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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess practices and challenges of leading school for improvement in Secondary Schools of West Shoa Zone. Descriptive survey method was employed to conduct the study and the sampling techniques used simple random sampling and availability sampling. In order to collect data, researcher used questionnaire, interviews and secondary sources. Questionnaire was distributed to 113 teachers, 28 SIP members, 30 PTAs. In addition to this, 4 school principals and 4 secondary school supervisors and 4 woreda education office SIP focal person were interviewed. To analyze the data, frequency, percentage, mean score, and T-test were used. Thus, to improve the situation, school principals have to give attention to planning, and should initiate commitments in developing strategic plan that entirely involves conducting self-evaluation by participating key stake holder (teachers, students and parents) and deploy by building consensus among stake holders for effective program implementation, school leadership should create fertile environment for working together, for trust development and create positive culture in order to plan together and strengthening unity among school community, the government should allocate additional budget to the school grant for successful SIP implementation and moreover, in order to solve their problems of finance and material resource, the schools should design income-generating mechanisms.
CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction

This Chapter deals with background of the study, statements of the problem, objectives, significance, limitation, operational key terms and organization of the study.

1.1. Background of the Study

Education is primarily concerned with the development of skills, knowledge, process and attitudes necessary for the learner to successfully function as a productive citizen in an ever changing world. Education also recognizes the characteristics unique to each individual and provides a process for the development and expression of each learner’s abilities and talents (Tanner and Tanner, 2007).

Improving Quality of Education for All (IQEA) is the result of international school improvement program, which focuses on the improvement of teaching learning by improving the main agents of schools. This indicates that merely focusing on improving some areas (partial improvement) is not guarantee to the school improvement. Rather the entire system needs to be given emphasis and treated well to bring quality of education and to realize school improvement (Hopkins, 2002).

In this regard, school is a knowledge production center, As skills production system, it is complex multi-layered system for social, political, cultural and economic development system. Further to this, the secondary school system is a formal institution vested with the responsibility of imparting and developing knowledge, skills and attitudes essential for individuals to fit into society and be able to contribute productively to its development, Moreover, this education institution must be supported with physical facilities and provision of quality services should be sustained to come to improved education system.

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) 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.

Leading school for improvement is an important aspect of the school system. It contributes a lot of the efficiency in quality of educational provision. As indicated in MoE (2007b) and ACT Government (2004) school improvement helps to create a learning environment that welcomes all learners. It enables teachers to be responsive to the diverse learning needs of students in their teaching learning approaches. Moreover, leading school for improvement is essential to enhance the involvement of parents and the community in school activities and to improve the effectiveness of the schools management.

In this regards, four secondary school principals, four secondary school supervisors, four Woreda Education Office SIP Coordinators, 32 PTA members, 28 SIP committee and 113 secondary school teachers were used.

Implementing School Improvement Program (SIP), which is of way to leading school for improvement is as indicated in school improvement guide line shows that it will enable to improve the teaching process by systematically increasing the competency, efficiency and motivation of teachers and developing strong harmony by exchanging experiences and the pragmatic practical training. Leading school for improvement also increases students for education and improving the necessary resources for education and to create suitable condition for learning. Furthermore, it increases the participation of parents and community and their feeling of responsibility by increasing their awareness regarding education and it provides quality of education by providing the necessary resources through the coordination of the community, non-governmental organizations, humanitarian agencies and religious organizations (MoE, 2006).

In connection to this, taking these facts into consideration, the researcher undertaken study on the practices and challenges of leading school for improvement in secondary schools of West Shoa Zone.
1.2. Statement of the Problem

The leading school for improvement is the effort that requires the collaborative efforts of stakeholders, form plan preparation through implementation and evaluation. To begin with leading school for improvement process as the first step should be establishing the school improvement committee. The committee members are comprised of teachers, management personnel, students, parents and community and the principal of each school’s works as the committee chairman (MOE, 2006). In this regard, Barnes 2004 suggests 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 leads, and coordinate the school improvement process.

According to Barnes (2004), the responsibility of school improvement committee includes obtain the input of school 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; assisted with documentation and evaluation of self-study; and assign and negotiate collection tasks with in school community.

However, this school improvement committee is not in line with the policy guideline that is expected to lead school for the improvement. Studies conducted at a national level also clearly show that Ethiopian Secondary Schools have been facing challenges for a long time in enhancing students’ academic achievement due to shortage of facilities, an absence of qualified teachers, poor leadership and management, lack of attractive learning environments and unsatisfactory parents and local community involvement (Ayalew, 2009). As quality is the major challenge of education system the first priority focus of ESDP V is quality education (MoE, 2015).

My research identify the gap to improve access to quality primary education in order to make sure that all children, youth and adults acquire the competencies, skills and values that enable them to participate fully in the development of Ethiopia, by conducting qualified research, shortage of financial resources, lack of learning facilities

Moreover, Habtamu (2014) conducted a study on the implementation of school improvement program where more of the leaders were not qualified, shortage of financial resources, lack of learning facilities, poor evaluations of curriculum, lack of conducting action research, poor
community participation, low school management commitment for student achievement, and lack of consistent supervisory support from WEO in SIP implementation.

In this regard, from the researcher experience point of view and report of educational meeting and workshop conducted at Woreda and regional level shows that in many secondary schools, the problem of leading school for improvement is highly exhibited. From these secondary schools, secondary schools of West Shoa Zone are prominently visible and could be mentioned as an example. However, to the knowledge of the researcher, there was no research conducted on the practices and challenges of leading school for improvement in secondary school of West Shoa Zone.

This study, therefore, was designed to assess practices and challenges of leading school for improvement in secondary school of West Shoa Zone. To guide the study, the following research questions were formulated and would be addressed on the study.

1. What are the school leadership’s endeavors to enhance leading school for improvement in secondary schools?
2. What are the major activities of school improvement program that implemented in secondary schools?
3. What are the monitoring and evaluating mechanisms undertaken in leading school for improvement?
4. What are the major factors that affect practices of leading school for improvement in secondary schools of West Shoa Zone?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

General objective
The general objective of the study was to assess practices and challenges of leading school for improvement in Secondary Schools of West Shoa Zone.
Specific Objectives

Furthermore, the study has the following specific objectives:

I. Assess the school leadership’s endeavor to enhance leading school for improvement in secondary schools of west shoa zone?
II. Investigate that the major activities of school improvement program are implemented in secondary schools?
III. Identify monitoring and evaluating mechanism undertaken in leading school for improvement?
IV. Explore the major factors that affect practices leading school for improvement in secondary schools west shoa zone?

1.4. Significance of the Study

The research will give insight idea on current practices of leading school for improvement in secondary schools of West Shoa Zone. The researcher believed that the study will have significance; Some of them are that:

- it may help principals, teachers, supervisors, parents and other concerned bodies to be aware of the extent to which leading school for improvement is being exercised in secondary schools of West Shoa Zone.
- it may provide important information to the national and local policy makers and program designers so that they will further revise and develop appropriate approaches of leading school for improvement in secondary schools.
- it may serve as an input for different levels of educational experts i.e. WEO, ZEO, and REB to know the current practice leading school for improvement in secondary schools.
- it may serve as a starting point for other researchers who are interested to do their research on the title.

1.5. Delimitation of the study

This study would be delimitated to assessing the practices and challenges of leading school for improvement in Secondary Schools of West Shoa Zone. It gives due emphasis on assessing the
extent of school leaders do strive to enhance leading school for improvement in secondary schools of West Shoa, it investigates that the major activities of school improvement program are implemented in secondary schools, identify monitoring and evaluating mechanism undertaken in leading school for improvement, and explore the major factors that affect practices of leading school for improvement in secondary schools of West Shoa. In connection to this, there were 22 Woredas in West shoa zone. The issue of geographical features and more resemblance of schools have been taken in to consideration and four woredas were incorporated in the sample study by using simpling random sampling techniques. The selected woredas are Ambo Woreda, Jeldu Woreda, Chelia Woreda and Mida kegn Woreda. In the same fashion, simple random sampling techniques were employed in woredas those have two and above two secondary schools like Chelia woreda and Jeldu woreda and Mida Kegn Woreda. Furthermore, Jeldu secondary and preparatory school, Meti secondary school, Gedo secondary and preparatory school and Chukala wange secondary school were sampled schools.

1.6. Operational definition of Terms

**Challenges:** Problems that affect the seconder school instructional leaders

**General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP):** This is the program designed to improve the quality of education in the school. it is one of the Ethiopian education strategies to improve fundamental obstacles that stand in the way of quality education.

**School Improvement program:** is a program which was launched by MOE and being implemented in secondary schools that have four different school domains.

**School improvement:** is defined as systematic, sustained effort aimed at change in learning conditions and other related internal condition the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively.

**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).

**School Leadership:** the term refers to the capacity to influence others to work to gather voluntary in the school.

**Woreda:**-refers to administrative structure level below zone and above kebele.
1.7. Organization of the Study

The research report is organized into five chapters. The first chapter dealt with the introductory part of the study and contains the background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, research question, and significance of the study, delimitation of the study and operational definition of important terms. The second chapter covered review of the related literature that provides the basic framework of the study. The third chapter indicate the research design and methodology employed to conduct the study. The fourth chapter focused on data presentation, analysis, and discussion and chapter five would present the summary, conclusions and recommendations. Lastly, list of references would be included.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Related Literature

2.1. The Concept of Leading School for Improvement

A school system is a dynamic system where input, throughput, and output and processes are continually underway. This continually changing feature of a school system demands it for a continuous improvement. Although the concept of school improvement dates back to the 1960s, it was strengthened in the mid 1980s, following the establishment of the organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) sponsored International School Improvement Project (ISIP) that established a distinctive body of knowledge which became internationally recognized (Stroll .et.al, 1996).

The basic idea behind leading school for 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, leading school for 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 Abera, 2013).

When we are talking about leading school for improvement as a process, it is continuous activity of fulfilling different inputs, upgrading school performance and bringing better learning outcomes at school level (MOE, 2005). This improvement is not a routine practice which can be performed in a day-to day activities of schools. Educational institutions have different settings and capacity in providing their services to the needy.

The school improvement has been defined in different ways by different scholars. According to Harris (2005), school improvement is defined as “a distinct approach to educational change that enhances student’s outcomes as well as strengthens the school’s capacity for managing improvement initiatives”. Hopkins further elaborated that school improvement is about raising
student’s achievement through focusing on the teaching and learning process and those conditions which support it. And also (Reynolds et al., 1996) has defined “a systematic, sustained effort aimed at change in learning conditions and other related internal conditions in one or more schools, with the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively.” Hopkins (in Macbeath and Mortimore, 1996) also defined school improvement as “a strategy for educational change that enhances student outcomes as well as strengthening the school’s capacity for handling change.

In general, the term improvement is familiar to all. It simply means reforming, transforming or upgrading the quality of inputs, process, service or product.

2.2. 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 by 2015. 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 and 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 this program aims to support schools in address 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 school 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 school improvement.

Therefore, school improvement is an important aspect of the school system. It contributes a lot to the efficiency and the quality of the educational provision. As suggested in MOE (2007) school improvement helps to create a learning environment to all learners. It enables teachers to be
responsive to the diverse learning needs of students in their teaching-learning approaches. Moreover, school improvement is essentials to enhance the involvement of the parents and the community in the school activities and to improve the effectiveness of the school’s managements. In general, school improvement helps to realize the provision of quality education for all children by making the overall practices and functions of school more responsive to the diverse student’s needs. To this end, schools and educationalists in collaborate, designed to strengthen the schools ability to manage changes, to enhance the work of teachers, and ultimately to improve students achievements

2.3. Conditions for School Improvement Program

It is difficult to plan and implement any school activity within a state of turmoil and unstable conditions. Those in charge of preparing and putting into action school improvement plan need to feel that they are working in a state of relatively stable environment. According to Harris(2005) the internal drives for change can be characterized as complex mixture of school-based factors, i.e the institutional needs and wants which provide the impetus for the schools development, some of these internal drivers are ‘givens’ in that they would exist irrespective of the type of leadership approach adopted. Other internal drivers are constructed by the leaders within the school by their commitment to a particular vision; values frame work or strategies of management. The ‘external drivers’ arise from policy interventions and edicts that require compliance. Increasingly head teachers, and those around them, are aware of being caught between these two set of drivers.

Changes are externally imposed so that that the head must interpret incoming documents before she/he can inform the staff. The speed with which those changes have had to be introduced means that she/he has had little time to motivate staff and she/he is finding it increasingly difficult to justify imposing yet more demands for change. It also makes it more difficult to see things through she/he has had to learn to delegate more of the responsibility for managing change (Day et al., 2000 as cited in Harris, 2005).
2.3.1. Internal Condition for School Improvement

Hopkins (2004) suggests that, difficulties often occur for both individual teachers and the school when initially embarking on school improvement. Teachers may be faced with acquiring new teaching skills or with mastering new curriculum material, and the school, as a consequence, may be forced in to new ways of working that are incompatibles with existing organizational structure. It is therefore often necessary to work on some aspects of the internal conditions within the school at the same time as achieving the curriculum or other priorities the school has set itself. Hopkins has also attempted to state a number of ‘conditions’ within the school with its capacity for sustained development: (1) a commitment to staff, 2) practical efforts to involve staff, students and the community in the school polices and decisions, 3) transformational leadership approaches, 4) effective co-ordination strategies, 5) serious attentions to the potential benefits of enquires reflection, 6) a commitment to collaborative planning activity.

The school internal conditions are the internal features of the schools, arrangement which enable school to get work done (Hopkins, 2002). Also as suggested in Hopkins (2001), internal conditions are a set of intervening variable operating at the school and classroom level and referred as enabling conditions or capacity that allows the process to affect the product high level of students’ achievement. So school will not improve, unless they have the capacity to do so. Hence, to enable school to provide better education and work effectively on strategies that enhances student achievement; it needs to fully arrange all these enabling conditions and other related conditions which support it.

Therefore, taken together these conditions results in the creation of opportunities for teachers to feel more powerful and confident about their work. In addition, the central condition is that if we take the enhancement of pupil outcomes seriously, then the work on the internal conditions of the schools has to complement that on development priorities related to classroom practice (Hopkins, Beresford, Ainscow, West and Harris in Hopkins and Harris, 1997)
2.3.1.1. Staff Development

A Systematic and integrated approach to staff development that focuses on the professional learning of teachers and establishes the classroom as an important center for teacher development is central to authentic school development. Staff development is the central strategy for supporting teachers as engage in improvement activities, attention to teacher learning has direct spin-offs in terms of pupil learning. The research evidence that is available on the effectiveness of staff development initiatives is, however, far from encouraging. Despite all the effort and resources that has been utilized, the impact of such program’s in terms of improvement in teaching and better learning out comes for pupils is rather disappointing (Fullan, 1991; Joyce and Showers, 1995 in Hopkins, 2004).

As result of his review available research evidence, Fullan (1991) provides a bleak picture of in-service initiatives that are poorly conceptualized, insensitive to concerns of individual participations and, perhaps critically, make little effort to help participants relate their learning experiences to their usually work place conditions.

In stark contrast to this gloomy analysis, the research evidence from schools with high level of students and teachers engagement and learning, demonstrates how they build infrastructures for staff development within their day-to-day arrangements. Such infrastructures involve portions of the school week being devoted to staff development activities such as curriculum and implementation, discussion teaching approach, regular observation sessions and on-site coaching.

Joyce and Showers (1995) in Hopkins (2004) identify a number of key training components which, when used in combination, have much greater power than they used alone. The major components of training are: a) presentation of theory or description of skill or strategy, b) modeling or demonstration of skills or models of teaching, c) practice in simulated and classroom settings, d) structured and open-ended feedback (provision of information about performance) e) coaching for application (hands-on, in class room assistance with transfer of skills and strategies to the classroom).
Therefore, staff development is the most crucial conditions to enable school improvement program implementation.

2.3.1.2. Collaborative Planning

Mac Gilchrist et al., 1995 in Hopkins (2004), suggested that schools that exhibit best practice in development planning now use it as a strategy to enhance directly the progress and achievement of students. The crucial difference between these and previous approach to development planning is that it is rooted in class rooms. The focus is on students’ learning, their progress and achievement, and which is needed to improve it and how this is best supported. The plan begins with learning goals for students. a teaching strategy for achieving them is then produced . this strategy is supported by any necessary adjustment to the school’s management arrangements ; for example, modifications to curriculum polices and schemes of work , changes to the staff development program and the time table and any re-allocation of budget, roles and responsibilities needed to achieve the goals set. This is radically different from the type plan that simply focuses on the implementation of external change , however important that is or development of school wide policies and practices , which may not have direct impact on class room practice (P :103). Therefore, collaboration is key to success full planning in the implementation process of school improvement program at school level.

2.3.1.3. Coordination

The school capacity to coordinate the action teachers behind agreed policies or goals is an important factor in promoting change. at the core of such strategies are communication system and procedures , and the way in which groups can be created and sustained to coordinate improved effort across range of levels or departments .of particular importance are specific strategies for ensuring that all staff are kept informed about development priorities and activities, as this is information vital to informed self –direction.

Communication is vital to overall school-coordination. In order for a school to organize itself to accomplish its goals, maintain itself in good working order and, at the same time, adapted to changing circumstance, sounding procedures for communication are essential (Hopkins,2004, p:100)therefore, good coordination is vital for school improvement program implementation.
Schools produced communication systems, procedures and the way in which groups can be created and sustained to coordinate improved effort across a range of levels. The school’s capacity to coordinate the action of teachers behind agreed policies is an important condition in promoting change. Coordination is about getting groups of teachers, and usually groups with different values and goals to contribute to the good of all. The importance of coordination for school improvement is so vital that schools that have a well-coordinated team are likely to have successful implementation of reform programs (Hopkins, 2002).

Therefore, the organizational approach which is most likely to create a positive working atmosphere is the one that emphasizes cooperation. The aim of cooperation must be encourage a more tightly systems within which efforts of individuals are coordinated in order to maximize their impact.

2.3.1.4. Involvement

According to Hopkins (2004), in effective schools, there is strong evidence that success is associated with a sense of identification and involvement that extended behind the teaching staff. This involves pupils, parents and indeed, other members of the local community. It does seem that those schools that are able to create positive relationships with their wider community can create a supportive climate for learning.

Reynolds (1991) in Hopkins refers to the existence of what he calls an “in corporative approach”. This he notes has to major elements: incorporation of pupils in to the organizations of the school and the incorporation of their parents through supportive roles. In many improving schools this approach is widened to include members of the local community (Gray et al., 1999 in Hopkins, 2004).

Pupil’s involvement is a particularly important factor in school improvement. This can occur at an organizational level, by involving pupils in decision making and encouraging them to take responsibility for the day-to-day routines. At the class level, student can be encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning and through involvement, to learn organizational, planning, discussion, decision- making and leadership skills (Stoll, 1991; Rudduck et al., 1996 in Hopkins, 2004).
When pupils are less involved, it is likely that their attitudes to school will be much more negative. Then when innovations are introduced, they may well become barriers to change. Their resistance may not be open and tangible, but never the less their initiative reactions may create the negative atmosphere that discourages staff from pursuing their goals.

The incorporative approach can be extended beyond the schools gate to involve parents, members of local community, and of course, school governors. Here the attitudes of staff area major factor. Unfortunately some staff still sees parents as hindrance. Similarly parental views of the schools and teachers vary. Often parental views of teachers are based on their own experience in school. This may have been negative, and the parents may see the school as an institution that fails people.

The whole issue of communications between school and parents therefore needs to be handled effectively, particularly through careful planning and skillful interviewing techniques. In addition Hussein and Postlethwaile, 1994 in Frew, 2010 stated that the success of school is associated with the sense of identification and involvement extends beyond the teaching staff. In other words, involvement and sense of identification of pupils, parents, non-teaching staff and other community members is as crucial as that of the teaching staff for the success of schools. Because the success of an improvement program (perhaps any other educational program) requires an interaction between many participants at different levels.

2.3.1.5. Leadership

Studies of school effectiveness affirm that leadership is a key element in determining school success (Mortimore, 1999 as cited in Hopkins, 2004:98). Recently, studies of leadership in schools have moved away from the identification of this function exclusively with the head teacher, and begun to address how leadership can be made available throughout the management structure and at all level in the school community (Gronn, 1999 as cited in Hopkins, 2004). This shift in emphasis has been accompanied by a shift in thinking about leadership itself. There is an increasing call for ‘transformational’ approaches which distribute and empower rather than ‘transactional’ approaches which sustain traditional, and broadly bureaucratic, concepts of hierarchy and control (Hallinger, 1992; Letiwood, 1993 in Hopkins, 2004, p: 99). Schools that are successful with their improvement efforts not only regarded leadership as distributed
function, they also deliberately set out to promote discussion about leadership style and to help staff from different levels in the school to share perceptions about how leadership operates. In improving quality education for all (IQEA) schools, such discussion tends to identify a number of key aspects of the leadership role (Hopkins et al., 1994 in Hopkins, 2004):

The responsibility of school leaders in establishing a clear ‘vision’ or set of purposes for the school. The methods through which the vision is developed seem to be as important as vision itself in generating staff commitment. There is clear concern in the literature over the imposition of a vision at the expense of ‘vision building’.

The way individual knowledge, skills and experience are harnessed, and the extent to which the school is able to transcend traditional notions of hierarchy or role in bringing together the ‘best team for the job’. Leadership that arises from relevant knowledge or experience seems to be more successful than leadership stemming from authority.

The way leadership is used in group or team meeting, leader behavior is obviously an important determinant of group effectiveness. A strong commitment to the quality of relationships within the group can however sometimes lead to over cohesiveness, with a corresponding decline in the quality of critical thinking which individuals bring to the group. The dangers associated with ‘group think’ are well known.

The more effective schools seem to explore opportunities for ‘spreading ‘the leadership function throughout the staff group. This means accepting the leadership is a function to which staff contributes, rather than a set responsibilities vested in a small number of individuals (p: 99).

2.3.1.6. Enquiry and Reflection

Schools that recognize that enquiry and reflection are important processes in school improvement find it easier to sustain improvement effort around established priorities, and are better placed to monitor the extent to which policies actually deliver the intended outcomes for pupils (Ainscow et al., 1994 as cited in Hopkins, 2004).Central to conditions that promotes the effective use of enquiry and reflection as development tools are: a) systematic collection, interpretation and use of school –generated data in decision- making, b) effective strategies for reviewing the progress and impact of school policies and initiatives ,c) widespread involvement
of staff in the processes of data collection and analysis, d) clear ground rules for the collection, control and used of school-based data.

Some schools are much better organized than others and have clear systems and procedures for collecting, analyzing and interpreting information relevant to particular aspects of the school or particular decisions. Even in these cases, however, a more general commitment to enquire into and reflect on the school’s progress is rare – more often it is the issue that is identified then the information collected, rather than data being collected to help identify what the issue should be. It is the habits of enquiry and reflection, particularly about the impact, rather than the implementation, of improvement programs, that are the important forces for improvement (Hopkin, 2004).

2.3.2. External Conditions for School Improvement

2.3.2.1. Capacity Building
School capacity can be described as the collective competency of the school as an entity to bring about effective change. This implies four core components: knowledge, skills and disposition of individuals’ staff; a professional learning community in which staff work collaboratively; program coherence; technical recourses (Hopkin set al., 2001).

Building capacity for whole school improvement involves bringing together these four core components: resources, structure, culture and the schools of staff, not only focusing on improvement but doing so in ways which are synergistic. The reason why building capacity at whole school level is so difficult to achieve is that all different elements develop, and decline unevenly (Hadfield in Harris, 2005). Therefore, Capacity is the key construct in creating the conditions within the school to enhance both teaching and learning.

2.3.2.2. Policy Issue
It is clear that, for success of school improvement initiatives the existence of a clear policy and intervention strategy will have a paramount importance. Thus the school internal conditions, classroom practices and the policy context should support each other, or should pull to have impact on SIP.
According to Marzano (2003), in the context of school improvement policy can be viewed as the implementation framework that guide the action of all involve in the life of school. Concerning the implementation policy, Hopkins (2001) stated that, “policy cannot be mandating what matters; it is implementation at the local and school level that dominate outcomes”. Hopkins (2001) also described that for its practicality a policy that developed at all levels needs to be coherent practical acceptable and implementation oriented. Therefore, the implication is that policy implementation needs care and continuous follow up in order that its impact can be measured. In short, the micro level policy should link to macro level policy and more should be given to the implementation. Moreover, Hopkins et al. (1994) suggest that in promoting school improvement, policy has to keep relating focus on student achievement and learning, pay attention to context build capacity and strengthen know capacity, research and dissemination. Hence for success of school improvement it needs to provide schools a wide range of policy options so as they can make choice and policy should aligned with system policy

2.4. Challenges for School Improvement Program

School improvement program is very complex that it 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, 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 the resources to engage in significant change. However there are common challenges that most school improvement programs face. 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 less well-socialized, 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 teachers” work is less autonomous and more integrated with that of other teachers 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 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 skill professionals needed to assure successful results.

In Ethiopia, besides the commitment of the country to improve access 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.

**Lack of Commitment of School Leaders**

Most of the school principal who are in the leading position did not get adequate educational training leadership. Even those who are trained also are not effective in leading the schools. 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).
Lack of Stakeholders Participation

Schools need participation of all stakeholders 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).

Lack of 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 secured their school environment (MOE, 2007).

Lack of Educational Input

Due to the lack of commitment of school society, other stakeholder and non-government organizations are not enough to solve the problem of the schools by providing instructional materials and other financial supporting; currently schools lack the required educational inputs (MOE 2007).
CHAPTER THREE

Research Design and Methods
In this part of the study, the research methodology sources of data, sampling techniques, variable which are studied, instrument used to gather data, procedure of data collection and methods of analysis were discussed

3.1. The Research Design
Descriptive survey research method was employed for this study. This is mainly because it was appropriate for the study and the method helps gather a large variety of data to a problem under study. In this respect, Keeves (1990) justified that descriptive survey research method is a fact finding study with adequate and accurate interpretation of the findings.

3.2. Sources of Data
Primary and secondary sources of data were used in study so as to obtain the relevant and adequate information.

3.2.1. Primary Sources
Primary sources help researchers get firsthand information about the research problem. These primary sources of information of the study were collected from all concerned bodies. In this regards, 4 secondary school principals, 4 secondary school supervisors, 4 Woreda Education Office SIP Coordinators, 32 PTA members, 28 SIP committee and 113 secondary school teachers were included in this study as sources of information.

3.2.2. Secondary Sources
The secondary source of data used for this study was documents. Secondary data were collected by reviewing pertinent documents such as SIP committee document frame work, PTA’s minutes of monitoring and follow up document, performance report of school leadership activities.

3.3. Sample size and Sampling Techniques
West Shoa Zone is one among 26 Zones of Oromia Regional State. In this regard, the researcher intentionally selected west shoa zone as the study area purposively since it was convenient to conduct study as one dweller of this zone and very easy to collect sympathetic data. In connection to this, there were 22 Woredas in West shoa zone. The issue of geographical features
and more resemblance of schools have been taken into consideration and four woredas were incorporated in the sample study by using simple random sampling techniques. The selected woredas are Ambo Woreda, Jeldu Woreda, Chelia Woreda and Mida kegn Woreda. In the same fashion, simple random sampling techniques were employed in woredas those have two and above two secondary schools like Chelia woreda and Jeldu woreda and Mida Kegn Woreda. Furthermore, Jeldu secondary and preparatory school, Meti secondary school, Gedo secondary and preparatory school and Chukala wange secondary school were sampled schools.

Since the number of respondents was fixed, the available number of secondary school principals, secondary school supervisors and woreda education office SIP coordinator were included in the study from four secondary schools purposively. Likewise, all eight PTA members from each secondary school and a total of 32 members were included in the respondents using purposive sampling techniques. Regarding SIP committee, 70% of the committee was included in the respondents using simple random sampling techniques.

Furthermore, four secondary school principals, four secondary school supervisors, four Woreda education office SIP coordinators, 32 PTA members, 28 SIP committee and 113 secondary school teachers were included from 188 teachers using simple random techniques in this study as sources of information.
### Table 1. Population and samples of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total respondents</th>
<th>Sampling technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meti Sec. Sch.</td>
<td>Jeldu PP sch.</td>
<td>Gedo Sec. and PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Po</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SIP committee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Woreda SIP focal person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Po- Population, Sa- Sample, Sec- Secondary, Sch- School, PP-Preparatory
3.4. Data Gathering Tools

3.4.1. Questionnaire
Questionnaire was the major data collecting instrument for the study. It is used for the main reason that it is a tool for obtaining varieties of opinions from a large population within a short span of time. In order to make better and relevant data, the questionnaire was composed of both closed and open ended items.

Both closed ended and open ended questionnaire items were provided for the 113 (60%) of teachers, 32 (100%) of PTA and 28 (70%) SIP committee of secondary schools of West Shoa Zones were incorporated in the study.

3.4.2 Interview
The second instrument that was employed to generate data is interview. The interview was actually for addressing issues that questionnaire may not cover and to support the descriptive results. Semi-structured type of interviews were conducted with principal, secondary school supervisors and Woreda Education Office SIP focal person.

3.4.3 Document
This was related documents like SIP committee document frame work, PTA’s minutes of monitoring and follow up document, Performance report of school leadership activities were documents reviewed to search for further study as a tool.

3.5. Method of Data Analysis
The Quantitative data that were collected through close-ended questionnaire from all respondents are coded, tabulated, analyzed, described, and interpreted based on the nature of the questions. In similar way, the quantitative data were analyzed by using the frequency, percentage and mean score, standard deviation and one way ANOVA.

The qualitative data that was collected through interview, document and open-ended questionnaire were analyzed qualitatively using narrative form. As Bogdan and Biklen (2002) stated that analysis in qualitative study basically involved word argumentations than numerical explanations. Standard deviation, Mean score and ANOVA (T-test) were employed to investigate statistical significance, difference or relationships as well as the level of agreement in
three groups of questionnaire respondents. These are PTA, teachers and SIP committee members. SPSS (version.23) was used for obtaining values of mean scores, standard deviations and F-test.

3.6. Ethical Consideration

A formal letter would be submitted to all the concerned bodies to obtain their co-operations. The researcher requested the respondents’ free consent for the study subjects to the investigation. Moreover, all the study participants were informed verbally about the purpose and benefit of the study along with their right to refuse. Furthermore, the study participants were reassured of confidentiality by explaining to them, their name and other identifier of their status was not documented in the questionnaires and the information was kept confidential that no one has opportunity to see the response except the researcher and the information they provided was not be used for anything other than research purpose.
CHAPTER FOUR

4. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data.

This chapter deals with description of the sampled population, analysis and the interpretation of data based on the information obtained from the questionnaires, interview and observation. It consists two parts. The first part is concerned with description of the background information of the sample population and the second part is concerned with analysis and interpretation of data.

The data collected through questionnaires, interview and document, Questionnaires were distributed to secondary school teachers, PTA and SIP committee while interview was conducted with principals, secondary school supervisors and woreda SIP focal person. The information gathered from questionnaires was organized in tabular form and were interpreted by descriptive statistics using percentages, frequency, grand mean, and ANOVA. The information gathered through interview was used to provide qualitative analysis in order to give answer to the basic research questions, which were set in the study. For analysis purpose the mean values were interpreted as mean 1-1.5 =SDA, 1.51-2.50 =DA, 2.51-3.50 =MD, 3.51-4.50 =A and 4.51-5 =SA in decision-making. KEY: - SDA= Strongly Disagree, DA= Disagree, MD= Medium, A= Agree and SA= Strongly Agree.

4.1. General Characteristics of the Respondents

Regarding the questionnaire respondents a total of 173 questionnaires were distributed and 171 (99%) were returned. The major characteristics of the respondents were presented in Tables 4.1.
Table 4.1: Sex and Age Distribution Qualification and service year of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>principal</th>
<th>supervisor</th>
<th>Woreda focal person</th>
<th>PTA</th>
<th>SIP committee</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA/MS c.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Years of services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 4.1, all secondary school principals and all secondary school supervisors were males. Half, of which is, 50% of male and female matrix was exhibited in Woreda SIP focal person. In case of PTA, SIP committee and teachers, majority 22 (73%), 21 (75%), and 93 (82%) of were respectively male. This is therefore, revealed that female participation in school leadership and as well teaching profession were still insignificant and it need extensive work
since it is impossible to bring quality education without the active participation of females in teaching and administrative activities of the school.

With regards to age distribution, item 2 of the above table, majority three of principals were within range, the of in the age 31-40 years. And three of the supervisors were in at the age of 31-40 and 41-50 respectively. Regarding Woreda Education Expert SIP focal person, majority 3 (75%) were range within of the age of 31-40 years. Majority 14 (47%) of PTA members were in the age range of 41-50. In connection to this, majority 13 (46%) and 79 (70%) of SIP committee and teachers were in the age range 31-40 years respectively. From this, it can be conclude the respondents are matured to provide valuable information in the study.

Item 3of the above table is about the qualification of the respondents. In this regard, majority, three (75%) of principals, 20 (71%) of SIP committee and 90 (80%) of teachers were first degree holders. Half of secondary school supervisors were first degree holders while the rest half were with MA holders. Regarding Woreda Education Office, SIP focal personas all were first degree holders. When we see PTA’s qualification, 13 (43%) did not have degree, MA and Diploma. The rest, 6 (20%) and 17 (57%) were diploma and degree holders.

Concerning years of services, it was convenient to see service years of principals, supervisors, SIP focal person of Woreda Education Office, SIP committee and teachers. In this regard, majority three (75%) of secondary school principals served 11-15 years the rest served 16-20 years. Half of the supervisors served 6-10 years and the rest half served 11-15 years. three of Woreda Education Office SIP coordinators served 11-15 years. In the same fashion majority 10 (30%) of SIP committee were served the years of 11-15. The rest 12 (43%) served 16-20 and above 20 years. Majority 65 (58%) of teachers served from 11-15 years and the rest 20 (18%) and 19 (17%) served 6-10 and 16-20 years.

Based on the above analysis it can be conclude that the respondents possess and important service years that help to deliver quality service and also provide valuable information of the study.
4.2. Leadership’s Endeavor to Enhance Leading School for Improvement

The following questions were listed to examine the leadership’s endeavor to enhance leading school for improvement in secondary schools of West Shoa Zone. In this first question, to check the extent of the school leadership strive to lead school for improvement.

Table 4.2: Response on Extent that School Leaders Strive for Leading for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent school leader strive to lead school for improvement</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>LE ME GE VGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N %  N %  N %  N %  N %  N %  N %  N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53 47 41 36 11 8 8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIP committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PTAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: LE-Less extent, ME- Moderate Extent, GE- Great Extent, VGE-Very great extent

In the above table the question was provided for respondents to check the extent that the school leaders strive to lead school for improvement. In this regard majority 53 (47%) and 41 (36%) of teachers responded that school leaders strive to lead school for improvement from less extent to moderate extent. In the same ways SIP committee also rated as less extent and moderate extent by forwarding the figure 13 (46%) and 8 (29%) respectively. However, the response of PTAs was different from the responses of teachers and SIP committee. In this regard, majority 14 (47%), and 12(40%) of the PTAs responded that school leaders strive to the extent of moderate, and great extent respectively.

To substantiate the above questions, interview was conducted with secondary school supervisors. The response of secondary school supervisors showed that school leaders exhibited less extent to lead school for improvement due to some internal and external factors. From this analysis, it can be concluded that the school leaders strive to a less extent for leading school for improvement.
Table 4.3: Response on School Leaders Strive for Leading for improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers, (n=113)</th>
<th>SIP committee (n=28)</th>
<th>PTAs (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School leaders make the school conducive environment for learning</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The adequacy of educational leadership skill to implement school improvement Plan is effective</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The school leadership has competency to lead school improvement program</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Secondary school supervisor provided assistance in SIP implementation</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.3, response to the item 1; school leaders make the school conducive environment for learning. In this regard, the mean value of teachers, SIP committee and PTAs were 2.43, 2.25 and 2.49 respectively. This showed that all respondents’ response shows the disagreement on the provision that the school leaders make the school conducive environment for learning.

Item 2 of Table 4.3 was about the adequacy of educational leadership skill to implement school Improvement Plan. In this regard, the mean value of teachers was 3.43, and the mean value of SIP committee was 3.18 and the mean value of PTAs is 3.34. These confirmed that all the respondents moderately agreed on the adequacy of educational leadership skill to implement school Improvement plan.

In Table 4.3 item 3 was provided to be rated on the school leadership competency to lead school improvement program. In light with this, the mean vale of teacher, SIP committee and PTAs were 3.23, 3.37 and 3.41 respectively. The respondents moderately agreed on the school leadership competency to lead school improvement program.

Item 4 of the Table 4.3 was provided for respondents to rate whether secondary school supervisor provided assistance in SIP implementation. The mean value of teachers was 2.38 the
mean value of SIP committee was 2.33 and the mean value of PTAs was 2.42. This therefore, indicated that the respondents disagreed on the provision of secondary school supervisor’s assistance and support in SIP implementation.

The interview response of Woreda Education Office SIP focal person and Secondary School Supervisor revealed that the school leadership makes endeavor to do.

4.3. The Practice of School Improvement Program in Secondary School

The following questions are stated to assess whether the activities of school Improvement program were implemented. In this respect, the extent of implementation on the four domains namely; teaching-learning process, safe and conducive learning environment, school leadership and community participation had been treated based on the selected items that represent the successful implementation of SIP in each school domains. For analysis purpose in table 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 the mean values were interpreted as mean > 3.5= High, 2.5-3.5=moderate; and < 2.5 low.

4.4.1. Teaching Learning Domain

Table 4.4: Response on the practices of teaching learning domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers, (n=113)</th>
<th>SIP committee (n=28)</th>
<th>PTAs (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The level of teachers satisfaction with school leadership commitmen</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to improve the learning achievements of all students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The extent to which active learning method of teaching was practiced</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The extent to which student achievement were improved from initial</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teachers participate in continuous professional development (CPD)</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in order to learn new knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 4.4, response to the item 1; teachers are satisfied with school leadership commitment to improve the learning achievements of all students. In this regard, as the mean value of teachers, and SIP committee respectively 2.13, 2.35. It was indicated that both teachers and SIP committee rated it low. However, as the mean value was of PTAs is 3.3 and indicated PTAs rated it as moderate. In connection to this, Woreda Education Office SIP’s focal persons replied on their interview that low level of satisfaction of teachers and even administrative personnel on the commitment of education leaders in making teaching learning more interactive. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is low teacher’s satisfaction with school leadership commitment to improve the learning achievements of all students.

Item 2 of Table 4.4 was stated about the extent to which active learning method of teaching was practiced by teachers. In this regard, the mean value of teachers was 2.23, the mean value of SIP committee was 2.46 and the mean value of PTAs is 2.42. These confirmed that all the respondents rated that low level of active learning method of teaching was practiced by teachers.

From this, teachers there is always more to do and they are always striving to find ways of doing it better the area of effective learning and teaching, by using active learning methodologies it is hoped that students will not only come to a deeper understanding of the issues involved, but also that their motivation and enthusiasm will be heightened.

In Table 4.4 item 3 was provided to be rated on the extent to which student achievements were improved from initial point. In light of this, the mean value of teacher, SIP committee and PTAs were 3.41, 3.23 and 3.37 respectively. The respondents moderately agreed that students’ achievement were improved from initial point.

Item 4 of the Table 4.4 was provided for respondents to rate whether teachers participate in continuous professional development (CPD) in order to learn new knowledge. The mean value for teachers was 3.34, the mean value for SIP committee was 3.38 and the mean value for PTAs was 3.27. This therefore, indicated that the respondents moderately agreed on the participation of teachers in continuous professional development (CPD) in order to learn new knowledge.

The interview response of secondary school principals showed that teaching and learning domain of SIP was very essential component. As the reality on the ground showed, the practice of teaching and learning domain was moderate. In the same fashion, the interview response of
secondary school supervisors indicated that implementation of teaching and learning domain of SIP was practiced at moderate level. Therefore, a moderate level of practice of teaching and learning domain in secondary schools was done.

4.3.2. Community Participation Domain

Table 4.5: Response on the Practices of Community Participation Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers, (n=113)</th>
<th>SIP committee (n=28)</th>
<th>PTAs (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Schools successfully mobilize the community to provide resources to support implementation of the SIP.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parents actively participate in school events (meeting, panel discussion and others).</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The participation of stakeholders (teachers, students and parents) in SIP implementation</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parents actively participate in donating the school goods and materials.</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.5, response to the item 1; schools successfully mobilize the community to provide resources to support the implementation of the SIP. In this regard, the mean value for teachers, SIP committee and PTA were 2.92, 2.82 and 2.98 respectively. It was indicated that all teachers SIP committee and PTA rated the item schools successfully mobilize the community to provide resources to support implementation of the SIP as low. In connection to this, secondary school supervisor replied on their interview that low level of community participation was observed in provision of resources and providing support in SIP implementation.

Item 2 of Table 4.5 stated about parents active participation in school events (meeting, panel discussion and others). In this regard, the mean values for teachers was 2.12, the mean value of SIP committee was 2.20 and the mean value of PTAs is 2.17. These confirmed that all the respondents rated that there was low level of mobilization of the community to provide resources to support implementation of the SIP.

In Table 4.5 item 3 participants were provided to rate on the participation of stakeholders (teachers, students and parents) in SIP implementation. In light of this, the mean value of teacher, SIP committee and PTAs were 3.17, 3.33 and 3.43 respectively. The respondents
moderately agreed on the participation of stakeholders (teachers, students and parents) in SIP implementation.

Item 4 of the Table 4.5 provided for respondents to rate parents active participation in donating the school goods and materials. The mean value for teacher was 2.23, the mean value for SIP committees was 2.15 and the mean value for PTAs was 2.50. This therefore, indicated that the respondents rate it low level of parents participation in donating the school goods and materials.

The interview response of Woreda Education Office SIP focal person and Secondary School Principals showed the low participation of parents in donating the school goods and materials in order to make school more attractive for students learning.

Therefore, based on the above analysis it can be concluded that low community participation in secondary schools of West Shoa Zones. Because of their low level efforts in creating good communication with school community, in the articulation of school vision, therefore the Woreda and Zone Education Offices are responsible to capacitate the school leaders the way to create their school mission, vision and Goals.

4.3.3. School management domain

Table 4.6: Response on the Practices of School Management Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. N</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers, (n=113)</th>
<th>SIP committee (n=28)</th>
<th>PTAs (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff members ability to demonstrate significant involvement in school decision making</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The extent to which capacity building training given in light of SIP planning to school community</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The strategic plan of the school was prepared on the basis of self-evaluation</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The assessment methods utilized is used to assess student learning</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 1 of the Table 4.6 provided for respondents to rate on Staff members ability to demonstrate significant involvement in school decision making. The mean value of teacher was 3.48, the mean value of SIP committee was 3.49 and the mean value of PTAs was 3.50. This therefore, indicated that the respondents rated it as moderate level and the staff were able to demonstrate significant involvement in school decision making.

In Table 4.6 item 2 provided to rate the extent to which capacity building training was given in light on SIP planning to school community. In light of this, the mean value of teachers, SIP committee and PTAs were 2.65, 2.2 and 2.71 respectively. All respondents agreed on low provision of capacity building training in light on SIP planning to school community.

Item 3 of Table 4.6 stated to know whether are not the strategic plan of the school was prepared on the basis of self-evaluation. In this regard, the mean value for teachers was 3.37, the mean value for SIP committee was 3.43 and the mean value for PTAs is 3.58. These all confirmed that respondents rated it as moderate level.

In Table 4.6 the response to item 4; on the assessment methods used to assess student learning shows that the mean value for teachers, and SIP committee and PTA were 3.23, 3.35 and 3.43 respectively. It indicated that all teachers, SIP committee and PTA were rated it as moderate shows of that the assessment methods utilized is used to assess student learning.

In light with this, the interview responses of the respondents confirmed that there is better status of school leadership and management in implementing participatory decision making, preparing strategic plan that incorporated self-evaluation and realizing effective assessment method that enhance students’ performance in learning activities.
### 4.3.4. School Environment Domain

Table 4.7: Response on Practices Maintaining School Environment Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. N</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers, (n=113)</th>
<th>SIP committee (n=28)</th>
<th>PTAs (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The adequacy of budget mainly for the achievement of school improvement program</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The utilization of school grant for school improvement activities as planned</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The degree to which class rooms are suitable for teaching learning process</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The collaborative work being implemented to support inclusive education for students and teachers with special needs.</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The school access to safe water for drinking</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Schools provision of quality school facilities that enable all staff to work and for learning of students.</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 1: Table 4.7 was provided for respondents to rate on the adequacy of budget mainly for the achievement of school improvement program. The mean value for teacher was 2.93, the mean value for SIP committee was 3.05 and the mean value for PTAs was 3.13. This is therefore, indicated that the respondents were rated as moderate adequacy of budget mainly for the achievement of school improvement program.

In Table 4.7 item 2 was provided to be rated on the status of utilization of school grant for school improvement activities as planned. In light with this, the mean vale of teacher, SIP committee and PTAs were 2.89, 2.2 and 3.40, and 3.19 respectively. In light of this, all the respondents agreed that moderate status of utilization of school grant for school improvement activities as planned.

Item 3 of Table 4.7 stated about the degree to which class rooms are suitable for teaching learning process. In this regard, the mean value of teachers was 2.09, the mean value of SIP
committee was 2.20 and the mean value of PTAs is 2.44. These confirmed that all the respondents rated that low level of class rooms suitable for teaching learning process.

In table 4.7, response to the item 4; Collaborative work is being implemented to support inclusive education for students and teachers with special needs. In this regard, as the mean value of teachers, and SIP committee and PTA were 2.26, 2.45 and 2.50 respectively. It was indicated that all teachers, SIP committee and PTA were rated low Collaborative work was being implemented to support inclusive education for students and teachers with special needs.

Item 5 of table 4.7 was stated about the school has access to safe water for drinking. In this regard, the mean value of teachers was 3.38, the mean value of SIP committee was 3.29 and the mean value of PTAs was 3.46. These confirmed that all the respondents rated that there was moderate access to safe water for drinking in secondary schools.

In table 4.7 response to the item 6; Schools provide quality school facilities that enable all staff to work and for learning of students. In this regard, as the mean value of teachers, and SIP committee and PTA were 2.26, 2.45 and 2.50 respectively. It was indicated that all teachers, SIP committee and PTA were rated low Schools provide quality school facilities that enable all staff to work and for learning of students.

In light these, the interview responses of secondary school supervisors showed that: government gave due attention in allocation of budget and school grant were provided for school based on the number of students for implementation of quality education as a whole. However, there were low provision of school facilities, less collaborative work and the problem of unsuitability of class rooms for teaching learning process.
4.3.5. Rating Implementation of SIP in Secondary School

Table 4.8: Response implementation of SIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Teachers, (n=113)</th>
<th>SIP committee (n=28)</th>
<th>PTAs (n=30)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Implementation of SIP in your school</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>average</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above table the level of implementation of SIP was provided to be rated. In this regard, majority of teachers ranked average rate of Implementation of SIP in secondary school. In the same fashion, majority of SIP committee and PTAs rated that average level of implementation of SIP by ranking 15 (54%) and 16 (53%) respectively. When we look the total sum of the responses, from the total 171 respondents, majority 96 (56%) of them responded that SIP was averagely implemented in secondary schools.

4.4. Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism of Leading for Improvement

The following questions were stated to check whether monitoring and evaluation mechanism undertaken in practice of leading school for improvement. For analysis purpose in Table 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 the mean values were interpreted as mean > 3.5= High, 2.5-3.5=moderate; and < 2.5 low.
Item 1 of the Table 4.9 provided for respondents to be rated on the School prepare meetings to review, update and formally approve schools polices, regulations and procedures. The mean value of teacher was 3.18, the mean value of SIP committee was 3.19 and the mean value of PTAs was 3.20. This is therefore, indicated that the respondents rated it as moderately level of school preparation of meetings to review, update and formally approve schools polices, regulations and procedures.

In Table 4.9 item 2 was provided to be rated on the status of school leaders provide monitoring and evaluation in implementation of leading school for improvement. In light with this, the mean vale of teacher, SIP committee and PTAs were 2.55, 2.10, and 2.61 respectively. In light with this, all the respondents were agreed that low status of school leaders frequently provide monitoring and evaluation in implementation of leading school for improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n o</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers, (n=113)</th>
<th>SIP committee (n=28)</th>
<th>PTAs (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Schools preparation of meetings to review, update and formally approve schools polices, regulations and procedures.</td>
<td>3.18 .631</td>
<td>3.19 .611</td>
<td>3.20 .601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>School leaders provide monitoring and evaluation in implementation of leading school for improvement.</td>
<td>2.55 .741</td>
<td>2.10 .899</td>
<td>2.61 .672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The ability of school improvement committee (SIC) to coordinate efforts in developing school improvement plan</td>
<td>3.27 .623</td>
<td>3.33 .621</td>
<td>3.49 .520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Schools creation of opportunities for students to develop into self-regulating learners within and beyond the classroom.</td>
<td>2.05 1.03</td>
<td>2.01 .522</td>
<td>2.09 1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: Response on the practices of Monitoring and evaluation mechanism of leading school for improvement
Item 3 of table 4.9 was stated about the degree to which the ability of school improvement committee (SIC) to coordinate efforts in developing school improvement plan. In this regard, the mean value of teachers was 3.27, the mean value of SIP committee was 3.33 and the mean value of PTAs is 3.49. These confirmed that all the respondents were rated that moderate level of ability of school improvement committee (SIC) to coordinate efforts in developing school improvement plan.

In table 4.9 response to the item 4; School creates opportunities for students to develop into self-regulating learners within and beyond the classroom. In this regard, as the mean value of teachers, and SIP committee and PTA were 2.05, 2.01 and 2.09 respectively. It was indicated that all teachers, SIP committee and PTA were rated low level of school creates opportunities for students to develop into self-regulating learners within and beyond the classroom.

**Table 4.10: Response on the practices of release of appropriate Monitoring and evaluation mechanism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers, (n=113)</td>
<td>SIP committee (n=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School leaders release appropriate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms so as to implement leading school for improvement on time</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 4.10, the item of School leaders release appropriate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms so as to implement leading school for improvement on time was provided to be rated by the respondents. In this line, majority 72 (64%) of teachers, again majority 19 (68%) of SIP committee and majority 18 (60%) of PTAs were responded that School leaders are not releasing appropriate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms so as to implement leading school for improvement on time.
Interview responses of secondary school supervisors Teachers 41(36%), say yes, no 72(64%), SIP members yes 9(32%), no 19(68%) and PTAs yes 12(40%), no 18(60%) also showed the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms undertaken in secondary schools were not regularly implemented and whenever monitoring and evaluation mechanism, they used for formality and no provision of feedback for the individuals under monitoring.

Therefore, from the above analysis it can be concluded that low level of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms by school leaders so as to implement leading school for improvement on time.

4.5. Challenges for School Improvement Program Implementation (SIP)

The following questions were asked to assess the factors which negatively affect the implementation of leading school for improvement.

For analysis purpose, for table 4.11, based on the views of respondents on the challenges of school improvement program the mean values were interpreted as mean $\geq 3.5$ serious problems, $2.5 \leq$ mean $< 3.5$ moderately problems and mean $< 2.5$ not a problem.
Table 4.11: Response on Factors Affecting Implementation of SIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teachers, (n=113)</th>
<th>SIP committee, (n=28)</th>
<th>PTAs, (n=30)</th>
<th>Comparing means one-way ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The problem of large class size to implement active learning in the class.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The absence of installed science and technology which support learning</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lack of training in SIP negatively affects its implementation</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory, library and pedagogical centers.)</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 1 of the above table shows the problem of large class size to implement active learning in the class. In this regard the mean value of teachers and the mean value of SIP committee were 3.93 and 3.89 respectively showed the problem of large class size was highly existed. However, the mean value of PTAs was 2.67 which is the problem of large class size moderately existed. The grand mean 3.5 was also confirmed the problem of large class size highly existed in secondary schools. The variation in responses was also confirmed by the F-value which is shown in the above table. The F-value 6.255 showed there was statistical significance difference between the respondents at p > 0.05 level of significance. The respondents have similar views on the problem of large class size to implement active learning in the class. In connection to this, the interview response of secondary school principals confirmed that large class size was a serious problem in secondary school and even it is increasing from year to year.

Item 2 of the table 4.11 shows the problem of the absence of installed science and technology which support learning. In this regard the mean value of teachers, SIP committee and PTAs were 3.25, 3.16, and 3.00 respectively showed the absence of installed science and technology which support learning problem of large class size was moderately existed. The grand mean 2.80 was also confirmed the absence of installed science and technology which support learning moderately existed in secondary schools. The variation in responses was also confirmed by the F-value which is shown in the above table. The F-value 8.516 showed there was statistical significance difference between the respondents at p > 0.05 level of significance.

Item 3 of the table 4.11 shows the problem Lack of training in SIP negatively affects its implementation. In this regard the mean value of teachers and SIP committee were 3.42, 3.04, respectively showed the problem of Lack of training in SIP negatively affects its implementation was moderately existed. In contrary to this, the mean value of PTAs was 2.41 showed low level of the problem of Lack of training in SIP negatively affects its implementation. The grand mean 2.96 was also confirmed the Lack of training in SIP negatively affects its implementation moderately existed in secondary schools. The variation in responses was also confirmed by the F-value which is shown in the above table. The F-value 2.341 showed there was no statistical significance difference between the respondents at p > 0.05 level of significance.

Item 4 of the table 4.11 shows the problem of insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory, library and pedagogical centers.). In this regard the mean value of teachers, SIP committee and
PTAs were 3.70, 3.54, and 3.58 respectively showed the insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory, library and pedagogical centers.) were highly existed. The grand mean 3.60 was also confirmed the insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory, library and pedagogical centers.) highly existed in secondary schools. The variation in responses was also confirmed by the $T$-value which is shown in the above table. The $T$-value 16.113 showed there was statistical significance difference between the respondents at $p > 0.05$ level of significance.

In connection to these, the interview responses of secondary school principals and supervisors showed that constraint factors affecting leading school for improvement were lack of school facilities like sufficient class rooms laboratories school pedagogy centers and play grounds and lack of sufficient technology resources and installation of in ternate were highly existed.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter deals with an overview of the purposes and procedures of the study, major findings, conclusions and recommendations forwarded.

5.1 Summary

The general objective of the study was to assess practices and challenges of leading school for improvement in Secondary Schools of West Shoa Zone. Accordingly, descriptive survey research method study was employed in this study and the related literature was reviewed. In order to achieve this objective the study was guided by the following basic research questions:

1. What are the school leadership’s endeavors to enhance leading school for improvement in secondary schools of west shoa zone?
2. What are the major activities of school improvement program are implemented in secondary schools?
3. What are the monitoring and evaluating mechanisms undertaken in leading school for improvement?
4. What are the major factors that affect practices of leading school for improvement in secondary schools of west shoa zone?

Secondary teachers, SIP committee in sampled secondary schools were selected by simple random sampling techniques and involved in the study as a main source of data. School principals, secondary school supervisors and PTAs were selected by availability sampling method.

[Different data collecting tools were employed to carry out the study. These included questionnaire, interviews and documents. The questionnaires were distributed to 113 secondary school teachers, 28 SIP committee and 30 PTAs. Among the distributed questionnaire, 99% were filled and returned.

In addition to this, four school principals, four secondary supervisors and four woreda SIP focal person were interviewed. Most of the data gathered were organized using tables and the data
gathered were presented in line with the basic research questions. For the sake of convenience of interpretation, related questions were treated together.

Finally, the study had employed different data analysis tools that the researcher thought of as result to the study under consideration. These statistical tools used include percentage, mean score and F-test. The analysis made therefore, justified the following major findings.

In light with the basic research questions, the major findings of this study were summarized as follows:

1. **Leadership’s endeavor to enhance leading school for improvement**
   The school leaders level of strive for leading school for improvement was in less extent, and the respondents responded that disagree on the provision of school leaders making the school conducive environment for learning. And low teacher’s satisfaction with school leadership commitment to improve the learning achievements of all students. The respondents disagree on the provision of secondary school supervisor assistance and support in SIP implementation.

2. **The practice of school Improvement program in secondary school**
   Low level of active learning method of teaching was practiced by teachers. With regard to the major challenges that affect school principals in implementing SIP is low level of communication with in the staff, all the respondents rated that low level of mobilization of the community to provide resources to support implementation of the SIP.
   The respondents rated as low parents’ participation in donating the school goods and materials, there was low level of class rooms are suitable for teaching learning process Low school facilities that disable all staff to work and for learning of students and less collaborative work and the problem of unsuitability of class rooms for teaching learning process.

3. **Monitoring and evaluation mechanism of leading for improvement**
   There is low status of school leaders frequently provide monitoring and evaluation in implementation of leading school for improvement. And low level of school creates opportunities for students to develop into self-regulating learners within and beyond the classroom. School leaders are not releasing appropriate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms so as to implement leading school for improvement on time.
4. Challenges for School improvement program implementation (SIP)

The respondents confirmed the problem of large class size highly existed in secondary schools. The absence of installed science and technology which support learning problem, the respondents rated low parents’ participation in donating the school goods and materials, there was low level of class rooms are suitable for teaching learning process, the problem of lack of training in SIP negatively affects its implementation as moderately existed and respondents confirmed that the insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory, library and pedagogical centers.) The respondents rated that low level of mobilize the community to provide resources to support implementation of the SIP,

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the data analysis and major findings, the investigator drew the following conclusions:

With regard to the Leadership’s endeavor to enhance leading school for improvement was not satisfactory because of the less collaborative efforts exhibited among teachers, school leaders and PTAs. Effective leadership also begins with extensive knowledge of the instructional environment: individual student needs, strengths and weaknesses of staff members, aspects of the instructional programs, student data, and schedules.

Even though the problem of large class size to implement active learning method, low level of community mobilization and low school facilities that enable all staff to work for learning of students, the practice of school improvement program in secondary school was moderately undertaken.

Low level and seasonal monitoring and evaluation mechanisms have been undertaken by school leaders.

The factors affecting leading school for improvement were lack of school facilities such as in sufficient class rooms laboratories school pedagogical centers and play grounds and lack of sufficient technological resources and installations of internet.
5.3. **Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study the following recommendations were made.

School principals have to give attention to planning, and should initiate commitments in developing strategic plan that entirely involves conducting self-evaluation by participating key stake holder (teachers, students and parents) and deploy by building consensus among stake holders for effective program implementation.

School leadership should create fertile environment for working together, for trust development and create positive culture in order to plan together and strengthening unity among school community. Each member of the learning community should have the feeling of connectedness. They must feel that they are contributing to the overall environment while being a bigger and important part of a supportive learning culture.

In order to solve their problems of finance and material resource, the schools should design income-generating mechanisms by taking in to account the available school facilities and technical experts to make involvement of all the school stakeholders.

Woreda Education Office and secondary schools should work collaboratively and full fill school facilities.

Monitoring and evaluation on the SIP were not under taken properly. Therefore, all the concerned body should give attention for monitoring and evaluation scheme for the success of SIP.
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Appendix A
Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire to be filled by Teachers, PTA and SIP Committee

Dear Respondents, I am currently conducting a study on Practices and challenges of Leading School for Improvement in Secondary Schools of West Shoa Zone, Oromia National Regional State. Therefore, you are kindly requested to fill out the attached questionnaire. The information you offer me play a crucial role in the conclusion that will be made after the analysis of data.

Note that:-

- All the responses that you offer me will be keeping confidential and used only for research purpose.
- There is no need to write your name on the questionnaire.
- Please try to make your answer brief.

Thanks in advance for your cooperation!!

PART-I BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Sex: Male □ Female □
2. Age: Below 20 □ 21-30 □ 31-40 □ 41-50 □ above 51 □
3. Educational Status: Diploma □ Degree □ M.Sc./MA □ If other □
4. Area of Specialization _________________
5. Years of service: < 5 □ 5-10 □ 11-20 □ >20 □

PART- II. WORK RELATED QUESTIONS

1. Leadership’s endeavor to enhance leading school for improvement

1.1 Do you think school leaders have commitment in leading school for improvement?
   Yes □ No □

1.2 If your answer is yes to what extent the school leaders strive to lead school for improvement?
   Less extent □ Moderate extent □
   Great extent □ Very great extent □
**Direction:** - The following questions are listed to examine the Leadership’s endeavor to enhance leading school for improvement in secondary schools of west shoa zone. Please show the extent to which these activities are carried out in your school by putting (√) mark in box against the choices

N.B 1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Undecided, 4= Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>General question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>School leaders make the school conducive and participatory environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>The adequacy of educational leadership skill to implement School Improvement Plan is effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>The school leadership has competency to lead school improvement program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Secondary school supervisor provided assistance in SIP implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The practice of school Improvement program in secondary school

The following questions are stated to assess whether the activities of school Improvement program implemented. Therefore, you are requested to give your response by rating the extent to which your school achieved by putting a (√) make in one of the boxes against each other

N.B 1=Very Low, 2=Low, 3=Medium, 4=High, 5=Very High,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>General question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>The teachers are satisfied with school leadership commitment to improve the learning achievements of all students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>The extent to which student centered method of teaching was practiced by teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>The extent to which student achievement were improved from initial point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Teachers participate in continuous professional development (CPD) in order to learn new knowledge to apply in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Participation</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Schools successfully mobilize the community to provide resources to support implementation of the School Improvement Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Parents actively participate in school events (meeting, panel discussion and others).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>The participation of stakeholders (teachers, students and parents) in SIP implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Parent actively participate in donating the school goods and materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School management</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Staff are able to demonstrate significant involvement in school decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>The extent to which capacity building training given in light on SIP planning to school community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>The strategic plan of the school was prepared on the basis of self-evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>The assessment methods utilized is used to assess student learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Environment</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>The adequacy of budget mainly for the achievement of school improvement program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>The utilization of school grant for school improvement activities as planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>The degree to which class rooms are suitable for teaching learning process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Collaborative work is being implemented to support inclusive education for students and teachers with special needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>The school has access to safe water for drinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>Schools provide quality school facilities that enable all staff to work and for learning of students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.19 Which major activities of school Improvement Program are mainly implemented in your school?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2.20 How do you rate the implementation of SIP in your school?
Low □ □ □ □ □ Average □ □ □ □ □ High □ □ □ □ □

2.21 Do you have anything to say on the implementation of major activities of leading school for improvement in your school?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

3. Monitoring and evaluation mechanism of leading for improvement
The following questions are stated to check whether Monitoring and evaluation mechanism undertaken in practice of leading school for improvement. Therefore, you are requested to give your response by rating the extent to which your school achieved by putting a (√)make in one of the boxes against each other

N.B 1=Very Low, 2=Low, 3=Medium, 4=High, 5=Very High,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>General question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>School prepare meetings to review, update and formally approve schools polices, regulations and procedures.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>School leaders frequently provide monitoring and evaluation in implementation of leading school for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>The ability of school improvement committee (SIC) to coordinate efforts in developing school improvement plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>School creates opportunities for students to develop into self-regulating learners within and beyond the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Do you think that the school leaders appropriate release monitoring and evaluation mechanisms so as to implement leading school for improvement?

Yes   _____  No   _____

3.6 would you please mention the strong and weak side you observed in providing monitoring and evaluation

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

4. Challenges for School improvement program implementation (SIP)

The following questions are asked to assess the factors which negatively affect the implementation of leading school for improvement. Therefore, you are kindly requested to give your response by checking mark (√) in the given boxes against the item.

N.B 1= Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Undecided, 4= Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Challenges of leading school for improvement</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>The problem of large class size to implement active learning in the class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>The absence of installed science and technology which support learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Lack of training in SIP negatively affects its implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory, library and pedagogical centers.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 can you mention any challenges of implementation of leading school for improvement______________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
Appendix B
Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
Department of Educational Planning and Management

Leading Questions for Interview to be conducted with Principals, Secondary School Supervisors and Woreda Education office SIP Focal Person

1. What is the practice of leading school for improvement in secondary schools?
2. How can you mention the commitment of stake holder in leading school for improvement?
3. Which major activities of school Improvement program are practiced in your school?
4. What are the extents of school collaboration with external stakeholders to support the practice of improvement?
5. What is the participation status of communities in school improvement practice?
6. To what extent the school improvement practice in school support student in improving their academic achievements.
7. What do you think the solution for leading school for improvement in secondary school?