

1.4 Qualification

Certificate   Diploma   First Degree    MA/MSC and above       

1.5 Experience on current position.

   1)Below 10 years

   (2)10-20 years
1.6 Do you ever take any training on SIP? 1=Yes 2=No

Section II. General question on SIP

1. Your office assign focal person in secondary schools?

2. How do you rate and explain the implementation the SIP in your respective secondary schools?

3. How do you rate and explain the leadership function that you and the school management play with regards to the SIP?

4. What efforts have been made to realize schools to be conducive for teaching-learning process?

5. To what extent finance (school budget and school grant) and technical supports given to secondary school to facilitate SIP implementation?

6. What challenges have you come across in the SIP implementation endeavor?

7. What possible measure should be taken to improve the implementation and practices of school improvement Programs?

8. Do you want to add something other than mention above?

Thank you for your cooperation!
Annex C

Addis Ababa University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Focus Group Discussion for school improvement committees, PTA’s and students a study on Implementing School Improvement Program and Analysis of Practices, Challenges and Opportunities in Addis Ketema Sub-city, Addis Ababa City administration.

Dear Respondents

This focus group guidelines designed to collect data for the study aimed at assessing the Implementation of School Improvement Program and Analyzing the Practices, Challenges and Opportunities as an input for the fulfillment of M.A Degree in Educational Leadership and Management. Thus, all the information you will provide have indispensable contribution to the success of my study. Your responses are kept confidential and used only for academic purpose. Therefore, for all efforts made and time you scarify to secure relevant, genuine and reliable information. I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation, in advance.

1. What do you understand SIP in general?
2. Have you participated in SIP strategic plan preparation and implementation? If so, how do you describe the situation?
3. How SIP is implementing in your respective secondary schools?
4. Do parents follow their children’s learning, disciplinary problems and discuss on the issue with teachers and school leaders?
5. What are the roles of SIP committees in creating awareness to community and stakeholders on school improvement program implementation in your school?
6. Are education facilities and materials fulfilled? Are secondary schools equipped with libraries with sufficient and recent reference materials, laboratories with necessary equipments and chemicals and functional pedagogical centers?
7. How do explain the status of teaching-learning methodology in the classroom? Is it student centered or teacher-centered?
8. How do you rate and explain the relationship among teachers, principals, students and other staff members of your schools?
9. What challenges do you think constrain effective implementation of the SIP in your school?
10. Do you want to add something other than mention above?

Thank you for your cooperation!
Annex D

Addis Ababa University
College of Education and Behavioral Studies
Department of Educational Planning and Management

Checklist guide for additional observation in order to supplement others data collection tools by observing the following major aspects of the College.

1. Name of School________________________________________
2. The type of places to be observed___________________________________
3. The time in which the place to be observed is established_________________

I. The Overall School Conditions and Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>The overall appearance of the College</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cleanliness of the College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Location of the information chart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Space for College expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Availability of different services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Availability of notice board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Physical plantation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other specify.....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## II. Issues of Availability, Adequacy and Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workshops with adequate equipments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Libraries with adequate reference materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>First aid facilities, co-curricular and ICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Staff rooms, staff launch and meeting hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Latrines based on sex placement both for staffs and pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Counseling and guidance service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Attendance format and lesson plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other specify.....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thank you for your cooperation!!*
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