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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the practices and challenges of school development planning in primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City, in Addis Ababa. The research employed descriptive cross sectional survey method, which is supplemented by qualitative data. The sampling techniques used included purposive, availability and simple random lottery sampling. The sample size was 167 teachers, 12 students and 12 parents, 32 principals from eight schools, eight Woreda education offices, eight cluster supervisors and five sub city education offices with the total of 242 participants out of study populations. The data gathering tools employed were questionnaire, interview as well as document analysis. The participants of interview were principals, parents, students, and cluster supervisors. Questionnaire was administered to 220 teachers, principals, cluster supervisors, Woreda and Sub City education office experts of which 216 of them were properly filled and returned. Then, the information gathered through closed-ended questionnaire was analyzed using frequency, standard deviation, and mean score while the data gathered through interview were narrated qualitatively. The findings indicated that the extent to which stakeholders’ engagement in school development planning, communicating on and evaluating the overall successes and failures of the school development planning were low. The major challenges identified were, lack of training, lack of trained facilitators, insufficiency of supports provided for teachers growth, insufficient allocation of budget, lack of commitment and peer evaluation, and insufficient feedback and follow up, were identified by this research as the serious challenges of planning in primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City. Thus the current practice of school development planning in involving stakeholders and identifying the school new development areas and working on it was not strong in primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City as concluded in this paper. To overcome the challenges encountered, recommendations have been forwarded. These include: orienting teachers in advance with the overall contents of the professional growth, motivating teachers and principals to willingly take more responsibilities in the implementation process, employing trained facilitators, and allocation of sufficient resources to effectively achieve the intended goals. Moreover, Woreda education office has to allocate the necessary school budget for training and other activities. The school leaders should also try to comply their school development plans with different national policies and documents written relating to education at Woreda, Sub City and regional level.
CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

The practice and challenges of school development planning in primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City in Addis Ababa was discussed in this thesis. The challenges of planning and the current practice in school development planning in primary school were investigated in this paper. Generally, this research paper is containing the following frameworks: statement of the problem, objectives of the study, limitation of the study, scope of the study, review of related literature, research methodology which includes, target population sampling techniques, data gathering instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis and interpretation and finally the summary, conclusion and recommendation of the research. In this chapter background, statement of the problem, objectives, significance, scope and the limitation of the study were discussed in detail.

1.1 Background of the Study

Education is at the heart of our ambitions as a nation. No other area of government activity has greater capacity to change the country for the better without education. According to Ministry of Education, education is the key to sustaining Ethiopian development and it is through education that the country will be transformed into a knowledge based society embracing new technology and using it to solve the problems of today and tomorrow (MoE, 2010). Wallace stated that there are six key steps or “processes” that the effective principal takes when carrying out his or her most important leadership responsibilities: planning, implementing, supporting, evaluating, communicating and monitoring. The school leader pressing for high academic standards would, for example, map out rigorous targets for improvements in learning (planning), get the faculty on board to do what’s necessary to meet those targets (implementing), encourage students and teachers in meeting the goals (supporting), challenge low expectations and low district funding for students with special needs (advocating), make sure families are aware of the learning goals (communicating), and keep on top of test results (monitoring) (Wallace, 1994).

So, for the development of any country quality education is very important and any organization to be successful especially educational sectors to bring quality education and to produce the better future generation the leader skill of planning is very crucial thing. And planning is defined as the process of establishing goals and suitable course of action for achieving these goals, deciding what to do and how to do it before action is required and determining how the organization can get where it wants to go. Through planning managers clearly put and outline exactly what organizations must do to be successful. Planning sets the stage for all other aspects of management such as organizing, staffing and controlling. As we have seen above, the definition of planning, it is also the process of preparing plan and plan itself is a specific
documented intention consisting of an objective (end) and an action statement (means). Planning is a specific action proposed to help organization achieve objectives. It is also a statement of recommended action that states what, when, and how something is to be done (Alemayehu, 2014).

Accordingly for the effectiveness of any organization having good plan is the key and it is the primary function for the manager of the organization. Since school is unique organization it needs clearly and carefully planned plan. The school should have a strategic school development plan that may be planned for 3-5 years and it may also has other educational branches of plans those might be derived or broken down from it for the success of the organization. According to Ethiopian educational programs and policies there are different long and short range plans those expected to be planned and implemented in each school. But each of these plans which are prepared at school level may or may not relate to and derived from each other. From my experience most principals plan different school plans only for seek of having all numbers of plans. This is in order to succeed during inspection since most inspectors are not worry for the quality of the plan rather than the presence of all number of plans. So, principals try preparing plans without worrying about the derivation from, the plans hierarchy, approach and its quality. Most principals are poor in delegating activities and they try to plan all school plans lonely. These are some of challenges in planning.

According to some countries experience, schools may produce a number of plans as part of the planning process which may include, for example, a SDP, a staff development plan, spending plans for grant funding, a post-inspection action plan and/or a plan for ensuring that the National Literacy and Numeracy Framework (LNF) is embedded in the curriculum. But some experts believe that schools only need one strategic improvement plan. And the SDP should be the single means of capturing the school’s improvement priorities and strategies and functions as a starting point for any external challenge, support and interventions. The SDP provides a means for streamlining schools’ strategic planning processes and avoiding unnecessary duplication and additional bureaucracy. It should therefore not be necessary to have separate plans in place such as spending plans for grants – these should form an integral part of the SDP which will reflect the circumstances the school is in at any point in time (Wallace, 1994).

Even though there are many challenges to plan, principals need to plan in order to cope with an uncertain environment. To cope with environmental uncertainty, organizations can respond as defenders, prospectors, analyzers, or reactors. Defenders- relying on a primary technology and/or a narrow product line to remain competitive i.e. few adjustments in technology organization
structure and methods of operation due to narrow focus. Attention to efficiency of current operations. Prospectors- seeking first-mover advantage by aggressively making things happen and not waiting for them to happen. It is attention devoted to new market opportunities, frequent development and testing of new products and services and source of change and uncertainty for competitors. Analyzers- follow the market leader and imitating what works and emphasis on detecting and copying competitors promising idea. Reactors- waiting for adversity (e.g. declining sales) to occur before taking corrective action, frequently unable to respond quickly to perceived changes in the environment and make adjustments when only forced to do by environmental pressures (Alemayehu, 2014).

The leadership practices relates to school development planning, a phenomenon which has become increasingly important in school systems around the world over the last decade, especially in managing both the increased pace and complexity of educational change (Fullan, 2001), calling into question traditional rational approaches to school development planning (Fidler, 2002), while considering the need for more flexible and creative strategies (Wallace and Pocklington, 2002). How principals approach planning, who they involve in the process and what they intend to achieve by it, may be of cultural significance (Quong, Walker and Stott, 1998). How principals approach decision-making may also reveal cultural differences (Dimmock and Walker, 2005).

Generally, success and quality in education must be planned, monitored, evaluated and re-engineered. In order to maximize the school’s performance, education managers must plan curriculum, staffing, teacher and learner performance, funding, school and community relations and many other factors. This planning, done at the school level, is referred to as school development planning. This practice provides schools with the opportunity to set objectives and performance targets in various areas of school life that contribute to the improvement of teaching and learning. Here in this paper different practice of school development plans and how principals could tackle the challenges of planning and implementing at the end were suggested.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
Planning occurs at many levels, from day-to-day decisions made by individuals and families, to complex decisions made by businesses and governments. It is a process whereby a direction is mapped and then the ways and means for following that direction are specified. Planning is the process of preparing a set of decisions for action in the future directed at achieving goals by optimal means (UNESCO, 2010). In education it can be defined as a practice aimed at preparing
the education system to address the future and to achieve the medium and long-term goals set by policy-makers. Planning also refers to the process of deciding what to do and how to do it.

IIEP, (2010) indicates that quality education is now crucial in Africa’s strategic plans towards catching up with the developed world. Quality education nowadays is considered as a right for children. In other words, children have a right to get quality education (UNICEF, 2010). In line with this, the EFA global monitoring report of UNESCO (2014), by stressing the importance of quality education, noted that a child denied the right to a quality primary education is deprived not only as a child, he/she is also handicapped for life- unable to cope up with situations requiring reading, writing and arithmetic unless given better access to educational opportunities in life as a youth or adult.

In practice, the Ethiopian government had no coherent strategy during the emperor government. The curriculum was unplanned and left to teachers who came from different countries with different backgrounds. The curriculum in place was incapable of producing citizens who had the capability to interpret, enrich, and adapt the heritage of the country to new needs and to changing conditions (Negash, 1990). It is possible to argue that ever since the late 1950s; UNESCO, the World Bank, and USAID were major partners in the planning of Ethiopian education. Most educational plans derived from the other country experience, without considering the environmental context and cultural people of our country. Currently, in our country Ethiopia educational plans such as GEQIP plan and ESDP 1,2,3,4 and 5 plans was launched. In order to fulfil this function effectively, educational planners need to have an understanding of the concepts which are defining and shaping their area of work. At the same time, they have to be aware of the context, challenges and constraints that arise when carrying out the operational activities of educational planning.

Effective education planning is an essential pre-requisite for improving education sector performance in all aspects – access, quality and efficiency. But as stated in MoE, (2007) capacity in education planning (including budget planning), monitoring and evaluation is limited at all levels, at the regional and woreda levels particularly at school level - where the main responsibilities for general education planning lie. As indicated in MoE (2005), there was a problem of low budget utilization in civil works due to weak capacity of management implementation. MoE (2006) also shows that there is weak administrative capacity of educational finance management. In relation to educational quality problems, overcrowding, lack of teaching resources; inadequate teachers’ training and high teacher/ pupil ratio are challenges of our educational quality. Those points are also the major problems of education in Addis.
Ababa particularly in Kolfe Keranyo Sub City. Lack of capacity in financial management will lead to the absence of quality of education. In addition to; lack of finance, lack of capacity to plan and manage funds and coordinate different actions at the ground level results in low implementation of policies and objectives.

Even though there are many forms of planning with several types of activities involved in its process principals expected to plan school based plan depending on the country policy and environmental context. The planning profession is a crucial part of that capacity, enabling the integration of analysis, design, negotiation and management into the process of making, and remaking, the places where we live, work and play. The relationship between practice in place-making and the academic discipline of planning will therefore underpin the future quality and functioning of our built environments (MoE, 2007). The ESDP IV (MoE, 2010) suggests that a special leadership and management program has been initiated to build the capacity of school principals and supervisors towards planning and managing school activities.

In school improvement program strategic planning need stakeholders’ participation in reality which is not as to be. Therefore, SIP strategic plan, schools vision and mission were not clear to the respective stakeholders (MoE, 2007). Consequently they lack the ability in planning, coordinating, directing, supervising and evaluating the school over all programs and activities through their subordinate (Tesfaye, 1990). The education sector’s action plan encourages parental involvement in terms of providing financial support to school, and participating in school events and in parent-teacher association (MoE, 2010). However, such parental involvement at school has little effect on students’ academic performance.

Although there are several indications for the improvement of educational quality at a national level, there is a problem of quality in the primary education of Addis Ababa. A simple indicator for this is the achievement of grade 8 students average pass marks of Addis Ababa compared to four regions (Amhara, Tigray, Oromia and SNNPR) and Dire Dawa city administration in the last two years (2012 and 2013). That is, compared to other regions (Oromia=94.4%, Tigray=86% and 87.4%, Amhara=80.1% and 82.1%, SNNPR=65.6% and 67.5%, and DireDawa=63.9%, Addis Ababa city Administration with relatively better infrastructure and a number of NGOs working on education, its grade 8 students academic achievement was found lower 67.1% and 65.9% in 2012 and 2013 respectively (MoE, 2012, 2013). When we also look at the second and third national learning assessments of grades four and eight carried out in the whole country in 2004 and 2008, the assessment scores of grade eight students in Addis Ababa were 35.94% in 2004 and 34% in 2008 (CGAAEB, 2011). This means, the achievement or the scores of grade 8
students of Addis Ababa in the second and third national learning assessments were far less than the minimum requirement of 50% to pass from one grade level to the next according to the Ethiopian Education and Training policy (TGE, 1994).

According to AAEB (2014) Addis Ababa Regional assessment of grade 8 students test achievement in science and mathematics is by far below the standard due to poor implementation of SIP. A school development plan is a road map that sets out the changes a school needs to make to improve the level of student achievement, and shows how and when these changes will be made. It recognizes that school development has a long-term, a medium-term and a short-term dimension. It is based on the premise that these three time dimensions must be addressed concurrently by schools if they are to respond effectively to the needs of a dynamic environment. It proposes a framework of three interlinked but distinct strands of planning activity that enables schools to cope with the complexity and unpredictability of change.

Generally the school development plan (SDP) is the school’s strategic plan for improvement. It sets out the actions a school will take to improve learner outcomes. SDP will be informed by the regular self-evaluation a school undertakes of its own performance and contextual data, and will contain the school’s improvement priorities together with short- and longer-term targets. The school’s priorities will include how the school is addressing the national priorities of: raising the standards of education in relation to literacy, raising the standards of education in relation to numeracy and reducing the impact of poverty on educational attainment.

There are gaps in school development planning process like lack of involving the school stakeholders, absence of communicating school development plans, and lack of correlation of school development plans from top down or from bottom to top in primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City. As well as, the school principals being busy in rotten activities, unmotivated principals and teachers, weak participation of stakeholders in planning to improve the skill of planning, the unmatched of BSC and school inspection score of the schools with students achievement are the common problems in primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City (KKSEO, 2016).

Thus, this study would emphasize the assessments of the practices and challenges of school development planning. And most schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City classified as level one and level two. Only two schools were classified as standardized school and there were no schools above the standard in this Sub City. The students’ achievement even the cut point for promotion from grade eight to the next was below the minimum requirement of fifty percent achievement which may be resulted by poor planning and its implementation motivated me to do scientific
research on this area. The investigation was conducted with the focus on in school development planning and its implementation. In light of the above pressing and sensitive issues, I initiated to fill the gap and conduct in depth exploration of the problem with reference to primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City, Addis Ababa.

1.2.1 Specific Research Questions
Thus, to assess the extent of planning and implementation of primary school development plans and to address the existing challenges the following basic research questions were formulated:
1. To what extent the stakeholders involved in school development planning process?
2. To what extents have school leaders and supervisors discharged the responsibility of SDP?
3. To what extent do Woreda and Sub City education office experts provide professional support to principals and others school stake holders as related to SDP?
4. What are the challenges of school development planning in Kolfe Keranyo Sub City?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objectives
The main objective of this study was to assess the practices and challenges of school development planning in the Kolfe Keranyo Sub City in Addis Ababa.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives
❖ To examine the current status of school development plan practice in Kolfe Keranyo Sub City.
❖ To explore the efforts of responsible school partners at different levels in supporting the process of primary school development planning.
❖ To investigate the contribution of principals and cluster supervisors in school development planning in Kolfe Keranyo Sub City in Addis Ababa.
❖ To identify the challenges faced in school development planning.

1.4 Significance of the Study
The school development plan will serve as a basis for the work of the school as a whole and also for evaluating and reporting on whole school progress and development. It is also very important to improve the performance of teachers in the classroom in order to raise student achievement by putting clear school goal and used as directions (MoE, 2002). The advantages of planning process for are less likely to be neglected important factors, information and reactions can come from a wider group, others in the organisation develop a whole-organisation view, the opportunities and constraints are known to everyone and others can propose developments which take advantage of opportunities, other decisions can be made in the knowledge of the strategy, implicit strategy can be tested and improved by the constructive criticism of others and strategic decisions can be more easily recognized (Fidler, 2002). Therefore, reliable information about the
way school development plan is implemented and planned by the stakeholders, the challenges facing, and the strategies to solve the problems is vital for the school in the process of regulating and initiating new changes or new school development needs within school. Moreover, the aim of any research is to get changes and propose solutions for the existing problems. In light of this, the study will have the following benefits:

- It may provide information for educational officials at Sub City, and Woreda level on the current practice and process of school development planning and help them discharge their responsibilities in primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City in Addis Ababa.
- It may help principals, supervisors and teachers know the status of SDPs implementation and discover challenges working against the success of school development plans.
- It may provide information to policy designers that will help further development of educational actions.

The study will add to the existing literature pertaining to the experiences of educators in terms of planning.

1.5 Scope of the Study

The study was delimited to the assessment of the practices and challenges of the school development planning, the support given by school leaders and supervisors and the challenges encountered in the process of implementing primary school development plans. It was also concerned to what extent school stakeholders involved in the school development planning process and its implementation in primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City in Addis Ababa. Kolfe Keranyo Sub City was selected purposely because it was the least performing Sub City from the ten Addis Ababa Sub Cities. And also only primary schools were selected as study area because of time and budget difficulty. But, the study area was convenient because I have more than ten years of working experience in different primary schools of Kolfe keranyo Sub City.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

It is obvious that research work cannot be free from limitation, that matter this study was also constrained with some limitations. One of the limitations was that using the cross sectional study method. Secondly, in interviews and focus group discussions most participants were not willing to be recorded as result of which the researcher only took notes on their interviews and focus group discussion responses. Thus, there might be loss of some significant information. Finally, the researcher excluded parents and students in the classroom in the sampled eight primary schools by involving parent teachers associations and student council members as representative of primary schools students. If parents and students in the classroom were included, they might
have had different views. Consequently, different results might be obtained from these groups as compared to the present findings.

1.7 Organization of the Study
This study has five chapters. The first chapter deals with background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, the scope of the study, limitations of the study, organization of the study, and operational definition of terms. The second chapter reviews literature related to the concepts of the problem area. Chapter three deals with research design and methodology including the sources of data, the study population, sample size and sampling technique, procedures of data collection, data gathering tools, methodology of data analysis. Chapter four has the research presentation and in chapter five the finding summary, conclusion and recommendation of the research was included.

1.8 Operational Definitions
❖ Primary school is a school for early education that provides the first four to eight years of basic education
❖ Challenges: -The term is used in the study to indicate problems encountered in the process of planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the School development plan (SDP) in primary school.
❖ Practices: -performing School development plan (SDP) activities
❖ School development plan – it is a document that is prepared for getting goals, developing strategies, and outlining tasks and schedules to accomplish the goals in school.
CHAPTER TWO
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE
The second part of the research presents relevant literatures related to the general concepts of the school development planning and the prevailing challenges. Published books, journals, policy documents and research reports are reviewed and briefly presented in this chapter.

2.1 The Concept of Planning/Plan Definition
2.1.1 The School Development Planning Definition
Planning is based on the theory of “thinking before acting”. Planning is an integral part of our life. We make plans in each and every step of life whether it is to go to school or to buy household goods during shopping. We make plans according to the limitations of our budget and resources to get maximum satisfaction and to fulfil goals from our activities. There are many possible definitions of the terms “planning” and “plan” given by different scholars. Planning enables the management to control employees’ behaviour and align it with the organizational goals. Also planning represents a contract between an organization and what its stakeholders desire (Anthony & Govindarajan, 2007). Planning can be action plan (short term) or strategic plan (long term).

According to Omran (2002) planning is the process by which an individual or organization decides in advance on some future course of action. It is also the process of determining how the organization can get where it wants to go (Certo, 2000). Additionally planning is defined in different dictionary in different ways. For example business dictionary defined the planning as a basic management function involving formulation of one or more detailed plans to achieve optimum balance of needs or demands with the available resources. Investor words glossary, it defined as the process of getting goals, developing strategies, and outlining tasks and schedules to accomplish the goals. It is the intellectual anticipation of possible future situations, the selection of desirable situations to be achieved (objectives), and the determination of relevant actions that need to be taken in order to reach those objectives at a reasonable cost. It is also defined as a practice aimed at preparing the education system to address the future and to achieve the medium and long-term goals set by policy-makers.

According to Coombs (1985) planning is a first, fundamental and technical managerial function that enables organizations to deal with the present and anticipate the future. It is deciding what is to be done, when it is to be done, how it is to be done and who is to do it. It is also an orderly process that gives organizational direction. Planning is the process of determining how the organization can get where it wants to go. Planning is also the process of determining exactly
what the organization will do to accomplish its objectives. In more formal terms, planning has been defined as ‘the systematic development of action programs aimed at reaching agreed objectives by the process of analyzing, evaluating and selecting among the opportunities which are foreseen. In school, plans were to consist of a statement about key areas for development set in the context of the school’s aims and values, its existing achievements and national initiatives, policies and priorities.

Therefore Schools, like other organizations, need to have a clear perception of where they are, where they intend to go, how they intend to get there and what strategies to use for monitoring progress towards the attainment of set goals. And according to Cuckle and Broadhead (2003) school development planning is a process that helps organizations to meet set goals in a systematic manner. It also refers to the process of developing a school plan that allows all members of staff to have a clear and coherent view of the priorities of the institution. It is a process undertaken by the school community to give direction to the work of the school in order to ensure that all pupils receive a quality education in terms of both holistic development and academic achievement. The process is based on a number of presuppositions such as: the quality of a schools education provision, a partnership enterprise, quality planning should involve input from all the partners in the school community and the quality of a schools education provision is rooted in the expertise and commitment of the principal and teaching staff. School development planning intends to effect change and innovation for school improvement and is therefore a comprehensive long-term planning process.

According to Bell (1998:453), the purpose of development planning is to assist the school to introduce changes successfully, so that the quality of teaching and the standards of learning are improved. In this regard, MacGilchrist and Mortimore (1995:207) assert that school development planning can be a school improvement strategy although not all SDPs lead to school improvement. This is based on how SDPs are drawn up and mainly what they focus on. Jones (1996:281) considers school development planning as a widely adopted approach to the management of planned change, advocated as a facilitating mechanism to aid the implementation of multiple innovations introduced in the education system. So, one can think SDP as strategic plan.

School development planning is a means, not an end – a means of enhancing the quality of educational experience in the school through the successful management of innovation and change. Accordingly, the process is sharply focused on the educational needs and achievements of the pupils and concomitantly on the professional development and empowerment of the
teachers (Xaba, 2006). So, school can learn by continually planning its development. School development planning can also defined as the process of planning the improvement and then implementing the plans over a specified period that encompasses the performance indicators to make it easy for the progress to be monitored.

Generally, as every school is unique, the operation of the planning process will vary considerably from school to school. The school development planning process is flexible and not a set of rules to be followed blindly but a framework for collaborative creativity. Each school must adapt the framework to suit its own particular circumstances. It is an ongoing process, rooted in a school culture of systematic self-review, in which policies and plans are continuously developed, implemented, evaluated and revised in the light of the school’s fundamental aims and the changing needs of its community. It is a cyclical process that yields cumulative and progressive results. Each planning cycle builds on the outcomes of the previous cycle. The SDP is the school’s strategic plan for improvement. And some scholars used interchangeably with school improvement plan. It brings together the school’s priorities, the main actions that will be taken to raise standards, the resources dedicated to these actions and the key outcomes to be achieved. In order to fulfil this function effectively, educational planners need to have an understanding of the concepts which are defining and shaping their area of work. At the same time, they have to be aware of the context, challenges and constraints that arise when carrying out the operational activities of educational planning.

2.1.2 The School Development Plan Definition

A plan is the product of the planning process and can be defined as a set of decisions about what to do, why, and how to do it. According to business dictionary plan is defined as a written account of intended future course of action (scheme) aimed at achieving specific goals or objectives within a specific time frame. It explains in detail what needs to be done, when, how, and by whom, and often includes best case, expected case, and worst case scenarios. Oxford living dictionary defined plan as a detailed proposal for doing or achieving something. It is also an intention or decision about what one is going to do. The Cambridge dictionary also defined plan as a set of decisions about how to do something in the future.

A plan of action serves as: a reference for action, built on the consensus, agreed upon by all those concerned as well as by those contributing to its implementation; an indicative, living framework, in such a way that allows for adjustments in light of new developments during implementation; and a policy directions and information on the implementation strategies, actions and benchmarks for implementations, monitoring and evaluation, as well as the
expenditure frameworks. Planning is also a method of trying to ensure that the resources available now and in the future are used in the most efficient way to obtain explicit objectives (Shuey, Bigdeli, Rajan, 2016). The school development plan is primarily a working document for use by the school. It will be based on the school’s analysis of current levels of performance, its assessment of how current trends and future factors may impact on the school and set out priorities and targets for improvement for the period ahead. Such a plan must embrace the organization’s aims, values, current achievements and future targets and should be designed in the context of national goals. The SDP brings together the school’s priorities, the main actions that will be taken to raise standards, the resources dedicated to these actions and the key outcomes to be achieved.

Fidler (2002) argues the range of developments covered by school development planning have extended up to three years but have mainly involved curricular and teaching developments. Whilst individual school needs have always played some part in the plan, these have generally been short term needs and anything more fundamental such as the future of the school operated outside the school development planning process which was mainly concerned with curriculum developments. Some schools have taken a longer-term perspective and deal in plans for a three-year period and have begun to undertake client surveys as a form of input into the planning process. However, school development plans (SDPs) have been internally generated plans, almost exclusively generated by teachers, concerned mainly with teaching and learning and an internal school document approved by governors. Strategic planning involves more than just a longer timescale. The more short term and operational nature of school development planning can be incorporated into the implementation of strategic planning.

2.1.3 Purpose of School Development Planning

Having good plan has many advantages for an organization. As stated by MoE (2002) the school development plan has as its essential purpose the achievement of school effectiveness as well as being a significant support for school improvement. It will help the school to realize its stated aims and objectives which will be firmly directed towards meeting the present and anticipated needs of the pupils. It will help to ensure quality in teaching and learning throughout the school. In helping to achieve effectiveness, the school development plan will direct attention towards those areas of school activity which are accepted as being essential in ensuring effectiveness. Effective planning is, therefore, helpful in management of organizations such as school, because among other things it enables educational managers: to reduce future risk; to promote efficiency; provides a basic for coordinated efforts; provides direction and sense of purpose; provides guidelines for decision making; contributes to the performance of other managerial function.
According to Hargreaves and Hopkins (1991) planning for an organization are providing a clear understanding of what organization need to do in order to achieve its development goals; guiding in prioritizing and making decisions; allows to focus possibly limited resources on the actions that will benefit us work the most; keeps us in touch with our context – global, national and local; Provides a tool to help us communicate our intentions to others; and provides a coherent guide for day-to-day implementation.

Premised on the basis of a holistic review on school performance, the purpose of the SDP is for the school to set out clear direction for development in line with the school’s vision and mission and the education policy of the territory. In other words, SDP is the blueprint for school development. Deliberations on major concerns, targets, timescale and broad strategies during the planning process are essential to gain consensus among stakeholders concerned. Through strategic planning, implementation and continuous monitoring as well as effective evaluation, school effectiveness will be enhanced with a view to provide quality education for students (UNDP, 2009). Alemayehu (2014) also describes the purposes of planning as fundamental: reach the objectives of the organization, protective: minimize risk by reducing uncertainties surrounding the organization and outline management action, and affirmative (confirmatory / positive) to increase the degree of organizational success.

Generally, school development planning is a tool for managing change and development. It is as much concerned with the present as it is with the future. It also brings coherence or purpose to the planning process, facilitates the improvement of the quality of teaching and learning, allows school development to take place in a systematic and logical manner, a tool that helps to create thinking and self-reviewing schools, allows staff members to be involved in making decisions that are crucial to the development of the school, thus giving them a sense of ownership, a strategy for the efficient management of resources, as the allocation of resources is driven and informed by priorities, allows SDP to take place in a coherent manner and within specific time frames, gives the school the opportunity to prioritize its aims and objectives, allows education managers to have an insight into the school’s strengths and weaknesses, thus making relevant intervention possible, creates opportunities for curriculum review to determine areas that require more attention and reinforcement and provides guidelines to facilitate the attainment of set goals in a systematic manner (Giles, 1996). The school leaders should aware all stake holders about their school development plan. This enables school stake holders to understand the benefit of school development plan and to be participant in its planning process and implementation. The purpose of school development plans was now to assist schools to introduce externally determined changes successfully, so that the quality of teaching and standards of learning were
improved (Hargreaves and Hopkins 1991). Plans were to consist of a statement about key areas for development set in the context of the school’s aims and values, its existing achievements and national initiatives, policies and priorities.

2.2 The Practice of Planning

2.2.1 Types of Plan

Any organization can have different plans. To have this different type of plans principals or other stakeholders should have the understanding of them. The Plans can be classified into different types of plan based on different criteria. According to Coombs (1985) plans can be categorized based on the following criteria. These are: duration, repetitiveness, breadth/function and levels or type of beneficiary. So we can classify the types of plans as: 1) classification based on duration: short-range plan, medium-range plan and long-range plan 2) classification based on repetitiveness: single use plan and standing plan 3) classification based on breadth/function: strategic plan and operational plan 4) classification based on levels or type of beneficiary are: mega-plans- societal level emphasizing outcomes, macro-plans-the beneficiary is the organization itself and micro-plans-the beneficiary is small group or individuals.

2.2.1.1 Macro Vs Micro Planning

As Coombs (1985) stated mega level of planning is a planning that focuses on external clients, including customers/citizens and the community and the society that the organization serves. Macro planning refers to decisions at a very aggregate level. For example, it may refer to decisions about the way national budget is to be allocated among various sectors. Micro planning defined in terms of the maximum number of constraints such as guidelines, norms, financial and other parameters laid down at the macro level that condition the flexibility of the planning exercise. Mega planning includes these levels of planning (macro and micro) as well by aligning them with positive societal contributions. According to Kaufman (2000) mega planning is a critical aspect of successfully defining, prioritizing, and achieving useful educational results (societal and community results, payoffs, and consequences). It is characterized by planning where the primary client and beneficiary is society, now and in the future. Thus, an educational institution benefits from the application of mega planning when it creates and assures the linkages between the mega, macro, micro, process, and inputs levels of the organization.

Mega planning views individuals and organizations as means to societal ends, and begins by identifying the outcomes that an institution commits to contribute to society. Likewise, macro educational planning focuses more on the strategic resource allocation decisions between different subsectors of the education sector or major functions within a given level of schooling depending on the overall development framework. Macro planning not only prioritizes
investment decisions at the aggregate level but also provides the overall development framework and often guidelines in the education sector. In these sense, macro planning is strategic compared to the emphasis of micro planning on the operational aspects of strategic interventions. In other words, in a decentralized planning framework, one would see macro and micro planning as a continuum, where one moves from the generality of purpose (developmental goals) at the macro level towards greater degree of specificity (disaggregated targets, processes, implementation control mechanisms, etc.) at the micro level. Macro plans typically include results to be obtained at the mega level, but are specific to the institution as the primary client and beneficiary of educational processes (Kaufman, 2000).

One can say that micro planning is about identifying (through participatory diagnostic techniques) problems, priorities, what works, what does not work and how best can the relationships among various stakeholders be managed (i.e. creating and managing social capital) so as to improve the quality and efficiency of a given level of education at the local level. Micro planning is not only concerned about raising the efficiency of educational expenditure (utilization of available resources), but also making educational development interventions relevant as far as possible by aligning them to the needs of pupils and the community, given the overall national development goals. In that sense, micro planning is expected to address more effectively the equity concerns (including spatial, social and educational) within the overall macro policy framework (Coombs, 1985).

2.2.1.2. Strategic Vs Operational Planning

Strategic planning is a means of establishing major directions for the organization. Through strategic planning, resources are concentrated in a limited number of major directions in order to maximize benefits to stakeholders—those the organization exist to serve and who are affected by the choices we make. Strategic planning is what makes a firm unique, a winner or a survivor and is intended to give any organisation a competitive advantage over its rivals (Thomas, 1993). Strategic planning, therefore, can best be understood as matching the activities of an organisation to its environment and its resource capabilities (Johnson and Scholes, 1989). It has been argued that, in schools, strategic planning is a key management process which draws together institutional values and goals and provides a framework for improving the deployment of resources and the quality of provision.

It is also management tool to help an organization improve its performance by ensuring that the members of the organization are working towards the same goals and by continuously adjusting the direction of the organization to the changing environment on the basis of results obtained.
Strategic planning is thus the integration of an organisation’s major goals, policies and actions into a cohesive whole. It consists of: a list of actions so ordered as to attain over a particular time period, certain desired objectives derived from a careful analysis of the internal and external factors likely to affect the organisation, which will move the organisation from where it is now to where it wants to be (Puffitt et al. 1992, p. 5).

Operational planning is the responsibility of lower management and is conducted by unit supervisor, foremen, etc. This is short-range plans covering a time span from one week to one year. These are more specific and they determine how a specific task is to be completed in the best possible way. Most operational plans are divided into functional areas such as production, finance, marketing, personnel, etc. for example, the production plans would require an analysis and decisions covering inventory levels of raw materials as well as finished product; feasibility of current production facilities, how to cope up with changing technology, etc. Operational planning is managerial and shorter term, as opposed to strategic planning, which usually has a 5–10 year horizon, sometimes even longer. Operational planning deals with day-to-day implementation and often has a one-year time horizon (Shuey, Bigdeli and Rajan, 2016).

2.2.1.3 Single-use and Standing Plans
As described in UNSCO (2014) single-use plan is developed for a one-time event or project. Such a course of action is not likely to be repeated in future, i.e., they are for non-recurring situations. The duration of this plan may depend upon the type of the project. It may span a week or a month. A project may sometimes be of only one day, such as, organising an event or a seminar or conference. These plans include budgets, programs and projects. In contrast standing plan is used for activities that occur regularly over a period of time. It is designed to ensure that internal operations of an organisation run smoothly. Such a plan greatly enhances efficiency in routine decision-making. It is usually developed once but is modified from time to time to meet business needs as required. Standing plans include policies, procedures, methods and rules. Single-use and standing plans are part of the operational planning process. There are other types of plans which usually are not classified as single use or standing plans. A strategy, for example, is part of strategic planning or management. It is a general plan prepared by top management outlining resource allocation, priorities and takes into consideration the business environment and competition.

2.2.1.4 Long range, Medium range and Short range Plans
The long-term or perspective plans, which cover a period of roughly 10-15 years, are less specific and indicate broad directions of development. It involves capital budgeting, product planning, project planning etc. The medium-term plans (which generally cover a period of
around five years) are more specific in their programs and strategies. It relate to development of new products and markets, product publicity etc. supportive to long range plans. Short-term plans, or annual plans, are usually for one year and are linked to the budget cycles. They are also called operational plans. It is made to achieve short term goals. It focused on the internal environment of the business. Most education plans are medium-term plans with specific objectives, targets and programs. These plans may have a long-term perspective. Medium-term plans are translated into annual plans and budgets (Coombs, 1985).

Generally having the understanding of types of planning enables an organization manager or leader which type of plan is preferable for the success of the organization. There is some type of planning which can be used interchangeably. Most organization may have one or above type of plans as a time. But there are type of planning which only planned at national level and the other type of planning which should be planned at organizational level. In school, school development and improvement planning are very important type of planning. But in most cases both school development and school improvement planning are used interchangeable.

2.2.2 The Planning Hierarchy

Planning responsibilities are different for managers at each organizational level. Managers find themselves planning for all sorts of things. Planning is one of the four major functions of management. In doing so, a manager can be certain that he or she is working toward some organization goal. Educational planning should be integrated with the plans or broader economic and social development. If education is to contribute most effectively to individual and national development, and to make the best use of scarce resources, it cannot go its own way, ignoring the realities of the world around it. So it should be an integral part of educational management. To be effective, the planning process must be closely tied to the processes of decision-making and operations. If isolated in a back room it becomes a purely academic exercise whose chief effect is to frustrate those involved.

If we think about the operational, tactical and strategic types of plans as stepping stones, we can see how their relationship to one another aids in the achievement of organizational goals. Operational plans are necessary to attain tactical plans and tactical plans lead to the achievement of strategic plans. Then, in true planning fashion, there are also plans to backup plans that fail. These are known as contingency plans (Coombs, 1985). To best understand the relationship between the different types of plans, let's start at the top. According to Amsale and Berhane (2005) strategic plans are designed with the entire organization in mind and begin with an organization's mission. Top-level managers, formulate long-term strategic planning to reinforce
the firm’s mission (the mission clarifies organizational purpose). Top-level managers will design and execute strategic plans to paint a picture of the desired future and long-term goals of the organization. Essentially, strategic plans look ahead to where the organization wants to be in three, five, even ten years. Strategic plans, provided by top-level managers, serve as the framework for lower-level planning.

According to Fidler (2002) the first level of detail of the strategic plan is the plan of the organizational structure and decision-making machinery of the school, including the involvement of governors. The strategic plan will have implications for the structure of responsibilities in the school and that combined with the culture of the school will have implications for how decisions are made and the involvement of governors. Where this implies a change in the culture of the school, this should have been recognised at the choice stage and the extent of the implications of the change recognised. Accordingly the detailed sub-plans for the four main areas of decision-making in the school are curriculum (and pupil outcomes) plan (what we intend to contribute to children’s learning), staffing plan (how we intend to recruit and develop people with the skills to do it), financial (and material resources and premises) plan (how we intend to acquire and spend the money to help us achieve it) and marketing plan (how we intend to obtain the resources and support of others to enable us to achieve it).

Generally, each of these plans will be interrelated and consistent with the overall strategic plan. In each of these plans there will be long-term and short-term objectives. Tactical Plans support strategic plans by translating them into specific plans relevant to a distinct area of the organization. Tactical plans are concerned with the responsibility and functionality of lower-level departments to fulfil their parts of the strategic plan. Operational plans also sit at the bottom of the totem pole; they are the plans that are made by frontline, or low-level, managers. All operational plans are focused on the specific procedures and processes that occur within the lowest levels of the organization. Operational plans can be either single-use or ongoing plans. It is most concerned with budgets, quotas and schedules. In the absence of strong coordination mechanisms and responsive corrective policy measures at the macro level, micro planning in its efforts to address the equity concerns may get too much standardized. The ground reality in most developing countries is that the two way feedback system (i.e. the top-down and the bottom-up) between macro and micro level units is either absent or very weak. The macro and micro planning units need to communicate effectively with each other in order to avoid the problem of dilution of information flowing from them. The top-down and the bottom-up linkages between macro and micro planning in education, therefore, need to be strengthened and harmonized in most developing societies. Planning, therefore, will become a shared, incremental and flexible
process that is based on the creation, monitoring and the continual adjustment of plans for the short, medium and longer term.

2.2.3 Approaches to School Development Planning

To have good plans in an organization having the knowledge of planning approach is an important. There are many approach of planning depending on who will take responsibility in formulating the plans or styles of thinking to plans. Firstly as Alemayewu stated in his literature the approaches of planning can be: individual vs committee, systematic vs ad hoc and developmental vs incremental approach. Approach to planning refers the degree of autonomy surrounding the planning process inside and outside the organization. Developmental approach is settings or environments with fewer constraints, and restrictions. It is characterized by bold (courageous), new, innovative and non-traditional approach. Organizational rigidity is minimal. Incremental planning- is less bold less innovative and traditional, due to internal and external restriction or limited managerial autonomy, may occur in conducive setting but managerial perspective is characterized by: a limiting mind set emphasis on short term goals, narrow assumption and desire to avoid risk, it involves marginal not major change in direction, thrust, and strategy. Proactive planning- is overt systematic, formalized and anticipatory and involves not only anticipating the future but also interfering and influencing environment. Proactive approach is for making things happen and shaping events in the best interest of the organization. Reactive approach-Reactive planning is planning done on the rebound in response to events. It is non- systematic and not anticipatory. Managers who prefer reactive planning are followers as they act and respond because of the actions of others e.g. competitors (Alemayehu, 2014).

Secondly, there are three distinct approaches that describe who have the responsibility for formulating plans: a) Centralized top down planning- is the traditional approach to planning in which a centralized group of executives or staff assumes the primary planning responsibility. b) Bottom-up planning- is an approach that delegates planning authority to division and department managers, who are expected to formulate plans under the general strategic umbrella of organizational objectives. c)Team planning- is a participative approach to planning where by planning teams comprising managers and staff specialties initiate plans and formulate organizational objectives (Amsale and Berhane, 2005).

Thirdly, there are three different ‘approaches’ to educational planning that were advocated by jargon by competing schools of thought in the 1960s which are called the ‘social demand approach’, the ‘manpower approach’ and the ‘cost-benefit approach’ (more accurately, the ‘rate-of-return approach’) (Coombs, 1985). The manpower approach could usefully call attention to
extreme gaps and imbalances in education’s output pattern that needed remedy, but this hardly required elaborate statistical studies. It could also give educators useful guidance on how, roughly, the educational qualifications of the labour force ought to evolve in the future—what the relative proportions should be of people with a primary education or less, secondary education, and various amounts of post-secondary training. The social demand approach is most commonly used to mean the aggregate ‘popular’ demand for education, that is, the sum total of individual demands for education at a given place and time under prevailing cultural, political and economic circumstances. If there are fewer classrooms and places than there are serious candidates to occupy them, one can say that social demand exceeds supply. The cost-benefit analysis/rate of return approach is what a rational individual roughly applies when deciding how best to spend his money when his desires exceed his means. He examines his alternatives, weighs the cost of each and the corresponding satisfaction or utility he feels it will bring him, and then chooses those particular options within his means that promise the highest ratio of benefits to costs.

2.2.4 Essentials of Sound School Development Planning

During planning managers need to address the essentials of sound planning such as organizational mission, vision, identify and analyze opportunities, goals, objectives, priorities, course of action to achieve goals, and resources needed. Types of planning and the planning/control cycle are also essentials of sound planning. Self-confident leaders produce simple plans, speak simply, and propose big, clear targets (Slater, 2003)

As indicated in MoE (2004) goal is the purpose that an organization strives to achieve and clearer statement of the mission specifying the accomplishment to be achieved if the mission is to become real. It provides a sense of direction, focus our efforts, guide our plans and decisions and help us evaluate our progress. Objectives -are commitments to achieve a measurable result within a specified period. Objectives have been called the single most important feature of the planning process. Well-written objectives are expressed in quantitative, measurable, and concrete terms. Priorities are a ranking of goals, objectives, or activities in order of importance that guide. It is the order and timing of decisions that management makes regarding the allocation of resources. The first priority should be given for task of ensuring whether there is sufficient capacity of implementation, objective schedule is prepared, skill promotion is included in the plan, school reform is prepared in plan and approved, the comment of stakeholders is included which they have given after seeing the plan before starting, and the follow up of action plan execution. In the Irish education a school plan contains two main sections. The first section deals with the total curriculum to be implemented in the school. The second section describes a range
of policies and practices which largely have to do with administrative aspects of school life. Some of these policies will change very little from year to year.

2.2.5 Process of School Development Planning

SDP is essentially a process in which policy and plans evolve from the ever-changing and developing needs of the school community. An important dimension in this process of planning is the collaborative effort and co-operation that takes place between the principal, the teachers, the board of management and the parents of the pupils attending the school. The involvement of all the partners in this collaborative exercise enables each to make its own special contribution which in turn is complemented by the contributions of the other partners (UNESCO, 2014).

The process involved in school development planning is of paramount importance to all those engaged in the exercise at all stages of the plan’s development. Effective school planning involves constant review, design, implementation and evaluation. It is recognised that the outcome of the process of planning results in a product. This will take the form of a document or a series of documents. As already stated, this product will include policies which are almost permanent features of the school development plan and will also include other policies which will be open to more frequent review and development. Planning is a complex process which requires high level of studies and analysis. To create a plan there must be determination of objectives and outlining of the course of action to achieve the goals. There is no set formula for planning. A planning process which is suitable for one kind of organization may not be suitable for another type of organization (Giles, 1996).

However, we can take the following steps as the guideline to draw a plan: 1) Analysis of the environment: planning begins with the awareness of the opportunities in the external environment and within the organization. For this SWOT analysis is most suitable. 2) Setting the objectives: give direction to the major plans. 3) Develop premises: are the assumptions about the future on the basis of which the plans will be ultimately formulated. 4) Determine and evaluate alternatives: Once various alternatives are identified, they must be well analyzed with their strong and weak points. 5) Selection of best alternative: When the alternatives are determined most suitable alternative must be chosen out from the list which can give maximum output with minimum risk. 6) Formulation of a derivative plans: translating into day to day operation of the organization. 7) Budget formulation: after decisions are made and plans are set the next step is giving them sufficient funds to carry them out. Optimum budgeting must be done for every course of action. 8) Implementation of a plan: Once the plans are set up, now the plans must be well informed and shared with the employees and managers expecting full commitment and
trust. Finally, the plans must be carried out. 9) Follow up action: obviously once a plan is carried out it generates certain output. The progress must be well monitored and managers need to check the progress of their plans so they can take necessary steps to improve the plans if needed (UNESCO, 2014).

In general, plans contain modules on the organisation and administration of the day-to-day activities of the school as well as statements on the curriculum and its implementation. In the process of school planning a significant role will be played by the principal, the teachers, the parents and the board of management. From this collaborative and consultative process a product, the school plan, will be formulated thus ensuring the continuing enhancement of the education provided for the pupils in the school.

2.2.6 Communicate the Plan

A dictionary definition of Communication information is “a process by which information is exchanged is “knowledge obtained from investigation, study, between individuals.” The two words “information” and “communication” are often used interchangeably, but they signify quite different things. Information is giving out; communication is getting through. Communication is a two-way street. Communication does not occur when information is sent; it occurs when the information has been received and has had an effect on the recipient. Most communications were either face-to-face, by phone, or by mail - snail mail (Slater, 2003).

Therefore schools need a systematic plan to communicate to all of their stakeholders that the human and economic consequences of not improving student performance and “readiness” are far worse than the challenges and pain of bringing about needed change. To accomplish sustainable school improvement, schools must first create a shared understanding of: why school improvement is essential, what new/emerging skills and knowledge requirements are needed, and how to bring about improvement by learning from successful practices that have worked (Daggett, 2014).

School can communicate the plan by distributing copies of plan to the various departments in the library, to the members of the library board and the board of the foundation or friends group, to the city or commissioners, and to selected groups and organizations staff members. Unfortunately, simply distributing copies of the plan did not qualify as communication. Because people tend to ignore communications that don’t directly apply to them. To connect with members of specific audiences, we will need to tailor planning reports for each group. We might develop a brief report for parents that highlights the portions of the plan that deal with services to children. The report for parents would highlight the goals and objectives that relate to services
for children. It might be printed on a single sheet of paper or even a large bookmark. Most strategic planning reports are intended for external audiences and are written from the users’ point of view. However, it is equally important that strategic planning reports be developed for your internal audiences: the staff and members of the board. The strategic planning documents written for your internal audiences will be revised and expanded as activities are selected and implementation begins, and they will be used to report progress toward reaching the objectives each year (UNESCO, 2014).

MoE (2004) stated the following strategies that should be implemented by all stakeholders of education and schools for the successful implementation of the SDP. Those strategies are—providing training to all stakeholders; self evaluations to identify weaknesses and strengths and formulate a common plan; identifying and putting into sequence the problems and formulate action plan; formation of implementation committees; searching for extra source of budget for the implementation; scheduling of monitoring and evaluation for the realization of the program; facilitating the exchange of experience for the realization of better outcomes; arranging contests among schools and Woredas; organizing of consultation forums; and the Woreda school improvement coordinating unit shall organize a symposium involving various public and civic societies; religious and governmental organizations to create awareness on the objective and implementation of the school improvement program, invite them to contribute their share and endeavour to use their contribution exhaustively.

Generally Planning requires clear and effective communication at all levels before performance begins to mirror expectations. Objectives are written and plans are documented to give employees direction. Good communication results in strong stakeholder buy-in and mobilization. Additionally, as stated in UNDP (2009) communication improves clarity on expectations, roles and responsibilities, as well as information on progress and performance. This clarity helps to ensure optimum use of resources.

2.2.7 Implementation of School Development Plans

According to MoE (2004) the implementation stage is usually composed of the following main periods and key functions: 1) Inception period: refers to concluding contracting arrangements, mobilize resources, establish working relationship with stakeholders, hold inception workshop(s), review and revise project plan, establish monitoring and evaluation systems. 2) Main implementation period: on an ongoing basis procure and deploy resources, including personnel, implementation activities and deliver results, monitor and review progress, revise operational plans in light of experience, and report on progress. 3) Phase-out period:
progressively hand over all responsibilities to local partners/beneficiaries, ensure maintenance plans are in place, ensure relevant skills are effectively transferred, and help ensure recurrent cost requirements are secured.

Implementation and monitoring firstly includes planning and re-planning: plans are best estimates of what will happen in the future, but must be modified an ongoing basics to take account of what actually happens during implementation. The activity and resources/budget schedules must therefore be periodically reviewed, refined, and update based on experience. Secondly it includes Reporting: project management/implementing agencies must provide reports on physical and financial progress to stakeholders, particularly those providing financial resources to support implementation. Good quality monitoring reports are an essential input to project evaluations and audits. Without clearly documented project plans and a documented record of progressive achievements, evaluation becomes an almost impossible task. For audits, clear project budgets and financial progress reports are also particularly important (Barth, 1990).

Planning, to be effective, must be concerned with its own implementation-with progress made or not made, with unforeseen obstacles that arise and with how to overcome them. Plans are not made to be carved in stone but to be changed and adapted as the occasion warrants. As plans for one period move into action, planning for the next must be under way, nourished by feedback from the first. Planning is, or should be, an integral part of the whole process of educational management, defined in the broadest sense. It can help the decision-makers at all levels—from classroom teachers to national ministers and parliaments—to make better-informed decisions. It can do this by helping them see more clearly the specific objectives in question, the various options that are available for pursuing these objectives, and the likely implications of each (Coombs, 1985).

Generally a plan has no meaning if it cannot be implemented. As the plan is being developed, the principal should think about how to begin implementing it. Existing procedures may need to be adjusted to shift the focus to and maintain it on implement. Principals, staff, and school councils should consider making changes to the daily timetable to support the plans goals and strategies. Changes to the time table convey the message that. The implementation process needs a timetable and strategy on how to proceed on the plan. It needs the active participation of all stakeholders and their comments. Planners have to implement according to the plan and if the plan is not workable they have to see other means. A plan is not a rigid document. It can be revised during implementation. That is why a serious attention should be given to the implementation process.
2.2.8 Educational Planning in Ethiopia

Since the 1940s Ethiopia has experienced three systems of political governance, each distinguished by its education policy. The first system of governance was the Imperial system that started soon after WWII and lasted until 1974; the second was the military/socialist system that lasted until 1991. The third and current federal system of governance became fully operational after 1994.

The Emperor and his government might have believed that they were laying down the foundations for the modernisation of the country but they did not pay enough attention to the communication gaps between the generations that modern schools were creating. In practice, the then Ethiopian government had no coherent strategy. The curriculum was ad hoc and left to teachers who came from different countries with different backgrounds. The educational policy of the Imperial system was simply dismissed as elitist and academic after it replaced by the new leader, who soon proclaimed a republic and promised that they would transform the economy and hence pull the country out of its poverty. A new curriculum was duly produced where five new subjects namely, agriculture, production technology, political education, home economics and introduction to business were added. This was in sharp contrast to the format of the curriculum of the Imperial period where students followed not more than seven subjects. The inclusion of additional subjects without prior planning and adequate infrastructure led to the further deterioration of pedagogical conditions (Negash, 1990).

After the Derge regime resigned the current government launched and began to implement the 1994 new education and training policy. Within the framework of the 1994 Education and Training Policy, and the 20-year education sector indicative plan, the government of Ethiopia launched the first five-year education sector development program (ESDP I) in 1997/98, followed by ESDP II in 2002/03, ESDP III in 2005/06, ESDP VI in 2010/11 and ESDP V in 2015/16. ESDPs I, II, III and VI concluded in 2001/02, 2004/05, 2009/10, and 2014/15 respectively, with remarkable success in expanding access to primary education (MoE, 2007). In addition to the rapid expansion of formal primary schooling, the introduction of alternative basic education strategies, responsive to the lifestyle of pastoral communities and disadvantaged children, also contributed to the overall growth of primary school enrolment (MoE, 2007). Currently, ESDP V is being implemented with particular attention given to ensure universal access to quality primary education by 2020 and to quality secondary education by 2025 (MoE, 2010).
The government of Ethiopia has made its ambition to strengthen the education sector performance clear through increased funding. In this regard, regions have been given a free hand to design their own 5 years educational sector development programs based on the specific needs of their region and also the plans of the various departments of the Federal Ministry of Education where included in the program (MoE, 2002). The equity and quality issues are being addressed that significant result has been recorded. This large an outcome of the education sector development program (ESDP) - a comprehensive intervention package developed by the government in order to mobilize national and international efforts to boost the performance of the system, in particular the primary education sub-sector. It is in fact a document that “translates the policy statement into action” comprising the first five years plans within a 20 years perspective plan (UNICEF, 2010). Within the framework of the ESDP III, the MOE has developed a General Education Quality Improvement Package. Even though a special Leadership and Management Program (LAMP) was initiated to build capacity of school principals and supervisors in planning and management they are expected to plan and implement their school plans with relation to the different type of plans planned by MoE.

Although school development planning tends to be seen as a recent addition to the range of management techniques deployed by heads and senior staff in schools its origins can be traced to the early 1980s (Clegg and Billington, 1997). Ethiopian Federal Ministry of Education prepared in 2012 the school performance classification framework. The school classification could be one, two, three and four from low performing to high performing. The school classification standards categorized under the three main points those are in put, process and output.

Generally the Ethiopian education system changed from the centralized to decentralized system. This change enables the educational sector particularly the school to be autonomous in decision making process. Even though there are long range plans those were planned at ministry of education and educational bureau level the school leaders are expected to prepare plans according to the school context.

2.2.9 The Stakeholders in School Development Planning

Everyone involved in or interested in the operation of schools has a role to play in the planning process. District school boards and superintendents of education play important roles in setting directions, and in supporting and monitoring school development plans. The most important work, however, takes place within the school community itself. An effective SDP results when principals, teachers, school councils, parents, and other community members work as a team to establish priorities, set goals for improvement, implement strategies to achieve those goals, and
evaluate progress. Generally planning is best done by those who will be carrying out the plans, both by managers and staff and with other stakeholders who are affected in the implementation of the plan (Shuey, Bigdeli and Rajan, 2016).

According to MoE (2007) Woreda school boards set direction and provide support for the school improvement planning process. They should encourage all stakeholders and establish policies to ensure that they play roles in developing, communicating, monitoring, and evaluating school improvement plans. Education experts/ superintendents encourage schools in planning improvements, facilitate their strategies, and monitor each school’s success. They should ensure professional development and training opportunities are available; support school councils, parents, and other community members in becoming full partners in the improvement planning process by communicating with them regularly; use principals’ meetings to provide principals and vice-principals with professional development opportunities and to model strategies.

Principals are the key players in the school improvement process. Principals’ roles fall into three main categories: communication, professional development and leadership. Firstly principals should clearly able communicating planning process to staff, school councils, parents, and other community members; ensure that everyone involved in the process receives regular communications about the improvement plan and the school’s progress; and communicate the final school development plan to all members of the school’s community. Secondly principals should encourage staff to lead the development and implementation of the plan; provide leadership and training opportunities to staff, parents, and other community members involved in the process, and support them in developing and implementing the plan. Finally Principals should develop and circulate a parent survey to provide parents with an opportunity to describe their feelings about the school and the ways in which they would like to be involved in their children’s education, inspire, influence other stakeholders for better performance; ensure that the school budget reflects and supports the plan’s goals and implementation strategies; and continually gather information on student achievement and communicate it to the school’s community as part of the plan’s monitoring and evaluation process (Barth,1990). MoE also developed the three school principal’s domain and competencies which include school vision and community leadership, instructional leadership and administrative leadership to enhance their quality of performance.

Teachers should actively participate and assume leadership roles in establishing priorities, setting goals, and formulating implementation strategies for the plan; work closely with school councils and parents to implement the plan; ensure that classroom strategies for improvement
address the needs of students at all levels of learning; assess students in a variety of ways and develop strategies for improving the level of student achievement; support the evaluation of the plan by providing up-to-date information on student learning, the school environment, and parental feedback and set and pursue professional development goals that focus on the goals and strategies identified in the plan. Finally, Secondary school students and students in Grades 5-8 could participate in setting goals and strategies; help communicate the plan to the student body; communicate the plan to their parents and participate in strategies to reach the school’s goals (UNESCO, 2014).

2.3 Challenges of Planning
Conley (1993) argues that strategic planning in schools faces challenges because a number of school leaders lack knowledge of the school development strategic planning processes as well as of how to convert school development strategic plans into action plans for effective implementation. Even though there are many challenges to plan, principals need to plan in order to cope with an uncertain environment. Through understanding the concept of uncertainty, planning helps to deal with the present and anticipate the future. Such an environment requires an approach to planning which can be based not on a set on immutable, externally imposed targets but on reaching agreement on a series of short term objectives derived from negotiated and shared common values (Bell, 1999). It needs to take into account the nature of the questions that may be asked about the future and that answers to them may be either unknown or unknowable. It has to be recognised that in coping with the new future, important information may not be available, important alternatives may be ignored and important possible outcomes neglected. Thus, plans will not be made and implemented. Rather, they will be made and remade endlessly as the school proceeds through a process of successive approximation to agree objectives derived from policy, both of which may change before being achieved.

Therefore to attain the plans goal, the model of leadership must address the five challenges: give busy educators continuous opportunities to enhance their efficacy in their primary roles through engaging in school wide leadership work; honour educators’ hard-won knowledge and skills while inviting them to examine the significant challenges facing them and the school’s effectiveness; strike a balance between faculty needs for affiliation and replenishment and the school’s need for coordination, planning, and improvement; nurture relationships that are authentic and robust enough to sustain open communication about issues of equity, power, trust, and performance and welcome all willing partners in taking leadership responsibility, differentiating roles and responsibilities so every person who wants to can appropriately participate (Donaldson, 2006).
There are many challenges that school leaders may face during planning and implementing the school strategies. Some of these school leaders’ challenges are lack of know-how, absence of commitment, time required and pressure of other work, tendency towards inflexibility, resource limitations- lack of manpower, budget, proper information and other resources hamper the planning activity, political instability and changing circumstances and higher turnover of principals (UNESCO, 2014). There are other challenges in planning which is currently happened in school. For example in improvements in access and enrolment have created new challenges (e.g., large class sizes or large numbers of overage students) and have heightened concerns about the actual quality of education students receive once in schools (Anderson and Mundy, 2014). Addressing this problem in our plan needs the principal skill and experience.

The linking plans and budgets is a device which should facilitate the alignment of the (planned) budget with sector plans and objectives. In very basic terms this means that, by using an appropriate macroeconomic model, the ministry of finance forecasts future government revenues and then proceeds with setting sector budget ceilings for a given number of years on the basis of government priorities and of the sector objectives and plans presented by the different line ministries. In that way this gives the same line ministries a better idea of the yearly budgets they can expect and thereby allows them to plan in a more realistic way. In spite of this, a common temptation when preparing an education sector plan is to try to do too many things within the same medium-term period. This inevitably leads to spreading the resources too thin, which in turn leads to poor implementation. The school is able to link the budget to its action plan in their work plan (UNICEF, 2010).

To meet the challenges of a changing world, schools, education institutions and other providers must themselves be learning organisations continually improving and evolving and learning from best practice. Developing school self-evaluation and ensuring that the department inspectorate’s complementary program of inspections and advisory visits help to support innovative and effective practice in schools and early years settings, while at the same time, providing adequate quality assurance for parents and the public. One of the major challenges is to provide the education infrastructure to meet the demands of changing demographics (Anderson and Mundy, 2014).
CHAPTER THREE

3. THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter presented the research method, the research site, the sources of data, the study population, the sample size and sampling technique, the procedures of data collection, the data gathering tools and methods of data analysis.

3.1 The Research Design

This study attempted to obtain information to examine and describe the practices and challenges of SDP. Hence it was a cross sectional with the belief that this design was suitable to obtain sufficient information on the issue from a relatively large number of cases at a particular time. The strategy will be the concurrent triangulation strategy which uses both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection concurrently in order to best understand the phenomenon of interest (Creswell, 2003).

3.2. Method

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were employed in this study to describe, interpret, generalize, analyze and to make interview and questionnaires. The qualitative method was employed as a supplementary to the study with the information gained by interview.

3.3. Sources of Data

The sources of data for this research were primary sources from teachers, principals, cluster supervisors and Woreda education experts and Sub City education experts.

3.4. The Study Area and Population

The study area for this research was Kolfe Keranyo which is one of the ten Sub Cities in Addis Ababa. Kolfe Keranyo Sub City has fifteen woreda and twenty six government primary schools. It is bordered by Oromiya regional state in the west and south west and two inner sub-cities Lidata and Addis ketema sub cities in the east and north east. The populations for this study were eight (31 %) primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City in Addis Ababa which were selected through lottery method of simple random sampling technique to provide independent and equal chance of being selected for the schools. These are: Bisrat, Mikililand, Keranyo Medanialem, Selamber, Gulelefana, Addistesfa, Timbetermiyas and Kale primary Schools. The rest 18 primary Schools were excluded from the study to make the study manageable and because of time and budget difficulty. The researcher believes that the sample sizes of eight primary schools were representative and help to compose well-founded generalization at the end of the study.

3.5 Sample Size and Sample Techniques

The study area was purposely selected because of the low performance in achieving educational practices and I have work experience of ten years as a teacher and a principal in different primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City. AAEB (2016) reports showed that the sub-city was
the least performing in overall educational activities for the mentioned reporting years. The eight primary schools were included through simple lottery sampling method from twenty six government primary schools. The participants of the study were school principals, teachers, PTSA, cluster supervisors, Woreda and Sub City education experts. The eight cluster supervisors, eight woreda and five Sub City education experts were selected using purposive sampling method for their close work relating with all school activities and they were believed to have the information required. To select sample teacher from each sample primary schools, the simple random sampling technique was used as it was indicated the sex of participants and groups proportionally. From 580 total teachers 167 teachers (28.79%) were participated in the study. Simple random sampling technique particularly lottery method were used to select teachers from each school to give equal chance. Thirty two (100%) principals were selected by using the purposive sampling technique. PTSA members were selected using 12 parents and 12 students (three from each primary School) was included by availability/convenience sampling technique of non-probability sampling method where the sample is taken from a group of people easy to contact or to reach and willing to participate.

Generally, these groups are close to the everyday in-school activities and are expected to provide appropriate information regarding school plans. Furthermore, twenty four parents and students representatives, eight principals and eight cluster supervisors were participated in the interviews and 220 respondents were participate in questionnaires. Parents and students participate only on interview.

Table 1 - summary of sample size and population in each selected primary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of Schools</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Cluster supervisors</th>
<th>Woreda education expert</th>
<th>Sub City education expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bisrat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>keranyo Medehane alem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Addis tesfa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Selamber</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gulele fana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mikililand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Timbetermiyas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>kale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6. Data Gathering Tools

The data collection tools that were used in this study are questionnaires and interview.

3.6.1. Questionnaires

Questionnaires are data collection instruments that consist of a series of questions and other prompts for the purpose of gathering information from respondents. They are written forms that
ask exact questions of all individuals in the sample group, and which respondents can answer at their own convenience. It is the most widely used type of instrument in education. The data provided by questionnaires can be more easily analyzed and interpreted than the data obtained from verbal responses (Gall et al., 2007).

There are three types of questionnaires that are used in studies. Firstly, structured questionnaires consist of closed or prompted questions with predefined answers. Secondly, Semi-structured questionnaires comprise a mixture of closed and open questions. The use of semi-structured questionnaires enables a mix of qualitative and quantitative information to be gathered. Thirdly, unstructured questionnaires are made up of questions that elicit free responses. These are guided conversations rather than structured interviews (Haines, 2007). In this study structured questionnaires were supposed to be better to get great amount of data from large number of respondents in a relatively shorter time with smallest quantity of cost. Hence, the questionnaires were prepared in English language and administer to all teacher participants with the supposition that they can understand the language. The questionnaire was consisting of two parts. The first part deals with the general background of the participants. The second part was containing the total number of closed ended question items that pertain to the basic questions of the study. A questionnaire was prepared by the researcher to collect information from teachers, principals and cluster supervisors and filled the questionnaires because the researcher believed that they are rich in the information will be required to accomplish the research.

3.6.2. Interview
An interview is the verbal questions asked by the interviewer and verbal responses provided by the interviewee (Gall et al., 2007). Additionally, research has shown that four types of interviews are frequently employed in social sciences. The first is the structured interview, whose key feature is that it is mostly organised around a set of predetermined direct questions that require immediate, mostly ‘yes’ or ‘no’ type, responses (Berg, 2007). The second type of interview is the open-ended (unstructured) interview which is an open situation through which a greater flexibility and freedom is offered to both sides (i.e. interviewers and interviewees), in terms of planning, implementing and organising the interview content and questions. The third one is the semi-structured interview, which is a more flexible version of the structured interview as “it allows depth to be achieved by providing the opportunity on the part of the interviewer to probe and expand the interviewee's responses” (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). For the purpose of this research, semi-structured interview was selected as it would allow covering various issues concerning the study and its advantage of flexibility in which new questions were forwarded during the interview based on the responses of the interviewees.
Fourthly, focus group interviewing which is, according to Barbour & Schostak (2005), “…an interviewing technique in which participants are selected because they are a purposive, although not necessarily representative, sampling of a specific population, this group being ‘focused’ on a given topic”. Although focus groups can be suitable for investigating complex behavior, it can sometimes be very time-consuming and effortful process. In addition to semi-structured interview focus group discussions was also used to triangulate the data obtained through questionnaire and to make the questionnaire and interviews data rich for supplementary insights in this study.

Generally, for this study, Semi-structured interview questions were prepared in English Language for schools principals, cluster supervisors, parents, students, Woreda education office experts and sub city education department office experts to gather more information. The interview questions were discussed with the interviewee in Amharic Language to reduce communication barriers and to get more information. The purpose of the interview was to get evidences and to gather more information that may not be easily held by the questionnaires.

3.7 Data Collection Procedures
The researcher used a series of data gathering procedures. The data was gathered by using questionnaire and interview. The school principal, parents, students and supervisor was purposively taken to be interviewed. Pilot study was conducted prior to the final administration of the questionnaires to one school respondents. The pilot test was conducted to protect the truthfulness of the instruments with the objective of assessment whether or not the items enclosed in the instruments enable the researcher to gather relevant and valid information. Besides, the purpose of pilot testing was to make necessary changes so as to correct confusing questions.

Bisrat primary school was taken through purposive sampling technique to fill the pilot test questionnaires. Then, the prepared questionnaires were spread for the sample subjects for the pilot study. The end result of the pilot testing was consulted with advisors before the delivery of data gathering tools. Then, the final questionnaires were spread to all participants in the sample. The result of the pilot testing was statistically computed by the SPSS 20 program. Based on the pilot test, the reliability coefficient of the instrument was found to be 0.7858 (78.58%) and, hence, was taken to be reliable. That is the instrument was found to be reliable as statistical literature recommend a test result of 0.65 (65% reliability) and above as reliable (George and Malley, 2003).
3.8. Validity and Reliability of the Study

According to Nahid Golafshani (2003), validity refers to the degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. Reliability has to do with the consistency or repeatability of a measure or an instrument and high reliability is obtained when the measure or instrument gives the same results if the research is repeated on the same sample. To be sure of the validity, the advisors and experienced teachers of Bisrat primary school were consulted to give their comment. Based on their comments, the instruments were improved before they were administered to the major participants of the study to reduce errors.

Moreover, to confirm the validity of the instrument, the questionnaire with sufficient number (220 copies) of items addressing all objectives of the study were administered to eight primary school teachers in Kolfe Keranyo Sub City and then, 216 copies were collected with high return rate of 98.2%. Triangulation of data gathering tools was executed by using interview in each sample schools.

3.9. Methods of Data Analysis

3.9.1 Quantitative Data

Quantitative data was analyzed using percentage, frequency, standard deviation and mean score. The data was categorized and frequencies were tallied. Percentage and frequency tally was used to analyze the characteristics of the population to determine the relative standing of the respondents. The items in the questionnaires were presented in Tables according to their idea coherence. The scores of each item were organized, statistically compiled and entered into SPSS to obtain the frequency, percentage mean value and standard deviation of each item.

3.9.2 Qualitative Data

The data collected from FGD and semi-structured interview was analyzed qualitatively. The written notes of interview were transcribed; categorized and compiled together into theme and were translated into English. Analysis and interpretations was made on the basis of the interviews.

3.10 Ethical Consideration

Having letters of permission from Addis Ababa University and woreda education office for ethical approval, the researcher introduced his objectives to all participants for study. After making agreement with the concerned participants, the researcher introduced his objectives and purposes. Then, the final questionnaires were administered to sample teachers with in the 8 primary schools.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.1 PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

This chapter presents the description of the sample population, analysis and interpretation of the data based on the information obtained through the questionnaires, and interviews. It consists of two parts. The first part is concerned with the description of characteristics of the respondents whereas; the second part deals with the analysis and interpretation of the data.

The purpose of this data was to explore the extent of the practices and challenges of primary school development planning in case of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City in Addis Ababa. To this end, the investigator developed data gathering tools that integrate various aspects of practices and challenges of SDP. For this purpose, one hundred forty three teachers, fifty two principal, eight cluster supervisors, eight Woreda education office, five Sub City education office expert and twenty six students and parents with a total of 242 respondents were also selected from eight primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City in Addis Ababa. The data was collected from a total of 239 respondents because four respondents were not filled and returned the questionnaires. To this end, a total of 220 copies of questionnaires were distributed, among this 216 (98.2%) were filled in and collected. But four (1.8%) of the questionnaire were not collected. Seven principals, twenty four parents and students, four clusters supervisors, four Woreda education office experts and one Sub City education office expert were interviewed. Finally, the research analyses were done based on the data obtained from the remaining 216 (98.2%) of the questionnaires, and interview.

Teachers, principals, cluster supervisors and educational experts responded to closed-ended questionnaire items. The closed ended items across sub-categories were computed and analyzed using frequency, percentage, standard deviation, and mean scores. Percentage was utilized for easy presentation of frequency distribution and for comparison of the degree of the prevailing practices and challenges. In addition, items across each category were arranged under the rating scale with five points. These points scale range from very high = 5, high = 4, medium = 3, low = 2 and very low = 1. It could be also used as very large extent/strongly agree = 5, large extent/agree = 4, undecided = 3, less extent/disagree = 2 and not at all/strongly disagree = 1 according to the characteristics of the items.

Besides, data from interviews and document analysis were triangulated to validate the findings. Mean scores were calculated from the responses. For the purpose of easy analysis and interpretation, the mean values of each item and dimension were interpreted as follows. The practices of school plans with a mean value of 0-1.49 as very low, 1.50-2.49 as low, 2.50-3.49 as medium, 3.50-4.49 as high and 4.50-5.00 as very high.
as medium, 3.50-4.49 as high achievement of the task, and 4.50-5.00 as very high implementation of the activities. On the other hand, for items related to challenges of school planning which are negatively constructed, the scale was inversely interpreted. Accordingly, 4.50-5.00 = very low, 3.50-4.49 = low, 2.50-3.49 = medium, 1.50-2.49 = high and 0-1.49 as very high in the magnitude of ineffectiveness. And also, Fr: Frequency, SD: standard deviation and Total %: 100.

4.2 Characteristics of the Respondents

Respondents were asked to indicate their background information regarding their educational background, year of experiences and gender. The details of the characteristics of the respondents are given in Table 2 below.

Table 2- Gender, educational qualification and year of services of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Cluster supervisor</th>
<th>Woreda education experts</th>
<th>Sub city education experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First degree</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and above years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the respondents characteristics in terms of gender. Regarding teacher respondents, the male teachers constituted 78 (32.2%) while the female teachers hold up 85 (33.8%). Concerning principals, cluster supervisors, Sub City and Woreda education office experts, almost all respondents are males but only one female respondent in Sub City education expert and ten female principals were participants. This shows that the essential data was mainly obtained from male respondents. Moreover, one can understand that the number of females in the participation of educational leadership is much lower compared to males in primary school of kolfe keranyo sub city.
The academic qualification of respondents listed in the above table shows that two (0.9%) and 86 (39.1%) of teachers are certificate and diploma graduates respectively. While 75 (25%) of teacher respondents are first degree holders. This implies that the qualification standards set by MoE were almost achieved. Furthermore, all the cluster supervisors, principals, Woreda and Sub City education experts hold first degree. The standard states that minimum request qualification to be leader at primary schools is degree. Therefore, according to their qualification, they could be the sources of reliable and important information for the study. But only 2.5% of school leaders qualified in post graduated diploma in school leadership and most principals come to the position simply from the experience of teaching without additional knowledge of leadership science. Even all of the newly hired principals begin their activities by try and error without getting any orientation.

According to the work experiences of the respondents, 73 (29.5%) of teachers respondents had 1-5 years of service as teachers. The small number of teacher respondents 24 (9.1%) had more than twenty years of work experience. Moreover, majority of principals 15 (11.4%) had the work experience of 1-5 service. This shows that the schools have teachers and principals with less experience. In addition, it is important to point out here that the lack of experienced teaching staff creates less effective school environment to practice and implement school different plans effectively. Likewise, the majority of school leaders were less experienced in leadership position and lack of experience to plan school development plans effectively in the schools. But, literature supports that principals are considered as a leader having the responsibility to assist teachers, particularly new and inexperienced teachers in developing and achieving educational objectives in line with the needs of the school (Steyn and Vanniekerk, 2002).

4.3. The School Stakeholders’ involvement in School Development Planning

Effective formulation of school development plans requires that principals are able to give the necessary guidance. In Ethiopia although principals are professionally qualified teachers it is questionable whether they are visionary enough to strategically propel schools. Sherman, Rowley and Armandi (2007) argue that it is usual to find people appointed in positions in which they do not have the necessary skills in Africa.

Everyone involved in or interested in the operation of schools has a role to play in the improvement planning process. District school boards and superintendents of education play important roles in setting directions and in supporting and monitoring school development plans. The most important work, however, takes place within the school community itself (Nyagah, 2015). Therefore to increase the involvement of stakeholders in school development planning
their understanding and skill of planning process should be developed. So in the following sub titles the level of stakeholders’ understanding about the concept of school development planning, the necessary elements included in it and importance of school development planning in school and also the level of stakeholders’ involvement in the planning process analyzed in detail. So in this sub title the current status of school development planning practice regarding involving stakeholders, understanding the science of school development planning of stakeholders and understanding the necessary elements included in planning of stakeholders and the stakeholders level of having informed about their school development planning importance was discussed below.

4.3. 1. The Understanding of Stakeholders about School Development Planning

This section deals with the items related to the contribution of school development plan to achieve school objectives. Each item is analyzed based on the data obtained through questionnaires responded by teachers, principal, cluster supervisor and educational experts and further backed by the data obtained from interview and focus group discussion.

Table 3- Understanding of stakeholders about the concept of school development planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>very Low Fr %</th>
<th>Low Fr %</th>
<th>Medium Fr %</th>
<th>High Fr %</th>
<th>Very high Fr %</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Understanding of the importance of SDP for quality education</td>
<td>51 23.2</td>
<td>88 40</td>
<td>37 16.8</td>
<td>17 7.7</td>
<td>23 10.5</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Understanding of SDP helps to facilitate changes in education</td>
<td>56 25.5</td>
<td>80 36.4</td>
<td>20 9.1</td>
<td>22 10</td>
<td>38 17.3</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Understanding of the goals of SDP and process of planning</td>
<td>52 23.6</td>
<td>59 26.8</td>
<td>44 20</td>
<td>26 11.8</td>
<td>35 15.9</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Understanding necessary elements of SDP</td>
<td>48 21.8</td>
<td>74 33.6</td>
<td>20 9.1</td>
<td>27 12.3</td>
<td>47 21.4</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conley (1993) argues that strategic planning in schools faces challenges because a number of school leaders lack knowledge of the strategic planning processes as well as of how to convert strategic plans into action plans for effective implementation. Even though the mean of the response was at high (3.59) on the understanding of the importance of SDP for quality education of the stakeholders, the understanding of stakeholders on the SDP to facilitate changes in education, the goals of SDP and process of planning and necessary elements of SDP was at moderate level. This implies that understanding of the importance of planning was in the range
of high level but most stakeholders were not understood their school development planning process, the necessary elements included in and whether it facilitate changes in education. The response of the interview held with principals and cluster supervisors confirmed that the understanding of teachers and principals on the importance of planning is good but others stakeholders such as parents and students is not as expected. From this it can be concluded that the understanding of planning that facilitate changes in education was in medium (3.44 mean) at school level. Similarly, the understanding of school leaders and stakeholders on the goals of their school development plan and the necessary elements of school development planning was at medium (mean of 3.31 and 3.23 respectively) as it can be seen in the above table.

Generally, the weighed mean of school stakeholders understanding of school development plan to achieve school objectives was 3.36 which were in the scope of medium. Development education would constitute an important background for the work of planning. But, the understanding of principals and other school stakeholders about school development plan importance for quality education, to facilitate change in education and for school improvement is at moderate level as the result of the study. The interview response also confirms that most stakeholders have no enough understanding about the types of plans, the goals of their school and the process of planning in their school. From the interview of cluster supervisor and teachers I also understood that most stakeholders have no awareness about school development plans. The school leaders themselves have no more understanding about single use and standing use and other types of school development plans. They also confirmed since most principals assigned without getting training and orientation they have no advance knowledge about leadership and planning rather than teaching science. But according to different scholars there are many types of planning which should be known and applied by school leaders in school. In Ethiopia there are many prepared long range, standing use, strategic plans which stated in general education quality improvement program (GQEIP, 2008). So schools expected to integrated different plans found at Woreda, Sub City and MoE level during planning their school plans.

Schools need a systematic plan to communicate to all of their stakeholders that the human and economic consequences of not improving student performance and “readiness” are far worse than the challenges and pain of bringing about needed change (Daggett, 2014). But many focus group discussion participants argued that most school stakeholders have no detail information about their school development plans. In contrast to this some agreed that students, parents and teachers participate in school development planning through their representative from parents, teachers and students associations. So this group argued that most stakeholders have detail information about their school development planning.
Additionally, on the focus group discussion most participants strongly agree that there should be one strategic school development plans that can be broke down into several operational and tactical plans as it delegated to lower managers and individuals for implementation. Contrast to this one school leader talked that his school has twenty five planned different school plans. From the data analysis most plans has no hierarchical relations and horizontal relations which all focus group discussion participants agreed on. This all plans were not distributed and communicated to stakeholders they simply planned by school leader and only collected for inspection purposes. Finally all participants agreed this and other problems happened because of school leaders’ lack of understanding of school development planning process.

4.3.2 The Importance of SDP to Improve Educational Achievement

It is clear that school development plan help to improve the academic achievement of the students and the quality of education.

Table 4- The benefits of school development plan in academic achievement of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Fr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SDP promotes to evaluate school actions</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SDP helps to anticipate the future</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SDP helps to enhance the quality of learning and teaching</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SDP as decision making tool</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SDP as adaptive changes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In item 1 of Table 4, the respondents were asked to rate the extent to which school development plans promotes to evaluate school actions and improves classroom activities. As we can see from the Table, the mean score is 3.1 which were in the range of moderate level. From the results, it can be said that the contribution of school development plans promotes to evaluate school actions and in improving classroom activities was found to be inadequate. The response of the interview held with school principals, and cluster supervisors confirmed that the support of school development plans promotes to evaluate school actions and to improve classroom activities as well as the student academic achievement is moderate and not as much as expected.
And also the respondents were asked to give their opinion by rating to what extent SDPs helps to anticipate the future, as adaptive changes and to enhance the quality of learning teaching. The mean of the items were in the range of medium level which can be said that the contribution of SDPs helps to anticipate the future, as adaptive changes and to enhance the quality of learning teaching is moderate. Likewise, the interview results from parents, students and cluster supervisors confirmed that the status of SDP implementation and preparing stakeholders for evaluating their action was medium level. Hence, one may say that the importance of school plans helps to anticipate the future and to enhance the quality of learning teaching was at medium stage in primary school of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City. But, in item 4 of the same Table shows that SDP as decision making tool helps enhancing the quality of learning and teaching was 3.5 mean which indicates the importance of school development plan as decision making tool is high level of support. From this, it can be stated that the important of SDP as decision making tool was to some extent practiced at high level. And also, the information gained from the interview from Woreda education office experts confirmed that the practices of school development plan as decision making tool is not hundred percent effective in each Woreda to improve the quality of education, as well as the academic achievement of students.

From interviews response some stakeholders agreed that using effective school development planning they enabled to change their students’ achievement and the whole schools performance. But most participants of focus group discussion and interviewees argued that they were not aware about their school development plans importance as decision making tools, for adaptive change, for enhancing learning quality in class rooms and to anticipate the school future.

Generally the implementation of school development planning to evaluate the school actions and to enhance the quality of learning and teaching at Kolfe Keranyo primary school was at medium level. The schools using their plan as decision making tool and adaptive change in school were also at moderate level according to this study. The total mean value as this study regarding school development planning importance for educational achievement was 3.43 which show moderate level. Most teachers replied in the interview show plans left on shelf and they could not used as decision making tool and adaptive change needed in school. The cluster supervisors also replied most of their school teachers have no aware about the educational policies that can guide them about quality teaching and learning. As the educational experts interview teachers and principals have no enough awareness about Ethiopian educational policy. In contrast, the school development plan has as its essential purpose the achievement of school effectiveness as well as being a significant support for school improvement. It will help the school to realize its stated aims and objectives which will be firmly directed towards meeting the present and anticipated
needs of the pupils. It will help to ensure quality in teaching and learning throughout the school as stated the research done by Xaba in 2006.

4.3.3 The Necessary Elements of School Development Planning

This part deals with the items related to the necessary elements or points included in school development planning. Each item is analyzed based on the data obtained through questionnaires responded by school stakeholders and further backed by the data obtained from interview. Therefore, the six items are interpreted as indicated in the Table below.

Table 5. The necessary elements or points included in school development planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>very large extent</th>
<th>large extent</th>
<th>moderate extent</th>
<th>less extent</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core values</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorit intrinsic strategies issues</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time tables</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results of Table 5, it can be said that the school development plan included vision, core values and prioritic strategies of the school was found to be at large extent. The response of the interview held with school principals, and cluster supervisors confirmed that the even though school vision is included in their plan most stakeholders were not aware about it and the school vision was not prepared in the school and it totally accepted from education bureau. But the vision statement communicates both the purpose and values of the organization (MoE, 2010).

And also as indicated in the item 2 on the mission of the school majority of respondents 73 (33.2%) rated that school development plan included mission of the school as moderate extent. The mean of the item was 3.49 which are in the range of medium level of support. Likewise, the interview results from principals, cluster supervisors confirmed that the status of school development plan implementation and preparing school development plan included mission of the school is at medium level of support. Hence, one may say that the school development plan included mission of the school was at medium stage in primary school of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City.

In item 5 of Table 5, the respondents were asked to what extent school development plan included goal was to high extent. As stated in the above Table the mean score of the item is 3.68 which is in the range of high level. But regarding item 6 of Table 3, teachers were asked to rate the school development plan included time table and the mean of respondents on the item is 3.18 which were in the range of moderate level.
Vision statements and mission statements are the inspiring words chosen by successful leaders to clear and concisely convey the direction of the organization. By crafting a clear mission statement and vision statement, school leaders can powerfully communicate their intention and motivate their team or organization to realize an attractive and inspiring common vision of the future (MoE, 2010).

During planning, school leaders and the stake holders should know what elements should be included in the planning. The crucial stage in school development planning is strategy formulation. It builds on the first stage where strategic issues are identified, opportunities, threats or constraint and strategic alternatives weighed to decide on best strategic action to be taken. Therefore planning begins with clear identification of goals or a vision to work toward, as well as to induce commitment and enthusiasm. The next step is to assess what changes need to occur and which may be accomplished by asking the people involved, reading documents, and observing what is going on within a school (MoE, 2013). According to the some respondents replied their school included the school vision, core values, mission, prioritic strategic issues, school goals and time table at large extent. But most interviewers said that most plans included the vision core values, mission prioritic strategic issues, goals and time tables in the document only without communicating with the stake holders. They also responded even the school leaders do not internalize the school mission and vision and it left on written form rather than changed to implementation. They said school vision, mission formation was not by participating stakeholders it simply derived from the central ministry of education.

**Table 6.** The extent to which stakeholders are involved in the SDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>very large extent Fr</th>
<th>large extent Fr</th>
<th>moderate extent Fr</th>
<th>less extent Fr</th>
<th>not at all Fr</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and Support staff</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Students</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community and Supporting NGOs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For school development planning to be successful, involvement of all school partners should be there. The principal, as the person responsible for administering the school and for providing instructional leadership, is ultimately responsible for improvement planning. But the entire school community should be actively involved in all stages of the process: planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating the progress (MoE, 2013). But experts, teachers and support staff, Parents and Students and the community and Supporting NGOs involvement in
school development planning process was at less extent. From the results, it can be said that the experts involve in school development planning process was found to be inadequate. The response of the interview held with school principals, and cluster supervisors confirmed that the experts involve in school development planning process as well as the student academic achievement was very low.

As indicated in the above Table 6 item 2, the respondents were asked to give their opinion by rating to what extent principal involve in school development planning process and majority 120 (54.5%) of respondents rated that principal involve in school development planning process was to the very large extent. But the mean of the item is 2.45 which are in the range of medium level of support. From the data, it can be said that the principals’ involvement in school development planning process was moderate. Likewise, the interview results from principals, cluster supervisors confirmed that the status of school development planning in which principal involve in its planning process was medium level. Some respondents argue because a few principals copied from the previous plans and /or from other school plan without planning according to school context and without improvement. Hence, one may say that the principal involve in school development planning process was at medium stage in primary School of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City. Principals are the senior executives in the schools and as such they require having leadership skills, hence better position to lead in strategy formulation. The principal has for a long time been expected to offer leadership on matters of quality improvement in schools (Ngware et al., 2006). This view has however been challenged by some scholars. Bell (2002) is of the opinion that a school principal cannot offer leadership on school vision since it is a collective responsibility of all stakeholders.

From the data it can be stated that teachers and support staff, parents and students, involvement in school development planning process was inadequate and got little attention which were largely passive and less active. And also, the information gained from the interview from Woreda education office experts confirmed that the practices of parents and students involve in school planning process was poor in each Woreda to improve the quality of education, as well as the academic achievement of students. It also implies that the community and supporting NGOs involvement in school development plan implementation was not to the expected level.

But everyone involved in or interested in the operation of schools has a role to play in the planning process. An effective school development plan results when principals, teachers, school councils, parents and other community members work as a team to establish priorities, set goals for improvement, implement strategies to achieve those goals, and evaluate progress (Asseffa
and Mesfin, 2014). But this study shows that expert, teachers, support staff, parents, students, the community and supporting NGOs participation in planning process was at low level. Interview participants believe that most school plans were planned by the school principals lonely without participate other stake holder. According to respondents believe most school development plans planned by principals and left on the shelf without changing in to action and it used only for inspection purpose. Even though the principals are the key players in school development planning, other stake holders should play their part to make the plan participate and part of decision making tool (MoE, 2004).

Currently school development planning practice in kolfe keranyo primary schools has not got enough attention as focus group discussion and interviewees responded. As document analysis shows, even though most necessary elements included in school plans, there were no enough evidence that shows the involvement of stakeholders in planning, evaluating and monitoring. Most parents and students total disagreed that they have communicate on plans. So as most teachers agreed parents were not playing their part because of they lack their role in education. Most principals also agreed producing litigious community was highly important in order to enhance students’ achievements which need communicating school development planning in detail to communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource analysis</td>
<td>Fr %</td>
<td>Fr %</td>
<td>Fr %</td>
<td>Fr %</td>
<td>Fr %</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of leadership skills and abilities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem analysis</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of core competencies</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of adequacy of staff members</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of external environment e.g. MoE policy, NGO, and community support.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in the above Table 7, the activities such as the resource analysis, analysis of leadership skills and abilities, needs assessment, problem analysis, analysis of core competencies and analysis of adequacy of staff members which takes places during school development planning is within the scope of low level. This indicates that the degree to which the practice of implementing the necessary planning process is low during planning. This indicates that the problem analysis is not practically implemented. It is also implies that the analysis of adequacy
of staff members is in the low level in primary schools of Kolfe Sub City. The response of the interview held with school principals, and cluster supervisors confirmed that there was some attempt made in the analysis of adequacy of staff members. From the data it can be stated that the attempt of principals in the analysis of adequacy of staff members was medium and got some attention.

There are MoE policy, standing plans and strategic plans prepared at national level and educational bureau level that should be included in school development planning. The new concept of planning also led to different ways of formulating questions concerning planning tools, the types of information required, the organisation of planning and links between plans worked out at the national, regional, and local levels, and relations among all those involved in planning (UNESCO, 1990). But, the analysis of external environment e.g. MoE policy, NGO, and community support is in the medium level of support in primary Schools of Kolfe Sub City. It is also implies that the analysis of core competencies is in the medium level in primary Schools of Kolfe Sub City. The response of the interview held with school principals, and cluster supervisors confirmed that there was some attempt made in the analysis of core competencies and analysis of external environment e.g. MoE policy, NGO, and community support. From the data it can be stated that the attempt of teachers and other stakeholders’ involvement in the analysis of core competencies was medium and got some attention.

Generally, in the planning process the environment analysis, resource, leadership skill and abilities, school problem, core competencies, staff adequacy analysis and need assessment are the key points to prepare sounded plans in school. But, following the planning procedures was at low level in primary schools of Kolfe Keraniyo Sub City as I could understand from respondents’ interview. Thus the total mean about the practice of planning procedures /steps was 2.34 which means at low level. But, the strategic management process entails four core stages including environmental analysis, strategy formulation, implementation and the evaluation and control stage, (Johnson et al, 2008). However, practitioners emphasize various stages based on their context, content or the strategic process itself. First and foremost, the management should establish mission, vision and objectives from which it can derive meaningful strategies (Sababu, 2007). Next, environmental analysis is a critical stage as it ensures formulation of strategies from an informed view-point of the external and internal environment (Bruce and Longdon, 2000).
4.4 The Challenges of School Development Planning

This section is devoted to the presentation of the major difficulties that hinder the positive application of school development planning. The challenges were learned from the responses provided to items as is displayed in Table 8.

Table 8 - Responses on the challenges of school development planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fr %</td>
<td>Fr %</td>
<td>Fr %</td>
<td>Fr %</td>
<td>Fr %</td>
<td>Fr %</td>
<td>Fr %</td>
<td>Fr %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of commitment of leaders and training on planning process</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of motivation for teachers and principals by the concerned bodies on the actions of plans</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources or budget to implement and planning process and linking plans and budgets</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness and know-how of stakeholders on planning activities</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The absence of giving and getting feedback on plans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of time for planning and pressure of other work</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher turnover of Principals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency towards inflexibility of leader</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lack of arranging training on planning process is in the range of high level. The response of the interview held with principals and cluster supervisors also confirmed that the lack of arranging training on planning process is not good and stakeholders such as parents and students was not involved in the process as expected. But, the absence of motivation for teachers and principals by the concerned bodies on the actions of plans is in medium at school level. As stated in the table the mean score is 3.57 and it is within the range of medium. The lack of resources or budget to implement and planning process was also medium and it was not adequate enough. Additionally the absence of giving feedback on plans is medium at school level. Thus it can be concluded that the absence of giving and getting feedback on plans is medium at school.

From the above data, it can be said that the shortage of time for planning and pressure of other work is moderate. School improvement does not happen overnight. So a principal should be in place about five to seven years in order to have a beneficial impact on a school because it takes a toll on the overall climate of the school. Schools experiencing exceptionally rapid principal turnover, for example, are often reported to suffer from lack of shared purpose, cynicism among staff about principal commitment, and an inability to maintain a school-improvement focus long
enough to actually accomplish any meaningful change (Xaba, 2006). As stated in the above
table the mean of the item is 3.55 which are in the range of high level. This indicates that the
higher turnover of principals is at high level of turn over principals.

Finally the respondents were asked to give their opinion on tendency towards inflexibility of
leader. As indicated in the table the mean score is 3.49 and it is within the scope of medium
level. This indicated that the tendency towards inflexibility of leader is medium at school. Thus it
can be concluded that tendency towards inflexibility of leader was at medium level in the school.

As part of the plan, actively monitoring progress against with stake holders to learn from
experience and to adopt a planning approach enables to meet emerging challenges over the life
time of the plan (Donaldson, 2014). Contrast to this the above table shows most respondents
strongly agree that the cause of unable to have effective plan in each school was the challenges
faced by school leaders such as lack of commitment, lack of sufficient training for school leaders
and teachers, lack of resources or unable to link plans and budgets, lack of know how about
planning, short of time and pressure of other work and instability of school leaders. These
problems hinder the school leaders to have sounded plan that aid in bringing quality education in
primary schools according to the educational expert response of interview. The interview
participants strongly agree that since there was no sufficient recognition approach in the school
leaders they were not motivated to plan effective school development plans. They also agree that
the higher leaders were not planned that can be starting point for the lower leaders. As the
interview response there were no top to bottom and bottom to top relation.

Planning is a complex process which requires high level of studies and analysis. To create a plan
there must be determination of objectives and outlining of the course of action to achieve the
goals. A planning process which is suitable for one kind of organization may not be suitable for
another type of organization. However, we can take the following steps as the guideline to draw
a plan: analysis of the environment, setting the objectives, develop premises, determine and
evaluate alternatives, selection of best alternative, formulation of a derivative plan, budget
formulation, and implementation of a plan and follow up action. Planning begins with the
awareness of the opportunities in the external environment and within the organization. For this
SWOT analysis is most suitable (UNESCO, 2014).
4.5 The Role of School Leaders and Education Experts in School Development Plan

Under this sub topic the role of principals, cluster supervisors, Woreda and Sub City education experts in school development planning was analyzed.

4.5.1 The Role of School Principals on School Development Plan

This part of analysis examined role of principals in school development planning.

**Table 9** - The role of principals in enhancing the practices of school development planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which principals effort to select facilitator for SDP process</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which principals effort to prepare training on SDP for stakeholders</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which principals effort to produces SDP with stakeholders</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which principals communicate SDP to stakeholders</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which principals effort to evaluate the school plans goals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which principals effort to give feedback on the actions of plans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development of principal effectiveness is not just about initial and ongoing training of principals, but also about developing coherence between training and local policies and processes for principal hiring, placement, appraisal, and succession planning; and developing the capacity of local supervisors to carry out their responsibilities to ensure and support principal effectiveness at the school and system levels (Anderson, 2014). But as we can see from the mean score of responses on item one in above table the principals’ effort to select suitable facilitators for school planning process is in moderate level (3.38) at the primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City. Regarding item 2, 3 and 5 of the same Table, the respondents were asked to give their opinion about the extent to which principals’ effort to prepare training on school development plan for stakeholders, produce SDP with stakeholders and evaluate the school plans goals with stakeholders. The mean score of the item 2 and 3 was 3.14 which show moderate level of prepare training on school development plan for stakeholders and producing SDP with stakeholders at school. Principals are also responsible to arrange inter-school visit programs, prepare intra-group discussion forums at school level, encourage teachers to exercise and try out peer evaluation, observe and visit other school activities, arrange training programs and provide constructive feedback. As indicated in the above Table principals’ effort to evaluate the school
development plans goals to develop self confidence and to avoid unnecessary tension and future malfunction was also at moderate (mean 3.33) level.

According to Steyn and Vanniekerk (2002) the principal is considered as a leader, motivator of the school having the responsibility for the development of staff training program, school based and to assist teachers, particularly new and inexperienced teachers, in developing and achieving educational objectives. Moreover, the interview held with Woreda and sub city education experts confirmed that the efforts of school principals to organize experience sharing and giving constructive feedback are not effectively implemented. However, literature shows that in the schools where teachers are accessed to new ideas and share experiences more readily, there is a greater potential for school and classroom improvement. Improving schools endeavor in the development of their staff creates opportunities for teachers to collaborate and to share best practices. Evidences also suggest that attention in such teacher learning can impact directly upon improvements in student learning and achievement (Day, 1999).

Finally, principals expected to exercise regularly monitoring the effectiveness of the changes to teaching and learning, ensuring the quality of engagement of teachers in school activities, giving constructive feedback (MoE, 2009). But this study shows that the mean score respondents on evaluating and giving feedback of principals on the actions of plans was at low (2.4 mean point) level. Many scholars argue that principals should enable to train, facilitate and communicate school plan to stakeholders. Principal’s training on strategic planning helps them to effectively guide in strategic planning (Nyagah, 2015). They also have to delegate each activities planned on their school plans to followers and follow up, evaluate and monitor, report to top managers and enable to get feedback to know how much they are progressing. They should also able giving feedback back to the stake holders which were below of their leadership. As most interview of cluster supervisions agree principals were too busy to paper work rather than preparing clear plan that enable them to evaluate monitor and control what was going good and bad in class and in school compound. So the school development plan cannot enable to evaluate and monitor class room activities. Most stakeholders could not take the plans as their own activities since there were no their involvement in planning. Therefore all aspiring leaders must complete the principals’ qualification program before being appointed as a principal or vice-principal (Bush and Jackson 2002). In general, principals’ roles in school improvement planning fall into three main categories: communication, professional development and leadership.

4.5.2 The Role of Cluster Supervisor for the School Development Planning
This part of the study displays the items with regard to the degree of support from cluster supervisors in the process of implementing and school development planning activities. Hence, it
is logical to assess the supportive function of cluster supervisors which is presented in the following Table.

**Table 10- Data results from the role of cluster supervisors.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts of Cluster supervisors to follow up the SDP performance</td>
<td>66 30</td>
<td>18 8.2</td>
<td>3 1.4</td>
<td>72 32.7</td>
<td>57 25.9</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts of cluster supervisors to maintain experience sharing among the cluster schools</td>
<td>24 10.9</td>
<td>15 6.8</td>
<td>5 2.3</td>
<td>99 45</td>
<td>73 33.2</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts of cluster supervisors to provide professional support on the actions of SDP</td>
<td>25 11.4</td>
<td>23 10.5</td>
<td>4 1.8</td>
<td>93 42.3</td>
<td>71 32.3</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which cluster supervisors effort to give feedback on the actions of plans</td>
<td>32 14.5</td>
<td>15 6.8</td>
<td>4 1.8</td>
<td>93 42.3</td>
<td>72 32.7</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 2.44 1.45

The objective of the supervisor is implementing teaching learning process through providing professional support and by forming suitable situations of students (USAID, 2004). In item 1 of Table 10, related the extent to which the efforts of cluster supervisors to follow up the school plan performance was at support. The mean value of this item was 3.07 which align towards medium. From the data, it can be learned that efforts of Cluster supervisors to follow up the school plan performance was found to be at the medium level of support.

In response to item 2 and 3 confirmed that cluster supervisors effort to maintain experience sharing among the cluster schools and provide professional support for teachers on the actions of school development plan was low. The mean score of cluster supervisors to maintain experience sharing among the cluster schools was rated 2.20 indicates low level of support. Similarly, the mean score of respondents on the efforts of cluster supervisors to provide professional support for teachers on the actions of school development plan was 2.12 which are in the scope of low level. School development plan can be effective if and only if cluster supervisors are knowledgeable, committed, willing, qualified and experienced. Additionally the effort of cluster supervisors to give professional support for teachers is low (2.40 mean). The weighed mean of table 10 is 2.4 which are in the range of low level. So, it can be concluded that cluster supervisors, rarely followed up and insufficiently assisted for the effective planning and implementation of the school development planning in primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City. But Woredas and cluster level supervisors need to support new principals and assistant principals with additional professional development and by assigning mentors from those who
served in the position earlier. However, unlike new teachers who are supported mainly on academic issues, a new principal need to be supported on both instructional leadership and academic affairs (MoE, 2014).

Most respondents replied that cluster supervisors did not play role in develop cluster center schools as expected and their role on supporting principals to prepare effective school development plans. Planning together as a group of schools at the cluster level helps to ensure that more competent school directors can work with the less competent ones to produce a rationalized plan that benefits everyone. This particular way of facilitating local management of resources offers definite lessons to the planning process which tends to suffer from very weak planning in individual schools (Bredenberg, 2002).

4.5.3 The Role of Woreda Education Office Experts on School Development Planning

Table 11- The role of Woreda Education Experts on school development planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Fr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts of evaluating SDP</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts of Woreda education office experts</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to allocate budget for SDP actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts Woreda education office experts</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to arrange training regarding SDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the effort of Woreda education experts to give</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feedback on the activities of SDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wereda school boards help set direction and provide support for the school development planning process. They should encourage all stakeholders and establish policies to ensure that they play roles in developing, communicating, monitoring, and evaluating SDP. They also support the development of team and leadership skills for school council members through training, conferences, and forums (MoE, 2013). Table 11 deals with the performance level of Woreda education office in accordance with the listed roles and responsibilities set by the MoE in the implementation of SDP. This part of the study displays the items with regard to the degree of support from Woreda education office experts in the extent to which the efforts of Woreda education office experts of evaluating SDP. Accordingly, the mean of the item is 2.2 which are in the range of low level of activities. From the data it can be said that the woreda education office experts were insufficiently monitor and evaluate the school development plan at primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City.
In item 2 of the same Table, various responses were given regarding the extent to which the efforts of Woreda education office experts to allocate budget for school development plan actions. According to MoE (2009), guide line education office having responsibilities in allocating the school budget and following up its accomplishments. The majority 79 (35.9%), and 64 (29.1%) of teachers replied that the extent to which the efforts of Woreda education office experts to allocate budget for school development plan actions is low and very low respectively. The mean score of this item response is 2.23 which were in the scope of low level. From this result, it can be learned that Woreda education office has given less attention to allocate budget for school development plan.

In item 3 and 4 of the above Table, the respondents were asked to rate the extent to which the efforts Woreda education experts to arrange training regarding SDP actions and to give feedback on its activities. The mean score of both items was at moderate level. This indicates that Woreda education office has given not more attention to prepare training on the actions of SDP and to give feedback on its activities. Generally, the average mean of the above table was 2.48 in the range of moderate level of support. This implies that the extent to which the effort of woreda education office experts to give feedback on the activities of school development plan was unsatisfactory at school level. The response of the interview held with parents and students confirmed that the status of woreda education office experts to give feedback on the activities of school development plan is at the infant stage and very low. This is because of lack of support from Woreda education office in the extent to which the effort of Woreda education office experts to give feedback on the activities of SDP.

### 4.6.4 The Role of Sub City Education Office Experts in SDP

#### Table 13- Role of Sub City Education Experts to school development planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which sub city education experts effort to deliver training for stakeholders</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which sub city experts efforts to give feedback on the activities of SDP</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts of sub city education experts effectively monitoring SDP</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above Table the role of Sub City Education Experts on activities of delivering training for teachers/principals on school development planning, to give feedback on the
activities of school development plan and effectively monitoring SDP activities were not satisfying activities. The weighed mean value of these items was 2.43 which were in the range of low. Thus, it can be concluded that extent to which sub city education office experts’ efforts to give feedback on the activities of school development plan was not satisfactory. Moreover, the average mean score of the above Table was 2.43 which were in the range of low level of support indicates that the continuous monitoring and evaluation system school development plan activities need highly improvement in the primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City. In the same way, the response of the interview held with principals, and Woreda education offices supervisory experts, and data obtained from parents, and students revealed that the supervisory assistance provided by either Sub City or Woreda experts was not regular and frequent. All the participants agreed that the Woreda or Sub City experts visit at primary schools with a maximum of once or twice in a semester. In view of that, the supervisory process was related with monitoring and evaluation of school performances. Generally, one can say that Sub City and Woreda education office experts support for primary schools under study were ineffective in activating and facilitating the actual implementation of school development planning.

But, education experts/ superintendents must encourage schools in planning improvements, facilitate their strategies, and monitor each school’s success. They should ensure professional development and training opportunities are available; support school councils, parents, and other community members in becoming full partners in the improvement planning process by communicating with them regularly; use principals’ meetings to provide principals and vice-principals with professional development opportunities and to model strategies; ensure that principals and staff receive the information (for example, the board’s strategic plan) and the resources they need to carry out the improvement planning process (MoE, 2013).

The result of focus group discussion most participants agreed that the support of educational experts should be strengthens in school development planning. As say of most participants there were no regular and strong supports from educational experts. There were also no guidelines that enabled school leaders how what included whom involved and when school development planning takes place as participants agreed finally. But a few focus groups argued there were Woreda and Sub City education experts support even though they never gave strong feedback after supports.
CHAPTER FIVE
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Summary of the Study

Although the problem of quality was the issue of our country, it broadly observed in Kolfe Keranyo Sub City. To monitor the implementation of general quality education package and form model schools those can share their best practices to others, the ministry of education formulated the school classification level in terms of input, process and output. This means grading school into four levels: level one, two, three and four which is below standard, on progress, standardized and above standard school in its performance respectively. Accordingly most schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City classified as level one and level two. Only two schools were classified as standardized school and there were no schools above the standard in this sub city. The students’ achievement of grade eight examinations was also very low. Even the cut point for promotion from grade eight to the next was below the minimum requirement of fifty percent achievement. So each school should have strong school development plan in which they identify and implement their new development priorities.

The main objective of this study was to examine the practices and challenges of school development planning in the primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo in Addis Ababa. In order to accomplish these objectives, the following basic questions were raised and answered in the course of the study. To meet this purpose, the five basic research questions were:

1) To what extent the stakeholders involved in school development planning process?
2) To what extents have school leaders and supervisors discharged the responsibility of SDP?
3) To what extent do Woreda and Sub City education office experts provide professional support to principals and others school stakeholders as related to SDP?
4) What are the challenges of school development planning in Kolfe Keranyo Sub City?

To search answers for these questions, both quantitative and qualitative methods were employed in this study. The data collected from the closed ended questionnaires was analyzed and interpreted using different statically tools such as frequency, mean, and standard deviation. The semi-structured interview and group discussion were also used to enhance the validity of the finding and to strengthen quantitative data. The sources of data were the primary sources from sample of teachers, principals, cluster supervisors, and, Woreda education expert and Sub City education expert of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City selected by availability sampling technique. For this purpose, 167 teachers, 32 principal, 8 cluster supervisors, 8 Woreda education experts, 5 sub city education expert and 26 students and parents with a total of 242 respondents were selected from
13 primary schools and Woredas of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City in Addis Ababa city. Sufficient data was collected that enable to reach at the major findings.

5.1.1 Characteristics of the Respondents
The characteristics of respondents regarding gender shows that most teacher respondents are female and in contrast most number of school leader are male. According to the data collected most teachers’ academic qualification was diploma and degree. But a few teachers have the certificate academic qualification. The school leaders, educational experts and supervisors’ academic qualification were degree and masters level. This shows that the primary schools academic qualification standard was almost fulfilled. Most number of teachers and school leaders experience fall between one and five years of experience which indicated most stakeholders in school were less experienced. Finally according to data got from interview of the principals and supervisors only a few of principals and supervisors have the got the school leadership training and orientations. Most principals and supervisors even educational experts have hired with only the experience of teaching.

5.1.2 Major Findings of the Study
On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered through all the instruments, the following major findings were indicated based on the basic questions of the study. Thus the major findings organized into the stakeholders’ involvement, the principals, cluster supervisors, woreda and sub city education expert role, the relation of school development plans to other plans and the challenges of school development planning.

5.1.2.1 The school Stakeholders’ Involvement in School Development Planning
On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered through all the instruments, the following major findings were indicated on the stakeholders’ involvement school development planning.

A. The finding of the study revealed that the understanding of school stakeholders about school development planning, goals of school plan, as well as understanding types and importance of school development plan was to moderate extent (3.36 total mean).

B. The study results indicated that the contribution of the school development planning in improving classroom activities, in changing students’ achievement, and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning was found at medium level (3.43 total mean) in primary Schools of kolfe keranyo in Addis Ababa city.
C. It was made known by this study that, school development plan contributions to prepare stakeholders for evaluating their school action was at medium (3.1 mean) level primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo in Addis Ababa.

D. The finding of the study showed that the lack of understanding of school leaders about planning hinders the school stakeholders to participate and implement the school development planning.

E. It was identified by this study that there were necessary components included in the school development plan but most stakeholders had no awareness about vision, mission, priotic strategic issues of their school and when and where each activity would be applied.

F. The study showed that the practice of school development planning more took place by principals (54.5%) rather than involving all stakeholders on preparation and some school development plan were directly copied from other school plan rather than preparing plan according to the context of the school.

G. As shown in the findings, the majority (65.3%) of respondents replied that the process of analyzing school problems, resource, external environment and need assessment during planning was low (2.3 total mean) and not effectively implemented.

H. Most teacher respondents believed that preparing school development plan was for the inspection purpose but not for the success of the school.

I. It was identified by this study that representative of parents and students involvement were to the less extent (2.19 mean) in school development planning in most primary schools.

5.1.2.2 The Role of School Leaders and Education Experts in School Development Plan

This study indicated that the effort of principal to prepare experience sharing among schools, preparing training, and arranging school development plan action evaluation was at medium extent (3.14 mean). Most interview participants responded that the training given to aware the goals and vision of the plans was not effective. They agreed that the role of school principals in facilitating the school development planning process and communicating the plan was at moderate level (3.53 mean) which indicated the progress of school development plans activities according to planned was also found to be insufficient and most school development plans left on shelf. The way of evaluating its actions during implementation was also poor according to the Woreda education experts say. On the other hand, absence of giving feedback from the principals, lack of commitment of principals to participate stakeholders in of planning (3.14
mean), tendency towards inflexibility of leader, and absence of giving and getting feedback on plans (3.69 mean) in primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo in Addis Ababa need improvement.

The study results showed that support from cluster supervisors for the implementation and planning of school development plan was found to be inadequate (3.52 total mean). Thus cluster supervisors role in the primary school was class observation only as most interviewees agreed. Contrast to this some participants agreed that cluster supervisors involve in school activities equal to role of the principals in some schools.

It was revealed that Woreda education office experts were found to be low (2.1 mean) in evaluating local Woreda school development plans and its actions, giving feedback and had given less attention to allocate sufficient budget for school development plan. Similar to Woreda education experts sub city education experts support for primary education was less as the study results. Generally education experts’ support or guidance of school activities was not regular as most respondents agreed.

In the analysis of external environment includes collecting and identifying different standing plans such as policies and long range plans that were prepared by MoE, NGO and community support to share goals changing according to the school context. This increases the school development planning effectiveness because it has shared the government and communities needs and goals to change to implementations. But habits of different school leaders to refer the plans planned at national, city and sub city is poor as most interviewees agreed on the focus group discussions.

1.2.4 The Challenges of School Development Planning
The result of this study showed that the main obstacles that operate against the practice and implementation of school development plan were less commitment of school leaders to plan effective school development planning, lack of awareness or know-how of stakeholders on planning activities of SDP, absence of motivation for teachers and principals by the concerned bodies on the actions of plans and lack of arranging training on planning process were identified the serious challenges. Moreover, failure to allocate resources or budget to implement and planning process and lack of linking plans and budgets, shortage of time for planning and pressure of other work, was to be found the problems that hinder the effective implementation of school development plan.

According to the findings less commitment of the school leaders are common in most school. They do not care about preparing good school development plans because there was not accountability. And there was also no strong recognition for having good school development
plans and effective implementation of it. The cluster supervisors spent most of their time only on class observation. But according to some interviewees they need them for the whole school activities facilitating and guiding. Additionally education experts come to school for seek of information not for support as focus group discussion say.

The study also indicated that most school leaders have no the knowledge of leadership science and planning. They have being leader without getting orientation and training about school leadership and planning. Focus group discussion participants strengthen these ideas by commenting that the previously hired principals were not assigned with their qualification and performance but their political commitments. According to the participants they spent most of their time on routine activities and political works so they have no enough time for school planning process and evaluating its implementations. Since they can’t linked their school budget with activities planned in their school development plans they unable to use their school grant budget and other financial income effectively. Because of this most school return back their budget to government even if there are many unfulfilled infrastructures in school.

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the major findings, it was concluded that the practice of planning and stakeholders involvement were at moderate level. Principals were not collaboratively solving educational challenges by team work in the primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City. Among the responsibilities expected from school principals are: preparing training or workshops, organize experience sharing with the nearby schools, communicating the school development plan, facilitate all stakeholders to participate in school development planning and its implementation, evaluating and giving feedback on planning which were not strongly implemented. Strong support and feedback was needed from all stakeholders to enhance the practice of school development planning. It is possible to conclude that teachers and other stakeholders were not encouraged by the school principals to highly participation in the school development planning activities and not to play their professional role in order to bring quality education. Thus, using school development plan as an instrument for quality education improvement was given less attention in primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City.

Woreda and sub city educational experts, and cluster supervisors were less supportive on the activities of school development planning. There was absence of commitment and lack of responsibilities among stake holders especially school leaders for its real implementation. From the study result it can be concluded that most cluster supervisors, principals and educational experts spent most of time on routine activities. Less commitment of school leaders to plan
effective school development planning, lack of awareness of stakeholders on planning activities or lack of know-how school plans, absence of motivation for teachers and principals by the concerned bodies on the actions of plans and lack of arranging training on planning process were found to be another challenges of school development planning and implementation in primary Schools of kolfe keranyo in Addis Ababa. Finally it can be concluded that there were not enough litigious school communities because the stakeholders did not communicate on school plans to increase the communities’ ownership of the plans. The current practices of school development plans being at lower level have its own effect on education quality. There were also not identified school new developments areas and that were planned as school development plans to enhance students achievements in most kolfe keranyo sub city primary schools.

5.3. Recommendations
Based on the major findings of the study and the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are forwarded. Since plan is to work out in advance how something is to be done or organized and it is a practice aimed at preparing the education system to address the future and to achieve the medium and long-term goals set by policy-makers the school leaders should prepare a sounded school development plan. So involving all school society in planning process and the school leaders, cluster supervisors and educational experts support in the school development planning process is recommended to be implemented. In addition, intra- and inter school group discussion on the action of school development planning and peer evaluation are suggested to be practiced in the primary Schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City.

A. To enhance school development planning practices, it needs the ministry of education and Addis Ababa education bureau to develop school development guidelines that enable each school how they can proceed in planning, evaluating and monitoring its implementations. It also needs strengthening the follow of information regarding school development planning, evaluating and monitoring its implementations from top ministry of education to bottom at school level.

B. To enhance school development planning practices, it is also essential to develop on incentive mechanism for principals, teachers, and other stake holders according to the school effectiveness. Teachers and principals performance of any practices of school based activities need to be allied with reward or recognition. To this end, the MoE, Regional education Bureau, Sub City education department, and Woreda education offices are advised to give feedback and recognition on SDP timely.

C. Woreda education office in collaboration with other stakeholders has to organize the necessary training, workshops and seminars on planning, educational leadership and
management and to sensitize management on importance of stakeholder involvement in school development planning. The same should be done for Woreda education office experts and cluster supervisors. Furthermore, it is recommended that there should be trained planning facilitators at Woreda and sub city level who are responsible for coordinating overall activities of planning and provides the required support as needed.

D. Principals have to prepare the school development plan with the participation of teachers and other stakeholders in the selection of the school prioritized strategic issues and identify the school new development needs. This condition helps teachers to be adapted with the plan and used to include their needs and demands as well as the existing challenges of the schools. These help to increase mutual responsibility of the school development plan stakeholders to implement the plan and the activities of plan effectively. Stakeholder involvement creates unity of purpose and ownership of the whole process and fosters the implementation process leading to multiplicative effect of school development planning. Principals should endeavor to carry out elaborate and extensive environmental analysis to ensure formulation of acceptable, economical and rewarding strategies.

E. It was recommended that the Sub City, and Woreda education officers and principals should practically assist stakeholders by creating conducive environment for skill development through both short and long term training programs, allocating sufficient budget, by preparing self and peer evaluation opportunities and followed by timely feedback. In addition, by fulfilling materials, and increasing the commitment of teachers and principals by giving motivation, in order to implement the plan actions sufficiently and to improve the students’ academic performance.

F. Finally, it was also strongly recommended that cluster supervisors should take immediate actions and follow up on the school planning and its performance, organize teachers and training on the activities of planning and maintain experience sharing with the nearby cluster schools and share planning manuals and materials to all primary schools for the real implementation of school development planning, as well as to improve the quality of teaching and learning activities, and to improve students result in primary schools of Kolfe Keranyo Sub City. Also cluster level of school development planning practice was recommended since believed it to ensure that more competent school directors can work with the less competent ones to produce a rationalized plan that benefits everyone.
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Directions: Dear respondents, the main function of this study is to gather relevant data to the study allowed “The practice and challenges of school development planning in primary schools in case of kolfe keranyo sub city in Addis Ababa city”. This questionnaire consists of three sections namely: section A -background information, section B –school development planning practices and section C– challenges of planning. Kindly fill it as honestly as possible by ticking according to the key provided. Your answer is very important for the achievement of the study. Thus, you are kindly requested to respond the questions, in order to provide the necessary information on top of the different issues related to the study. The achievement of this study depends on your truthful and real response to the questions. The information will be used for academic reason only and responses will be kept private.

NOTICE:
➢ Please, read all the questions before attempting to answer the questions.
➢ No need to consult others to fill the questionnaires.
➢ You do not need to write your name on the questionnaire.

SECTION A: background information: Please, write your personal background on the space provided.
School………………………… Sex: Male……..Female……Academic Qualification……………… Years of experience in teaching…………… Years of experience in principal…………… Years of experience in supervisor…………… Years of experience in other fields……………

SECTION B: PRACTICE OF PLANNING
1. Items linked to school stakeholders’ understanding of the concept of school development planning: Please use one of the following Likert scales to point out your response by marking(x) against each closed ended item from the given rating scales. 5=very high 4= high 3= Medium 2= Low 1=Very Low=2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Understanding of the important of school development plans for quality education</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>understanding of school development plans helps to facilitate changes in education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>understanding of the goals of school development plans and process of planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>understanding necessary elements of school development plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>understanding of school development plan types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Items related to the benefits of school development plan: Please use one of the following Likert scales to point out your response by marking(x) against each closed ended item from the given rating scales. Strongly agree=5 Agree=4 Undecided=3 Disagree=2 strongly disagree=1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>school development plans promotes to evaluate school actions</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>school development plans helps to anticipate the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>sdp helps to enhance the quality of learning and teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>school development plan as decision making tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>school development plan as adaptive changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Using a scale of 1-5 from the key: 1- not at all, 2- less extent, 3- moderate extent, 4- large extent, 5- very large extent indicate which of the following points does your school development plan have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritistic Strategic issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Using a scale of 1-5 from the key: 1- not at all, 2- less extent, 3- moderate extent, 4- large extent, 5- very large extent indicate how your school development plan related to /derived from other plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It has top down relation to woreda /sub city or city school /development plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has bottom top relation to woreda /sub city or city plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School development plans have top down relation to each others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School development plans have bottom top relation to each others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All school development plans are prepared by team approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Using a scale of 1-5 from the key: 1- not at all, 2- less extent, 3- moderate extent, 4- large extent, 5- very large extent, indicate the extent to which the following stakeholders are involved in the sdp process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and Support staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community and Supporting NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Using the same scale as in (5) above, tick to indicate the extent to which you carry out the following activities during strategic/others planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of leadership skills and abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of core competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of adequacy of staff members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of external environment e.g. MoE policy, NGO, and community support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION C: challenges of planning

7. Items Related to the challenges of planning and implementation strongly agree=5 Agree=4 Undecided=3 Disagree=2 strongly disagree=1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of arranging training on planning process and Absence of commitment of leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of motivation for teachers and principals by the concerned bodies on the actions of plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources or budget for planning process and Lack of linking plans and budgets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness and know-how of stakeholders on planning activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The absence of giving and getting feedback on plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of time for planning and Pressure of other work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher turnover of Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency towards inflexibility of leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Using the same scale as in (8) above, tick to indicate Items Related to the functions of principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which principals effort to Select a suitable facilitator for school development planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which principals effort to Prepare training on sdpl for stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which principals effort to produces annual school plan with stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which principals communicate school plan to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which principals effort to evaluate the school plans goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which principals effort to give feedback on the actions of plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Using the same scale as in (8) above, tick to indicate Items Related to the functions of cluster supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts of Cluster supervisors to follow up the sdpl performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts of cluster supervisors to maintain experience sharing among the cluster schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts of cluster supervisors to provide professional support for teachers on the actions of school development plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which cluster supervisors effort to give feedback on the actions of plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which cluster supervisors effort to give feedback on the actions of plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Using the same scale as in (5) above, tick to indicate Items Related to the function of Woreda Education experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts of woreda education office experts to prepare local plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts of Woreda education office experts of evaluating sdpl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts of Woreda education office experts to allocate budget for sdpl actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts Woreda education office experts to arrange training regarding sdpl actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the effort of woreda education office experts to give feedback on the activities of sdpl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Using the same scale as in (8) above, tick to indicate the Items Related to the sub city education office expert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which sub city education office experts effort to deliver training for teachers/principals to planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which sub city education office experts efforts to give feedback on the activities of school development plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the efforts of sub city education office experts effectively monitoring school development plan activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your cooperation!!
APPENDIX B
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
Institute of Education and behavioral Studies
Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interview Guide for Principals and cluster supervisors

General Information about the Participants:
Sex…………. Academic Qualification…………… Service Years…………

Guiding Questions for Interview

- to what extent of stakeholders about the understanding of school development plan in your schools?
- What kind of activities has been practiced on school vplan in your schools?
- What are the obstacles for the effective implementation of school development plan in your schools?
- What kind of solutions do you propose to solve the problems of the implementation of school development plan strategies in your schools?
Interview Guide for Woreda and sub city education office experts

General Information about the Participants:
Sex…………….. Academic Qualification………………………………………………
Service Year………………………………………………

Guiding Questions for Interview

What do you think is the status of school development plan implementation in your Woreda and sub city?

What kind of role do you play in your Woreda and sub city schools development planning activities?

What are the obstacles for the effective implementation of primary school development plan in your woreda and sub city?

What kind of solutions do you propose to solve the problems of planning in your woreda and sub city?
General Information about the Participants:
name of school .......... Sex...... Academic Qualification/grade................. age ............

Guiding Questions for Interview

- What kind of activities has been practiced on school development plan in your schools?
- What is your role in your school development planning process?
- What are the obstacles for the effective implementation of school development plan in your schools?
- What kind of solutions do you propose to solve the problems of the implementation of school development plan strategies in your schools?
- Do you participate in your school development plan communication?