The Management of Primary School Facilities in Selected Weredas of Arsi Zone

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

By:

Hailiye Ayu

Addis Ababa

July 2007

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

The Management of Primary School Facilities in Selected Weredas of Arsi Zone

A Thesis Submitted to School of Graduate Studies Addis Ababa University in Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements of the Degree of Master of Arts in Educational Planning and Management

By: Hailiye Ayu

Addis Ababa

July 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Let my sincere heartfelt gratitude go to my thesis advisor Ato Melaku Yimam for his insightful comments, unreserved professional and technical guidance and meticulous observation on my thesis.

I would like to forward my deepest gratitude to my wife W/ro Tmire Talila who besides helping and encouraging me in my studies, has shouldered the responsibilities for looking after our sons Melaku, and Muluken our daughters Mahilet, Addishiywot and Betelihem.

I would like also to extend my grateful thanks to my long time friends Ato Mesfin H/Michael, W/r Bizu Yihdago, Ato Nigatu Yiglatu, W/r Wayinishet Mola and Ato Mirutse G/Wahid for their moral and material support.

Last but not least, I owe my thanks to W/r Blen Tesfaye who has helped me in typing this manuscript.

Hailiye Ayu

ACRONYMS

ESBU	Ethiopian School Building Unit
IDA	International Development Association
MOE	Ministry of Education
REB	Regional Education Bureau
ZEB	Zone Education Bureau
WEO	Wereda Education Office
MOFED	Ministry of Finance & Economic Development
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
UPE	Universal Primary Education
PTAs	Parent Teacher Associations
WETB	Wereda Education and Training Board
KETB	Kebele Education and Training Board
EMPDA	Educational Materials Production and Distribution Agency

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to identify the major practices and problems prevailing around the management of primary school facilities in Arsi zone. Particularly focusing on the adequacy and compatibility of school facilities to the teaching learning and the competence of school decision makers in the management of school facilities, were delt with to answer the basic research questions.

Purpose descriptive survey method was employed in this study. Data were collected using three type of questionnaire to 5 Wereda Education Office Heads, 4 Wereda Education Planners, 13 supervisors 23 principals, 19 vice principals and 104 Teachers with total 168 respondents selected from five Weredas and twenty five schools using purposive, availability and random sampling techniques.

The data were analyzed using percentages and chi-square test. The study finding conveyed that the basic school facilities such as classrooms, furniture, library and laboratories were reported to be scarce and some of them were not available. Even the available facilities were not organized appropriately to implement the new methods of teaching in the curriculum. Furthermore, their planning and procuring systems have a problem due to the incompetence of school decision makers.

Depending on the findings and conclusions drawn from the study at capacity building and evaluating the systems of planning and procuring school facilities have been recommended.

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Qualified teachers and administrative workers alone are not the only ones needed to conduct a convenient teaching learning process. School facilities are also determinant factors that contribute their part in an education process. According to Davis and Leveless (1981: 2), school facilities include such things as, "... a site, a physical structure, an arrangement of spaces, a set of special environment, and cluster of specialized tools called furniture and equipment." They also explain that school facilities can facilitate or hinder the teaching learning process. Others, such as Adams (1987: 158), elaborate additional facilities such as sufficient school site, sanitary facilities and attractive environment to be useful elements to improve and to implement the designed curriculum so as to attain the intended educational objectives.

In Ethiopia the management of Educational materials has undergone a lot of ups and downs. According to Bender et al., (1976: x), the Ethiopian church and Quranic Schools were once managed to teach religious education using their outer wall yards, haphazardly designed buildings, without writing materials, books and furniture. This time "... Schooling was held in an open air students' sitting on shipskin that were brought every morning and took away in the evening" later, after the Emperors death, in 1927 the opening of Teferi Mekonnon School at an out lay of forty three Million Maria Theresa made the country to own a more modern school with its facilities.

According to Teshome (1979: 87-125), after the liberation, various measures had been taken to reconstruct the disrupted educational system of the country. It was during this period that the schools that were changed to garrisons by the Italians and others were restored and new ones that are serving till now were constructed at a cost of more than three million dollars in Addis Ababa and in Provincial cities. As Teshome (1979) further explains though expansion was held with great responsibility to rehabilitate the disruption, the demand for education was so high that classrooms were crowded with students flood to the extent they were sitting outside the building in the sun, without enough learning materials, and with few ill equipped libraries. This mismatch between supply and demand in education at the period forced the MOE to launch a controlled expansion.

Teshome (1979: 105-106), points out how the then, controlled expansion is exercised as follows:

> *This scheme of controlled expansion did not only decrease the construction of new schools, but also brought some new structures of varying size and quality among the schools. The schools in the capital differed from those in the provinces. The former were more modern in structure and design. Those in the provinces were less impressive, in most cases built of local materials by local workmen*

With regard to the beginning of the management, Meaza (1966: 96-156) discusses the establishment of the MOE in 1950 with four departments under the director General who was headed by vice Minster of education. Out of which "... the store department was the one and was responsible for negotiating the purchase of major items equipment, books, teaching materials and the distribution of supplies to the schools". Moreover, there was also a sub architect department responsible for the selection of site, drawing of plans, for the approving and supervising of construction of new schools and maintenance. Mean while, the constitution of a planning board in 1956. of materials production center paved the way for the coming of the educational Materials production and distribution agency.

According to Teshome (1979: 87-125) the formation of special unit that coordinates elementary school construction was introduced as Ethiopian school Building unit (ESBU) and with in three years, over 109 elementary schools were built by the help of the Swedish government. Moreover, with an agreement made in 1974 with the International Development Association (IDA) building schools near homes of the rural people had been effective in distributing the schools allover the country.

According to the school year educational statistics of MOE (1973 E.C) there were 5,822 Elementary schools in the country. After twelve years in 1985 E.C. the number of schools in the country made a remarkable progress to 8120 Elementary schools (MOE, annual abstract July, 1994).

For the schools of this period as to Nebiyu (2000: 296-298) discusses the Educational Materials Production and Distribution Agency (EMPDA) was established in 1975/76 E.C. as a sole distributor for educational materials and facilities which until later, substituted by the regional government as a result of the decentralization of the education management in the new education and training policy of 1994.

Nowadays, the number of both private and public schools is growing tremendously. To control the quality service the schools are rendering and to evaluate their performance. The Ethiopian Government set a minimum standard on curriculum preparation, teaching materials, teachers' qualification for the level, and on the physical facilities to be used for each level of schooling to make citizens get quality education. Gaynor et al., (1998: 18-19) state how standards are used as a point of reference to find out problems and to know where the problem lies so as to remedy it. Gaynor further discusses as standards are respected because of their sources. Standards may be established on once past performance or other comparable country, or from other organization point of reference. Federal states and regions prepare their institutional standards so as to evaluate their performance, an organization service delivery etc. Moreover federal, states and local regulations have many functions; they help to check whether equity addressed in schools or not, to fairly distribute resources, to determine standards of building for cost control, safety and life span. Further more, standards share cost among levels, states, and locality and schools, to determine personnel's, teachers' administrators' qualification at a given level and services rendered to students with disabilities moreover, moral, and professional ethics are among ethical standards required to be exercised in education sector.

It is on this premise that various levels of the educational echelons (MOE, REB, ZED WEO and Schools) set their respective standards based on the mandates given to them. The pre-primary and primary school facilities standard by the MOE in 1987 E.C. is mentioned in Appendix IV.

In relation to the decentralization of management in education, the school based management system is nowadays a preferred mechanism in most educational systems because it is relatively easy to audit the problems, to prioritize the needs, to set the objectives, to tackle problems related to human, material and financial resources of schools, and to raise funds and to evaluate outcomes in relation to the objectives set.

In the 1994 Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia due attention is given for the construction of school facilities to improve access of primary education and to attain the Millennium Development Goals. This makes the primary schools in the country 19412 in 2005/06 (MOE Annual Abstract).

To attain this global, MOE take measures to decentralize roles and responsibilities to the extent of schools to increase parents and community role in managing schools so as to develop community participation using Wereda education and Training Board (WETB) and Kebele

Education Training Board (KETB) as a bridge (ESDP, 2003/04). As a result, in the past four years (1994-97) the expansion of schools in Oromia region is increasing dramatically. According to MOE (2003/04) statistical data in 1994, there were 4592 elementary schools in the region while in 1998 E.C., the schools in the region reached 7488.

Similarly, the expansion of schools and student enrollment is growing rapidly in the Arsi zone.

Table 1: Primary School Expansion and Student Enrollment in Arsi Zone

Academic Year	Expansion of Schools			Student Enrollment
	Previous Total	New Constructions	Total	
1986	76	356	432	-
1996	432	115	547	543917
1997	547	167	714	658463
1998	714	102	816	695373
1999	-	-	731	564572

Excluding two weredas that were separated to newly organized zones

Source: Arsi Zone 1999 Educational Statistics

The number of Schools was 76 in 1986 then a remarkable progress was made in ten years time and 356 new schools had been constructed in the zone. As data in table 1 above shows after 1996 the number of schools increasing in hundreds every year while at the same time the number of students were increasing in ten thousands every year. Moreover, as the current data depicts the teaching learning is going on in 731 primary schools with a total enrolment of 564572 students. Thus in order to cope with this changes and guarantee the sustainability of the school facilities supply, competent management that plan schools based on school mapping in an innovative design need to work collaboratively in a team (Paisy, 1992: 141). Moreover, for the better improvement of school facilities UNESCO (1972: 36) discus the need for competence in management skills and collaboration in planning school buildings and facilities as follows:

> *... the next generation will require buildings and amentias which facilitates teaching methods unknown to the past generations audio visual equipment, extensive libraries recreation areas to name a few. And their planning will require the cooperation of different expert advisers.*

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Primary education has become a priority agenda in most nations. That is why our country Ethiopia has been struggling to attend 'Education for All' in 2015 E.C. For the purpose, educational reforms were made, strategies that improve the inputs of education such as maintaining the standard of facilities and decentralization of the educational management was set with the grand objectives of improving access, quality, equity and relevance of education. To attain this national objectives, in Arsi Zone primary schools were constructed in hundred every year to improve access. Educational management is decentralized for proper curriculum implementation.

Despite all the efforts, the availability of basic school facilities such as classrooms, library, laboratory, furniture and the organization of school compound were not in line with the minimum standard set by MOE, Even the existing ones were not well designed and organized to implement the new methods of teaching in the curriculum. Moreover, the budgets distributed through WEO to schools have a shortcoming interms of prior planning school facilities due to delay in budget and faulty purchase. Above all managing school is a team activity in which each member shares an organizations burden. However in the actual situation sometimes principals' willingness to involve others in the planning has a problem while other time the willingness on the part of teachers and students to participate in the managerial activities to the level expected.

Therefore, to reveal and avert the drawbacks around the management of school facilities, conducting the study is found appropriate. This researcher has, therefore, been initiated to look into the matter in detail by way of addressing the following basic research questions:

1. Do facilities available in government primary schools conform to the minimum standard set by the MOE?
2. Do the available school facilities conform to the new methods of teaching in the curriculum?
3. To what extent does the existing WEO School financing system enhance the improvement of school facilities?
4. Who are involved in the management of school facilities? What major roles are they playing?
5. Do the major school decision makers have the necessary competence in managing the school facilities?

1.3 Objective of the Study

1.3.1 General Objectives

The general objective of this study is to identify the main practices and problems that hinder proper implementation of the curriculum in Arsi zone so as to suggest possible solution to the problems by making effective and timely decision

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The study is conducted specifically:

- To assess whether primary school facilities available in the zone in line with the MOE standards.
- To examine whether the existing primary school facilities available in schools are appropriate to implement the new methods of teaching in the curriculum.
- To investigate the practical problems in school facilities finance.
- To examine the roles and responsibilities of school decision makers.
- To analyze the level of competence of school decision makers in school facilities management.
- To find out the short comings of the management of school facilities and to guide the future.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This researcher believes that the study will have the following contributions:

1. It helps to raise the awareness of the WEO, the school management (school principals, teachers, and personnel in charge), practitioners and policy makers so that they can meet the increasing demand for school facilities and the changes that need to be made to fill the gaps in disseminating these facilities among localities, programs and departments.
2. Even if the study area is limited in scope the researcher believes that the result of the study may contribute to other primary schools as there is relative similarity.
3. The researcher believes that the study may help to create a link between the school facilities and the teaching learning process (curriculum, teachers training). So it will help to adjust future designs in school facilities accordingly.
4. It may also initiate other researchers to see in to the matter in detail.

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

The study was conducted in Arsi Zone of Oromia Region. Out of the twenty five were in the Zone five have been selected. This covered 20% of the total. Again out of 199 schools in the selected weredas twenty five schools were taken.

With the objective of assessing the practices and problems of the management of school facilities particularly focusing on the availability of physical facilities such as classrooms, furniture their convenience for the curriculum, implementation, the planning, financing of school facilities, and the competence of the major school decision makers were the themes treated.

1.6 Limitation of the Study

In the process of this study the investigator encountered with various challenges in which shortage of related literature in the field was the one while for the study only questionnaire has been used due to lack of time and respondents cited in the study were occupied by fifteen days workshop of National Census Training and the reluctance and carelessness of some respondents in filling the questionnaire were among the few. If he hadn't faced the problems. the comprehensiveness and the reliability of the study would have been improved.

1.7 The Research Methodology and Procedure of the Study

1.7.1 The Research Design

For the study descriptive survey method were employed using questionnaire as an empirical data gathering tool as the method is an economical means and continent to examine and describe the practices and problems in the management of school facilities in the study site in a relatively large scale and in detail based on the data.

1.7.2 Data Sources

The sources of data in this research study were WEO Heads, WEO Planners and supervisors from Wereda and the school principals, vice principals and teachers who have served more than two years in the school.

1.7.3 Sample Population and Sampling Techniques

The total number of respondents in this study were 168. Out of which 5(20%) WEO Heads 4(16%) WEO Planners, 13(13%) supervisors 23(3.1%) principals 19(3.7%) vice principals and 104(1.2%) teachers. The researcher employed availability sampling for the wereda respondents, school principal and vice principals as they are incumbents of the position while teachers were selected using stratified random sampling using their level of education and years of service.

1.7.4 Data collection Tools

Among data collection tools, the study employed the questionnaire with closed and open ended questions to elicit answers to the basic research questions of the study, as it was economical means to reach the two groups of respondents (WEO and school).

1.7.5 Data Collection Procedures

The questionnaire was translated in to the regional language 'Afan Oromo' to make it easily understandable. Before full scale implementation pilot test were done in Asslla Andinet, Gohi primary school and Tiyo Wereda Education office was requested to check if there was any ambiguity in the language, the content and the clarity of the questions to avoid errors before dispatching the questionnaire. As a result, some wrongly constructed questions were changed and unnecessarily repeated questions were omitted. Orientation been given to brief the respondents about the objectives of the study with the intention of getting genuine and reliable responses.

1.7.6 Methods of Data Analysis

The study was used both quantitative and qualitative method of data analysis. Data gathered through questionnaire with closed ended items were tallied and tabulated from the highest frequency distribution to the lowest to make it easily understandable. To compute the responses, percentage and chi-square test were employed. The chi-square test has been computed at $P<05$ degree of significance as error is inevitable phenomenon in researches of such a type. In the end the closed ended responses were analyzed quantitatively while the open ended responses were analyzed and interpreted qualitatively.

1.8 Organization of the Study

The study comprises four chapters, of which the first chapter deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem objectives of the study, significance, delimitation, limitation, methodology of the study and organization of the study. The second chapter presents the review of the related literature. The third chapter is devoted for the presentation and analysis of the data in which summary of the findings, conclusion and recommendations are part and parcel of chapter four.

1.9 Definition of Terms

Primary Education: a primary education from grades 1-8 sub divided into two sections of basic (1-4) and general 5-8 education (MOE, 1994, 14).

Woreda: is a part of an area developed for administrative purpose in a given authority and responsibility with a population size of about 100.000.

Private School: is a school owned by individuals for the purpose of providing education for pre-primary, primary and above.

Government School: a school that is owned fully by the government.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Review of the Related Literature

2.1. Introduction

This chapter deals with the review of the related literature enriched with facts, theories and empirical findings from reputable sources that were written on the management of school facilities. The review begins with defining the term management and facility and followed by other topics such as key school facilities, the status of school facilities in implementing the educational program, the school based management for the improvement of school facilities, the major decision makers of school and finally the competency of the school management will be discussed to mention a few. Before taking an idea or a concept for grant it is advisable to view it from various authorities perspective this enhances clear and comprehensive understanding which again will help as a spring board for the forth coming assessment.

2.2. What is Management?

To begin with the term management as cited in Haileselassie (2000 :8) it was a catching word in theory, practice, research and literature in the past two decades, the document went back to quote How Henri Fayol (1916) defines the concept: "to manage is to forecast and to plan, to organize, to command, to coordinate and to control." Similarly Atchison and Hill (1978) as cited in Haileselassie, put the definition of the word as the way "to a common set of activities that are designed to promote and direct purposeful work". Other authority Harold Koontz also views management as "the art of getting things done through and with people informally organized groups." The above mentioned definitions one way or the other focus on the human element aspects, focus on the strategy to attain commonly agreed organizational goals specifically. However, the definition suits with the purpose of the study is the one that is organized by Peter Drucker and expressed as quoted by Mcllweel (1991), and cited in Haileselassie according to this authority "management is: the organ of society specifically charged with making resources productive, someone who directs the work of others and who does his work by getting others to do theirs. Peter Druckers' definition comprehensively emphasizes the role resources (human, material, financial) play in the goal attainment.

2.3. What is Facility?

According to word net Princeton edu/per/web facility is something designed and created to serve a particular function and to afford a particular convenience or service "catering facilities", toilet facilities, educational facilities. Another authority by the name Philip B. Gove (1989: 813) on the Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines facility in two ways as "... something that promotes the ease of any action, operation, transaction or course of conduct usually used in plural". And something that is built, constructed, installed or established to perform some particular function or to serve or facilitate some particular end. From these definitions one can easily understand that facilities are inputs that can help as a means to the realization of designed program(s) and activity in an organization or school.

2.3.1. Classification of Facilities in Education

Kimbrough, Ralph B. (1968:332) in his writing conceptualizes school building and its ground as a system of facilities that is designed to accommodate schooling activities. For him graded school encompasses facilities such as administrative office, primary classrooms, intermediate classrooms, library clinic, lunchroom, special classrooms, toilets, and other service facilities.

Davis J., (1981: 2) on his part describes what a school facility include in the following ways "a site, a physical structure an arrangement of spaces, a set o special environments, and a cluster of specialized tools called furniture and equipment"

Regarding the requirement of primary school facilities, Herrick John H. et al., (1956: 120-121) list facilities other than classrooms, shops and laboratories where direct teaching learning takes place into four as follows: "Non-classroom facilities for pupils, administrative offices and staffrooms, custodial and service facilities and facilities for public use."

Other authorities such as Smith, Louis M. and Keith Pat M, (1971: 27-28) divide physical facilities of school in their specification in to four as: "Educational space, 'general purpose classrooms, special instructional areas' auxiliary, spaces, special facilities and general environment."

Except for difference of terminology the school facilities classified above is almost similar if not identical to that of Herrick John H. et al., (1956). What makes the Smith, Louis M. Keith, and Pat M., (1971) facilities different and so special is that the flexible nature of the building for varying

purposes. As to Smith, Louis M and Keith Pat M. (1971) the flexibility of the building of four kinds 1) daily flexibility 2) frequent flexibility 3) infrequent flexibility and 4)long-range flexibility. The first, daily flexibility refers to the moveability of furniture, equipment, and walls or partition according to the need. The second and the third imply changes for periods days and weeks while the fourth is to show long term additions, deletions and alterations. Among all, the flexibility of facilities will be helpful for teachers and their pupil to change their methods of teaching accordingly. Moreover, the ability to make addition in the long-term flexibility also will benefit administrators to manage additional enrolment.

2.4. The Importance of Setting Facility Standard for Education

According to Resnick, Lauren B. and Wirt, John G. (1996: 6-62) policy makers use standards as an instrument of speeding up the educational programs and to judge the attainment of major concerns such has access and quality. In the 1960s improving access was the concern while later changes shift the interest to the quality of learning, this time, policy makers believe that as quality learning is achieved by the accountability for the expenditure of funds or by fulfillment of the resources. The gradual development in the complex and diverse delivery system of education shift the conception from government by rules or design standards to governance by out comes or performance standards.

Rivlin, (1971) as cited on Resnick, Lauren B. and Wirt, John G. (1996: 53) "... the idea that programs should be judged in terms of their outputs, or their effects on clients rather than their inputs, or the resources they used." This is not to mean that resources are unimportant for the attainment of quality learning but it is to emphasize on out put and out comes. The secretary's commission of America on Achieving Necessary skills, (1991: iv) as cited on Resrick, Lauren B. and Wirt, John G. (1996: 55) argues for "the development of standards for work place readiness. assessment tools to determine whether standards are being met, and institutional structures to maintain and implement those standards and assessments.' UNESCO review reports and notes in Asia and the Pacific (1985: 47) also identify factors that contribute to a doctrine in standards as:

> *The academic level at primary school; the nature of grade VI examination, the selection system in to secondary education, conditions of appointment and working conditions of teachers, training of teachers, school community relationships, inspection system; material and supplies to schools and feedback from the schools based on the information collected from teachers and personnel of schools.*

According to Rensnick and Wirt (1996) standards are dynamic all the time based on the social and economic level of the country. Other authorities such as Goddard, Del and Leask, Marilyn (1992: 19-22), view standards as a central concern of teachers' students, parents and government in the process of achieving high quality learning all schools with the possible resources provided.

Moreover, the MOE 1987 E.C. standard document for elementary school facilities also discusses the role, that, clear policy objectives, quality of a curriculum, the organization and management and the human, material and financial resources plays in the delivery of quality education. It further explains the significance standard facilities have in maintaining uniform function of public, community and private schools, which in turn minimize the variance, might be created in student's achievement. Setting standard also helps to use resources economically by controlling the problem under or over utilization of facilities might bring about MOE (1987: E.C: 1-3).

Baker, J., and Peters, J., (1963: 50) describe three advantages of standards in the maintenance of facilities: the first is to reduce the frequency of maintenance, as the quality of materials been produced by a certain company or brand competes, with other company's or brand products to stay competent in the market. The second is efficiency. Efficiency in this sense refers to the mastering of the system in the process of operating similar hardware continually. The last one is economy which helps in the reduction of spare part inventories for the maintenance, in obtaining training from the company for long lasting facility service.

2.5. The Key Primary School Facilities

2.5.1. Instructional Facilities

2.5.1.1. Classroom

Out of facilities in the school, classroom is the one where students pass relatively much of their time. Irrespective of what material it has made of it has to be airy and bright that can allow sun light, with an optimum temperature between 70 and 75°F. Every corner of the classroom should be spacious for reading and writing with comfort naturally or with 50-70 foot candles artificial light. The floor should be cemented to keep the classroom clean from flu and other disease. It has to have windows that can be easily opened and closed. Educational pictures drawn on the wall of the classrooms also create impetuous on learning. Moreover, classrooms of the future should be of large and small size to be suited to the changes in the instructional programs (team teaching, individual and group learning) Kimbrough Ralph B (1968: 332-348).

Other writers such as Herrick John H. et al., (1956: 254-261) and McClurikin (1964: 120-125) discuss about classroom size and shape one after the other. The authorities agree, as there was a strong debate as to which classroom shape to choose among square, rectangular and other shapes of classrooms in the 1950 and 1960s. Though no curricular specialist is evidenced in favor of one or the other, the admission of light into class, usable area made some schools to produce rectangular school systems set their own standards of shape flexibly.

According to the writers classroom size is viewed from two perspectives student enrollment and size in square feet per pupil. Herrick John H. et.al., (1956), puts pupil-classroom ratio 30:1 with a minimum of 900 square feet for a classroom while the later states similar pupil-classroom ratio and left the class size in square feet unmentioned.

Hugh Hawes (1979: 147) suggests the need to have adequate space for the young children to work properly in the classroom or on covered verandahs in order to use all kind of groupings. The MOE standard document for kindergarten and primary schools in 1987 E.C. puts the elementary classroom size as 7x8: 56 square meter for 1-4 and 6.92x7. 26 = 50.24 square meter for 5-8 with 50 and 40 students per classroom respectively.

2.5.1.2. The Library

What makes a human being different from other creatures is his accumulation of knowledge and experience in books and libraries to the upcoming generation with vast stored knowledge that help man to solve the problems he encounters in the struggle to achieve quality life. John W. Best (1977: 403). The various reforms in the curriculum brought about new methods and techniques of teaching-learning such as project work, problem solving; group and individual learning etc which makes teaching learning to go beyond the textbook approach and demand the use of well equipped functional elementary school library. The modern elementary school curriculum encourages teachers and students to use variety of instructional aids like: maps, reference books, periodicals, pamphlets, authentic material etc. for its success. Therefore, the presence of the library service plays a pivotal role in achieving classroom activities Kimbrough, R.B. (1968: 301-302). He further discusses that to get well equipped functional library there should be an effective leadership who exert his atmost responsibility to equip the library facilities and create corporate culture among the users of the library (teachers and pupils) and the librarian to both achieve quantity and quality of service for the instructional needs of pupil. According to this authority, in

1960 the American Library Association established specific standards of library facilities such as the number of books, size of facilities and technical arrangement.

Other authorities such as Herrick John H. et al., (1965: 338-352) discuss the importance of planning library facilities in education and what a complete elementary school library requires, as a minimum a reading room, an office space, a work space, storage space for books and storage for materials. The reading room of a library for disciplinary reasons, shouldn't be a study room. The reading room should have sufficient light both natural and artificial with careful sonic design to control both the internal and external noise. Besides the authorities advise to locate the library in a convenient noiseless place for users and where the students get easy access to drinking water and toilet service.

2.5.1.3. Laboratory

Herrick John H. et al., (1956: 282) discuss as laboratories are life and blood for the teaching of sciences and other subjects such as language especially 'speech' for the process of practical application of theories. Therefore, their organization requires due consideration in its construction Herrick (1956)explain the consideration to be given for ventilation, and safety, to remove irritating or poisonous gases to aerate the laboratory and to control fire in case it happens. Smith, Louis, M. and Keith Pat M. (1971: 182) on their part emphasize on ample space for various purposes as storage place and preparation room that suit to work with and smooth flow of traffic.

2.5.1.4. Resource Center

Herrick John H. et al., (1956: 348) refers; the term as a place where teachers' and pupils find teaching materials that assist the instruction. According to him, resource center space is designed in the basis of activities to be provided in the local school program. In the center instructional materials are made, stored and distributed whenever necessary. For these purposes to be fulfilled the center needs sufficient space for workshop and display room. Kimbrough Ralph B. (1968: 302) on his part calls resource center as "the instructional materials center." He discusses this center as it includes audio-visual materials (projection equipment, films, filmstrips, slides recordings charts) in addition to other material. For him it is the expansion of responsibility to coordinate material facilities and teaching aids to effectuate the current elementary school program.

2.5.2. Administrative Facilities

2.5.2.1. School Office

School office is a place where ample information about school occupants is organized and records are reserved for future use. Kimbrough, Ralph B. (1968: 343) lists down what school office includes as principal's office, reception area, guidance and counseling offices, teachers' workroom, curriculum coordinators office, teachers lounge, vault, storage rooms for supplies and books, conference rooms and health clinic. He reminds us that these offices are opened established to serve the instructional need of the school.

For the location, Herrick John H. etal., (1956: 366-367) points out four factors as the need for future expansion. Accessibility to the occupant, spatial affinities to classrooms and with buildings in other part and the suitability for use when other buildings are closed. These offices should be suitable for counseling with out interruption for secretarial services as typing, keeping record, clerical work and as a reception area. More over, it serves as separate work room for duplication, supply room conference room during committee meeting and other school services Kimbrough Ralph B (1968: 344) suggests the need to have an attractive, comfortable administrative area that is furnished with the necessary office facilities that radiates a pleasant feeling when the faculty communicates with parents, teachers, other citizens, officials and students.

2.5.2.2. School Stores

In the school, stores are significant places to keep unused school furniture and equipment, reserve textbooks and old files etc. for effective handling of materials. Herrick John H. et. al., (1956: 373) suggests two types of stores in a big schools: The central storage and small building stores. According to the authorities, the reason for this is to ease the handling and to prevent pilfering, spoilage, and other losses. For proper handling of material, economy of space, storage equipment like shelves and bins should be considered in the design of the plan.

2.5.3. Health Service Facilities

2.5.3.1. Toilet Facilities

Charles, C., Wilsons, M.D (1964: 253-255) discusses as toilet in school is an important facility that makes students to feel schools as their homes especially to attract girls' education and to reduce dropouts of girls. A clean, bright, well ventilated toilet room for both sexes is important

that facilitates healthy teaching learning environment. It has to be located in the right place to safe guard water bodies, air pollution, and accessibility from every classroom and secure girls. It has to be constructed of non absorptive materials for effective cleaning.

2.5.3.2. Water Supply

Safe and sufficient water supply is vital in the school for cleaning, gardening drinking, safety and recreational purposes. As in rural areas when the water source is other than pipeline periodic, chemical and bacteriological check is necessary to safe guard the school community from water borne diseases Charles C. Wilson, M.D, (1964: 249-250).

2.5.4. General Environment Facilities

2.5.4.1. School Ground

Authorities such as Kimbrough Ralph B (1968: 337-338) and others discuss as a school ground that is kept clean and beautiful serves for various purposes. Firstly, as an instructional space for physical education and other small and large group teaching secondly, as a recreational place for swimming, thirdly, for partial activities like gardening and fishing. Proper planning of school ground will help for the safe arrangement by zoning various school activities mentioned earlier to be continued in harmony for a long period of years.

For this, principals and other faculty members are expected to work hard for play area safety and health by avoiding unnecessary obstacles fulfilling other auxiliary spaces like locker, dressing rooms, showers, first aid room and storage spaces for uniform and equipment.

In addition Rao, V.K and Reddy, R.S (2005: 67) and others remind us spaces and places to be organized in the school ground as parking, walks from one block to another, and space for planting fruits, indigenous trees and flowers to beautify and Create attractive scene that encourage pupils, teachers and others to stay in alone, in groups, in crowds and in mobs of hundreds for various purposes that support the instructional need.

2.6. The School Based Management for School Facility Improvement

According to International Institute for Educational Planning http://www.unesco. org /iiep, the school based management came into being as a result of the weakness of the centralized school management system in the 1980's as one of the major issues in school reform in the educational systems of various countries under different terms' as SBM, and GM in UK and Wales,

Tomorrow's schools and charter school in USA, the school of the future in Australia, better schools in Western Australia, school based decision making in New Zealand and so on. The need for adapting this reform is becoming a growing interest in many parts of the world. This new innovation mainly focuses on school empowerment in resource utilization, self budgeting, school based curriculum development self management staff development, student counseling and other developments with the aim of increasing efficiency and effectiveness of the school systems. So as to improve the quality of education schools' provide. The quality of education provided in school based management can be judged on how school adequately responds to the local situation.

In favor of this on Spear C. Eric (1994: 53) to cite what an audit commissioner said:

> *"the objective of delegating financial management from local authorities to schools was to empower schools to use their closer knowledge of pupils and their communities in determining how resources applied to greatest effect. A further aim was to improve efficiency by building schools, through their day to day management to use resources efficiently."*

In addition to what has been said so far Thomas and Jane Martin (1996: 3) suggest the importance of resources as a means to an end to translate parents aspiration for their children as these can be easier through the school based decision-making to innovate the design of the buildings, to have better space and other facilities.

According to the study conducted by these authorities on 15 grant maintaining and SBM schools in UK 9 head teachers told as there was an improvement to refurbish their teaching rooms with carpets, with blind windows due to understanding children's' and staffs response to a quality environment as a stimulus for learning.

Demmock, Clive (1993: 3) enumerates six features of effective school based management descriptions that cited on (Brown, 1990) as follows: "autonomy, flexibility and responsiveness, planning by the principal and school community, adoption of new roles by the principal, a participatory school environment, collaboration and collegiality among staff and heightened sense of personal efficacy for principals and teachers"

Green, Howard (1993: 21-25) also puts the changes resulting from the local management school and its impact in the following words governing bodies and heads are partners in the managing of resources "... a new frame work for schools pushes these changes towards their logical conclusion and envisages a pattern of for schools where quality, diversity parental choice, school

autonomy and accountability are the major themes. It sees acceptance of these principles as lying at the heart of shaping a more open, more responsive and more demanding system of education."

2.7. The Status of School Facilities to Curriculum Success

To enjoy the fruit of education, the use of innovative school facilities should go hand in hand with changes in curriculum. However, in many school systems the existing facilities are out of date, so they do not accommodate the current needs of the teachers, students, other personnel and the new curriculum inputs. The state policies in building codes do not lend it to changes. An attempt to re-mould the old school building style by preparing new educational specification that is based on local needs is a necessity Morphet et al., (1972: 176).

> *The real cold fact is that school facilities contribute to stubbornly assert increasingly obsolete educational models of the industrial age. And our teachers and kids keep telling us something is wrong. With the size of the classes, the lack of flexibility, lack of technology, well its just not fun place to be. http://www.filel//A:/Fit EP and OB20% buildings.htm.*

The other equipment worth mentioned in 'school for the teaching learning is furniture. But furniture in schools is not suitable for diverse classroom interaction such as group and individual work as it does not accommodate to use the classroom for different purposes. Moving the attached desks is a difficult task. It is also clear that different tasks demand variety of sitting arrangement. Sitting in groups when the activity requires individual arrangement vise versa will make the lesson unsuccessful. With regard to Furniture, Hugh Hawes (1979: 147) criticizes as the immoveable seating arrangements only permit one kind of groupings that faces the teacher. In favor of this V.K. Rao R.S Reddy (2005: 68-69) say:

> *"Almost all school furniture, even the most modern, is badly designed for human beings, and it reminds the students of the institutional living they have tried to put behind them. Perhaps it is time for all of us to stop buying school furniture and think more creatively about the kind of furniture people need in order to learn and work together."*

To change this obsolescence of school facilities and to change the situation for the better, authorities propose "...a new school design that responds to individual study, small group and traditional lecture space for large group instruction and a computer based activities area. In effect, there are five different learning settings within a 2, 500 square foot learning environment designed to support a variety of learning styles" http//file:// A:Xfutureclassrooms:htm.

McClurkin, W.D. (1965: 4-9) discusses the need to update the school facilities with the growing need of the aim, content and methodology of the curriculum. He exemplifies how developing communication skills in language do necessitate for the improved language laboratory. He further explains what well organized facilities mean to education as follows: "... good school facilities portray in their space arrangements and their physical accommodations the increased efficiency of organized education in promoting the growth and learning of pupils."

2.8. Planning Educational Facilities

At this point in time no one argues on the importance of planning. Especially planning school facilities is crucial as it involves many parties, requires huge investment in terms of money and time and relatively long work process. Herrick John H. et. al., (1956: 5) writes the major steps to be followed in school building planning as. Educational planning, architectural planning and ends up with the acceptance of the construction by the board of the school. According to him this process may take from two to five years depending upon the size of the educational program and the support from the participants.

McClurkin, W.D. (1964: 16-80) on his part discusses seven important information needed in the planning process as community, historical, resource, cultural, political and social analyses; 2) population studies like demographic trend, mobility of families, the crowdness or sparseness of living, availability of school in the area; 3) school board policies such that length in school year, distance from school, school size, grade structure, pupil progress, school subjects, use of school property and other matters; 4) school organization in human, finance and material resource; 5) Educational program; basic, general, adult education program, or elementary, secondary; 6) school building utilization whether the school plant and other spaces utilized fully and effectively or not, 7) Evaluation of the capacity and adequacy of the existing facilities. In relation to the school facility planning, Stoops et al., (1981: 203-219) discusses the main activities incorporated in the planning as this:

> *Planning should include legal research, identifying the need, projection of maximum land use in the district pupil population projections, and school plant assessment after approval by the school board, the funding proposal must be presented to electorate in such a way as to secure the maximum turnout of favorable voters.*

Davis, J. (1981: 30-41) tells us the importance of preparing educational specification that serves as guide to the architect in designing school, by giving information about the educational

program (the type of courses, services) to be held, the kind of equipment and materials installed to successfully implement the forth coming functional schooling, and he also cites 21 points that help in the preparation of specification.

Hugh, Hawes (1979: 197) discusses the importance of 'consultation' in the planning of schools to decide 'variation in the means, the material available' and also to give them a chance for the curriculum designers to suggest the type of building and furniture they need taking into account the style and the cost based on the economic difference of the locality, even to plan schools for the poor as without them curriculum is not complete.

According to, Tolbert and Baum (1985: 393) in the design of new school projects four technical things should be taken into account: size, location, timing and the technology package.

Size of a new school is determined based on school mapping to know the student population out of school and the program to be delivered. So as to estimate the cost of the school, for the selection of school location accessibility and environment is also a decisive factor either in improving or decreasing students' enrolment especially that of girls. Studies indicate that the nearer the location the better the enrolment and to reduce the chance of abduction on their way to home. Besides this, school should be located in a safe attractive environment relatively free from noise of frequent high way, industry, business areas and dancing hall etc which continually distract teachers and students from interacting. In support of this Kivula (1983: 11) warns us "... school site shouldn't be located near places of amusement, travelers, dance hall, drive in theatres, cemeteries, or over installations which in any way demoralize, or adversely affect the outlook of the school child."

On top of these Tolbert and Baum (1985: 394) further discuss mentioning the need for locating projects nearer to primary source of energy, select convenient soil type, observe the pattern of rainfall and the availability of water sources.

With regard to time it is understood that school construction is planned a head of time, as the process of procuring takes a reasonable time to construct a new school and fulfill other related input that helps to start a school. Therefore, time precedence is vital for, timely supply of education (Getachew, 1999: 8).

Technology package is the availability of raw materials for construction, the labor force, cost of local capital and government policy on construction should be followed Tolbert and Baum,

(1985: 394). In relation to materials of construction Herrick John H. etal., John H. etal., (1956: 126) also say it is the responsibility of educational planner, to be successful in the technical design of schools and the decision of building material to reduce obsolescence created because of poor quality. For this, involving parents and community is an important in educational planning to be fair in locating schools and attaining support from the community to decide raw materials of building based on experience considering the negative impact of using poor quality materials and in relation to the government policy. Above all, empirical studies conducted in USA between 1980 and 1986 on the effect of noise in relation to school location or school site shows that students that are learning in schools exposed for prolonged high intensity noise within and outside in community work setting affects students' behavior, achievement and health http://www, *the relationship between environmental quality of school facilities and student performance*

2.9. Procuring, School Facilities

In material management in general and school facility in particular the procurement function is done based on periodically revised procedures and guide lines of the policy manual. One of the policy decisions is whether 'to make' within the user's plant or to buy it form outside. This decision is made to curb consistent failures of supply of items, quality requirements, and quantity requirements and cost aspects (Gopalakrishman, P. and Sundaresan, M. (1977: 11-12)).

2.9.1. Purchasing Facilities

In any organization supply of goods or service is a necessity to accomplish commonly agreed goals on the basis of the requisition from various departments, sections of the organization. That is why supplies such as furniture cupboard, books for the library etc is acquired. Purchasing uses as a principle the 'five-rights' price, quality quantity, time, and source in the acquisition of supplies and facilities. For this the following purchasing functions should be followed:

> *Identify the purchase needs, Identification of potential suppliers, conduct educational materials market research, collect of verbal and written quotations (or Performa), preparation and issuance of bidding documents, analysis of bidders document, selection of supplies, Issuance of purchase order, administration of contracts and maintenance of purchase records.*

To guarantee the continuity of educational materials and supply at the lowest price Nebiyu (2000: 307-311).

Ray, Hack and Candoli (2001: 210-215) refers the above mentioned purchasing functions with different terms as: Purchase act, and the sub parts as Requisition, Specification, Quotation, Bidding, Advertising, Contracting Bid Opening, Bid award, security requirement: vender evaluation and the like which is almost similar in content. They view purchasing as not an end in it self in the materials and supplies management. Items are purchased to implement the aim and goals to be achieved, this process considers the objectives, needs and policies of those served. According to these authorities purchasing involves the management of material flow from the source of production to the point the service is used. Purchasing follows the power and responsibility delegated to each level as 'state mandate', Federal mandate', centralized and site based capacity of purchase.

2.10. Receiving and Controlling School Facilities

2.10.1. Receiving School Facilities

Facilities acquired either by making or buying quantity and received by the clerk assigned for the job, after being checked and inspected carefully in relation to the ordered amount as well as suppliers' delivery note. The clerk signs for the receipt and the notes be prepared in copies, to be delivered to the supplier with comments about the items if need be. The documentation process helps for the correct control, security and accuracy in general and that of school facilities in particular. In computer assisted organizations order is coded, on the data base to be contrasted with the actually received. This will make the control easier when the goods checked. If in case there are damaged, incorrect items noted, "But it is decided to keep them, a reduction in price might be negotiated". Otherwise, the goods arranged to be returned Margaret (1998: 156-161).

Dobler (1996: 406) on his part discuss receiving as clerical activity where purchasing of materials to be controlled and wrong items inspected for correction. Receiving takes time. Because it is a check point where receiving report is prepared for the invoice payment, future purchase is negotiated and purchase order is closed. Poor receiving creates wastage and additional cost. Therefore, the writers suggest the need to be supervised by a responsible person on continual basis.

2.10.2. Controlling School Facilities

2.10.2.1. Controlling of Fixed Assets

Fixed assets consume relatively a high amount of investment in terms of money, time and energy. Therefore, their usage needs a careful monitoring and control of costs and records. For proper utilization of the assets in addition to the initial capital costs, the following ongoing costs should be managed: "regular maintenance, ad hoc maintenance and breakdown, cost of hiring replacements, cost production during maintenance and breakdown, insurance, power cost, consumables, e.g. stationary for a computer system, security systems and financing costs for loans, mortgages etc."

In the control of fixed asset recording costs of the assets alone will not suffice other information about the asset need to be registered using the following data: "description, date of purchase, cost, depreciation, record, supplier, insurance details, location, breakdown and maintenance record and usage, e.g. number of hours, miles traveled, units produced".

Moreover, fixed assets should be labeled with a code for better follow up and they should not be moved from place to place with out the legal notice of the authorities sometimes it's advisable to fix the most expensive assets to prevent its removal. On top of these, locking the doors, and instilling security cameras and fitting with an individual alarm that detect movement is among the means of controlling Margaret (1998: 177-179).

In relation to codification other authorities tell us that organizations store large number of items. Therefore they need some sort of identification, to create a consensus in naming the material in the organization. Even if the objective of codification is similar system of codification varies from organization to organization based on the nature of the items. According to the writers there are two fundamental systems known as Kodak system and Birsch system used in the companies of USA and UK respectively Gopalakrishan P. and Sundareson M. (1977: 39-41).

2.11. Planning Orientation and Training

The fast development in science and technological changes is discarding the old manually operating machines and equipments Instead the introduction of modern electronic, computerized machines and equipments and building materials necessitated the need to orient users and train

personnel's to reduce unnecessary waste result due to misuse on continuous and progressive manner to cope with changes Clinfton (1984: 145-147).

Ray, Hack and Candoli (2001: 289-290) express the steps to be followed after completion of the construction of facilities, during the hand over of the facilities to the instructional personnel. They emphasize the need to orient how to successfully use the facilities for the purposes intended and train students to make them good guides to the community and their successors.

2.12. Planning for School Facilities Maintenance

Baker and Peters (1963: 43) and others view maintenance as a program that is held to assure the continuance of the instructional and, supportive school facilities to be orderly and safe for the service they were designed. It is believed that maintenance program is a component of an effective school facility. Its planning beings by identifying the work to be done, the starting and the finishing time and the responsible body, based on the master inventory, specific checklist and previous years maintenance records is helpful to decide on the budget. According to the writers "there are a few "rule of thumb" approaches that might be considered in relation to the cost. The cost of maintenance covers not more than five percent of the recurrent budget or one percent of the plant replacement cost. Elementary school facility maintenance is a challenge as the users are youngsters who expose the school facilities to frequent wear and tear in addition to the weathering and the long use.

Kimbrough, Ralph B. (1968: 340-342) on his part discusses the need to have an attractive school and classroom environment to arose teachers' pupils and other school personnel's through regular redecoration using custodial service, refurbishing the school facilities to create constructive and cheerful feeling in the delivery of the teaching learning. Finchum, (1961) as cited on Kimbrough custodial services in elementary schools are determined on the basis of numerous factors such as the size, condition, stage of development of the school site; type of construction, location and mechanical systems used. The author has also noted to plan for the storage place, for the custodial supplies, safety and prolonged service Baker and Peters (1963: 44) enumerate what maintenance entails as plumbing, heating and ventilation, electrical systems, doors and windows, roofing, walls and floors, and other items requiring day to day follow up or renovation to keep the health and safety of the facilities. They also classify maintenance into two broad categories as preventive and remedial.

2.12.1. Preventive Maintenance

According to Baker. J. and Peters, J. (1963: 44) and Handy, H.W. and Hussain, K.M. (1969: 83) preventive maintenance is an ongoing task of renovation to protect school facilities from failure of function. The writers view it as the most cost effective and sensible way of maintenance program that contribute to prolong function of facilities. The later groups divide preventive maintenance in to two as, "the scheduling of work on a periodically recurring basis which assures that routine jobs are completed as sound practice dictates, and the small house keeping maintenance tasks which are done routinely, without fanfare, by the custodial or permanent maintenance personnel". This implies the provision of adequate custodial service with little money before damages occur and become beyond the capability of the school workers in day to day and long term activity.

Kimbrough Ralph B. (1968: 340-341) discuses the use of custodial service in the maintenance of property as follows:

> *Custodial service fulfill the purposes of preserving property values, protecting health and safety, providing a climate conducive to learning, facilitate good will in the system, maintaining neat and clean facilities and effecting operating economies. Unfortunately, many school systems do not provide adequate custodial services.*

2.12.2. Remedial Maintenance

Remedial maintenance refers to the type of maintenance that requires special planning and large capital investment. It takes into account the un programmed or emergency facility breakdown-replacement program created by manmade and natural disaster like wind blowing the roof and cracking of the pipe. Baker and Peters (1963: 44).

In addition Ray, Hack and Candoli (2001: 236-246) put as maintenance concentrated with repair, replacement, and up keep of all school facilities while operation is devoted to keeping facilities and equipment ready to use. These authorities explain three organizational plans of maintenance namely 1) the local system maintenance program; 2) the contracted or out sourced maintenance program' and 3) the amalgamation of the two. As to the writers both ways have their own advantages and disadvantages. For example district financing reduces cost, and creates job for personnel's, eliminates overhead cost, avoid delays, etc while outsourcing helps to reduce the work load on the management and help them to focus on the educational program. These writers

classify types of maintenance into four as: 1) Preventive 2) Periodic 3) Recurring and 4) Emergency.

2.13. The Major Decision Makers of the School

Managing school is a complex activity as compared to other organizations. Because of the centrality of its relationship to other organization in the society and as it receives orders from all members of the community. Campbell et al (1962: 80-85) as cited in Ayalew (1991). This made the management of school to be a team or collaborative activity. As a result, countries are devised their own systems of management, sometimes with similar responsibility but different names and vise versa to cite a few. If one sees the school management of Sankhuwa Saba District of Nepal. Schools are managed by school-cooperative committee which is chaired by "an elected body namely, the panchayata assembly". The committee is modified to mobilize resources, to check school finance and to case the headmaster. The committee also plays its role with DEO on supervising and control school budget. According to this management system, the panchayata members freely deal with their responsibility of school support.

In Ethiopia the Kebele Education and Training Board is the highest management team in a school in which 3 PTA members who are representatives of parents including the chairman are members of the board in which kebele chairman is a chair person. The head teacher is a secretary, female and youth association representatives and teachers association chair person of the school are members of the board. MOE (2002: 24) next to the KETB the PTA is key decision maker in school.

It is organized from a chair person elected from the parents teachers assembly of which two teachers are elected by parents-teachers assembly of which one is a female and parent representatives up to four members based on 2:1 parent-teacher ratio MOE (2002: 28-29).

2.14. The Responsibilities of School Decision Makers in the Management of School Facilities

2.14.1. School Board

According to Kagan, (1972) as cited in Bush, et al., (1980: 275) school board manages the general character of the school based on the power delegated to them by the 1944 education act with the professional manager of the school that is responsible for the conduct and curriculum of

the school. The board discuss on issues of the school's curriculum, teaching methods, internal organization or financial affairs through the head teachers report.

Herrick, John H. et al., (1956: 13-14) view the board as a policy maker, and need assessor, fund solicitor, approval of educational specification, site selector, collaborator to the architect, and award contracts for the construction in the building and installing of school facilities.

According to the MOE (1994: 22-23) document the board is administratively subordinate to the Kebele Education and Training Board (WETB with) equal life time of the kebele assembly. It has about 20 various mandatory responsibilities; however, to be economical those directly or indirectly related to the facility management are discussed as follows:

- Approving and executing the schools' annual budget plan
- Raising funds from internal as well as external sources
- Enrolling school age children in the vicinity and raising awareness to reduce dropouts.
- Facilitate efficient use of the schools property and control frond and misuse.
- Monitor and supervise the head teachers, teachers and non-teaching staff are on the on proper teaching learning process.
- Plan and coordinate community contribution in materials, labor and in cash for the provision and expansion of school.
- To motivate teachers works hard to ease their problems so as to reduce turnover.
- Appoint teachers
- Dismiss those who are unwilling to accomplish their responsibility.
- Quarterly report to the concerned
- Select and give new school sites when necessary. And others

2.14.2. The PTA

Parents Teacher Association (PTA) is organized in the schools with the intention to enhance the school effectiveness through building smooth communication that facilitate understanding between educators and the parents Kimbrough, Ralph, B., (1968: 86). Thomas and Jane Martin (1996: 82) on their part express as PTA's in school plays significant role in internal and the

external fund raising. In the study visit conducted in 15 secondary schools in UK four schools benefited substantive financial contributions as a result of the newly organized PTA's for varied instructional support activities like library development and musical instrument for after school entertainment. Stoops et al. (1981: 470) also explain PTA's as bridge between the parents and the instructor to make the best for the child and also to transfer information about school policy to the community and report community interest and criticisms to school.

Regarding the organization of PTA (MOE, 1994 E.C: 25-30) discusses they are subordinate to parent teacher assembly with a life time of 3 years. The assembly can cancel the appointment in case of distrust. Moreover the document presents the 16 responsibilities assigned to PTA, to mention a few that are related to the management of school facilities:

- Work on students personality development
- Monitoring teachers and head teachers
- Conduct teaching and non-teaching workers discipline problems
- Monitor and control the proper delivery of academic program
- Take measures on students who have discipline problems
- Consult the KETB and the management on how to raise school funds
- Evaluate teachers performance
- Reward teachers, school heads and non teaching staff, workers who have done exemplary activities.
- Call parents meeting to strengthen parent school relationship.
- Plan duties related to their job and responsibility with the approval of parent-teacher assembly and present excuision report every semester.
- Control students dropouts relating with the parents
- Take part in the preparation of school plan in giving comments and suggestion.

2.14.3. The School Principal's Role

In the writings of Bush et al (1980: 73-97) the role of the head and its position are discussed briefly. According to them, head teachers occupied strategic position in the mobilization of the resources of the school for the accomplishment of goals. They also call it as "the man in the middle role' in society. The need to develop new skills managerial and coordinative tasks, which again subdivided into programming, coordinating, monitoring, collateral and service-giving

relationships. In this coordinating is the integration of others tasks based on negotiation rather than directive.

Kimbrough Ralph B. (1968: 118) divide principals roles in to two as agent of change in the school system and as one who develops an open pluralistic system in which teachers can and will act as agent of changes. He further, discusses the need to involve various practitioners in planning of school facilities with especial emphasizes the leadership role' the teachers and principals of the elementary schools play in the planning of facilities for higher quality education. To get capacity building and good career development prospects. To ensure best school leadership, proper manpower planning is indispensable. For this, careful selection of candidates based on merit, building their capacity from time to time: through in service, short term and long term, on the job training and giving incentives by using the career development plans will help initiate, retain and attract effective leaders Forjela, S.B. (1993: 107-127).

Stoops, et al., (1980: 89-92) enumerate the role of principal as a business manager, as an educational leaders, and as a public relations person among which principals as a business manager is at the center of budget preparation, expenditure control, equipment and supplies administrations, school plant maintenance and operation based on the policies and regulation of board committees at different level. According to there authorities as an educational leader is also expected as a program designer that excel one step ahead of his staff to be viewed by his colleagues 'as a teacher of teachers'. They view principals as public relation person who devote much of his time and attention to integrate school community bond through two way communication. Saxe (1980: 194) also view principal as the responsible person for all activities in and around the school ground. He further divides principal's primary function into broad parts as a director of instructional program and as school facility operator, above all subordinates of some incumbents and supervisory and administrative roles based on the rules and regulations of the board of education. Saxe Again (1980: 201) lists statement of duties for elementary school principals in loss Angels City Board of Education among which number (13) reads us "provides for the proper and best use of the school plant by initiating requests for maintenance repairs and proposals for essential or desirable alternations and improvements."

Similarly the MOE (1994: 33-39) Educational Organization for Financial and community participation document presents 21 responsibilities and accountabilities of the head teacher among which some are concerned with the management of facilities.

2.14.4. Teachers Role in the Management of School Facilities

As repeatedly discussed in the review, school facilities need is based on the educational program planned in which the school staff (teaching and non-teaching) be involved and also pupils and parents might be participated to its effectiveness Herrick John H. et al., (1956: 9) Saxe (1980: 167-191) on his part describes the role of teachers in the administration as institutional, managerial and technical. Institutionally teachers take their part in the administration of education through their association. At managerial level for instance a person in a position of unit leader involves in the planning, coordinating instructional activities. Moreover, he works as a resource allocator and material manager to foster efficiency and effectiveness of his unit and environment as a whole. From the technical point of view Saxe (1980) sees the teacher as a traffic manager who shares the space, as supply manager who is supplying material and official time keeper that decides the beginning and the end. Baker and Peters (1963: 249) and Charles C Wilson, M.D. (1964: 264) present teacher as a collaborator for the custodians in the process of keeping clean and orderly teaching environment by securing the assistances he can get from his students.

2.14.5. The Students' Role in the Management of School Facilities

Various studies show that people perform better if they participate in planning and decision making Baker and Peters (1963: 7). Therefore, participating students in the planning and decision-making of school facilities will help them to develop a sense of ownership which in turn leads them to take part actively in the management and especially maintenance and operation of their school environment Charles C Wilson, M.D. (1964: 264) discusses the role students play in keeping the school building and grounds neat and tidy. In rural elementary schools of Ethiopian custodial service, beautification of the environment by planting different types of trees and flowers is actually done using students good will under the encouragement and supervision of their teachers and other personnel's.

Hicks William V. (1957 136) explains for us to what extent students are responsible in the management of property if they are participated in the decision making beautifully as follows.

> *"...place these articles about school on tables, pedestals, and window sills. The pupils will be less likely to destroy them if they have a feeling that these articles belong to them, too, if they have had a part in this "corner brightening" and are encouraged to want a colorful school. If they have earned the money, or helped to earn it, and have been a part of purchasing and selection, they will want to protect and care for these beautiful additions".*

2.15. The Competence of School Administrators

As management literature by Katz (1974) as cited in Ayalew (1991: 3-4) depicts. Managers of institutions including education should have to have conceptual, human and technical skills to properly manage organizations.

1. conceptual skills refers to the ability to see or view an organization as wholesome and know how each and every part in an organization contribute to the greater whole. It also requires the knowledge of how parts integrate and change in one affects the other. Therefore, managers of school need to know how the school interacts internally within its members and externally with the local community to respond to their needs.

2. Human skill is concerned with how to lead people as a group and individual to accomplish certain organizational goals at work place. This skill is manifested in how employees view their bosses and vis versa. In this deal, considerable self respect and respect for others will promote effective relationship among people.

3. Technical skill deals with having specialized knowledge or understanding of particular activity as a matter of professional training or experience. Technical skills can be demonstrated on how one uses tools, methods procedures and techniques in a given work activity. In schools teachers need various teaching methods based on the nature of subjects they teach. The school decision makers also require the knowledge of finance, accounting, scheduling, purchasing, construction and maintenance. Having knowledge of technical skill for school leaders is significant to manage the work in a balanced way putting themselves in the workers' shoes. Ayalew (1991: 3).

Schools are places where complex activities are going on and where there is relatively higher human intimacy and relationship exists among people of similar profession. This makes the management of school a bit different. Human handling in this institution needs careful consideration at times of selection, motivation and working with Ayalew (1991: 3-8).

Green, Howard (1993: 144-149) views competence from two dimension as

- The characteristics of effective or 'superior' managers, or
- The actual performance required of managers.

He discusses that as the first view gives much emphasis to personal competence that individuals bring about to their job to register successful attainment while the second view tries to relate the ability to perform work activities to the standards required. In this management standards give due emphasis to the management role required as opposed to what the individual manager and the attributes they should possess. According to the document the second view is favored by the management Charter Initiative (MCI). The MCI derived the following key management functions based on the analysis of the managers' jobs and by further dividing into component parts.

Table 2: Management Charter Initiative page 146

Key roles/function	Management competences (units)
1) Managing operation	1. Initiate and implement change and improvements in services, products and systems 2. Monitor, maintain and improve service and product delivery
2) Manage Finance	3. Monitor, and control the use of resources 4. Secure effective resource allocation for activities and projects
3) Manage people	5. Recruit and select personnel. 6. Develop teams, individuals and self to enhance performance
	7. Plan, allocate and evaluate work carried out by teams, individual and self 8. Create, maintain and enhance effective working relationships
4) Managing information	9. Seek, evaluate and organize information for action 10. Exchange information to solve problems and make decisions.

CHAPTER THREE

3. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data

3.1 Characteristics of the Respondents

In this study five Wereda Education Heads and four Wereda Education office planners and thirteen supervisors were involved as a group. Out of which 5 (100%) WEOHs, 4 (80%) WEOPs and 13 (100%) supervisors found to be wereda sample elements. Form the other category 23(92%) of school principals, 19 (76%) vice principals and 104(83.2%) teachers became subject of the study from the five sample Weredas in the Arsi Zone. So as to analyze, interpret and find out the main problems prevailing in the sample area based on the information from the total 168 respondents returned the questionnaire by filling the necessary information.

Table 3: Characteristics of Respondents

Variable	Categories of respondents	Wereda Respondents								School Respondents								Grand Total	
		WEOH		WEOP		Supervisors		Total		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers		Total			
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Sex	Male	5	100	4	100	13	100	22	100	23	100	18	94.7	82	78.8	123	84.2	145	86.3
	Female	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5.3	22	21.2	23	15.8	23	13.7
	Total	5	100	4	100	13	100	22	100	23	100	19	100	104	100	146	100	168	100
Age	18-25	-	-	1	25	1	6.7	2	9.1	2	8.7	5	26.3	28	26.9	35	24	37	22
	26-35	-	-	-	-	2	13.3	2	9.1	13	56.5	9	47.4	48	46.2	70	47.9	72	43
	36-45	3	60	3	75	7	46.7	13	59.1	6	26.1	3	15.8	23	22.1	32	21.9	45	26.8
	46 and above	2	40	-	-	3	20	5	22.7	2	8.7	2	10.5	5	4.8	9	6.2	14	8.3
	Total	5	100	4	100	13	100	22	100	23	100	19	100	104	100	146	100	168	100
Level of education	Below grade 12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Grade 12 complete	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	-	-
	10+1TTI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5.3	10	9.6	11	7.5	11	6.5
	12+1 TTI	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	1	4.5	-	-	3	15.8	19	18.3	22	15.1	23	13.7
	12+1 college	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	1	4.5	-	-	2	10.5	30	28.8	32	21.9	33	19.6
	Diploma	3	60	4	100	10	66.7	17	77.3	23	100	10	52.6	41	39.4	74	50.7	91	54.2
	12+Diploma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.9	2	1.4	2	1.2
	12+2 college	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	15.8	2	1.9	5	3.4	5	3
	10+3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	BA/BSC	2	40	-	-	1	6.7	3	13.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.8
	Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	5	100	4	100	13	100	22	100	23	100	19	100	104	100	146	100	168	100

As can be seen form the table 3, despite the fact that the government has been exerting its at most effort to empower women, all Wereda respondents are males while of the total school respondents 22(21.2%) are females. With regard to the age distribution of the respondents 72(43%) are in the category of 26-35 years followed by age group between 36-45 which is 45(26.8%), youngsters between 18-25 years of age groups are in the third and 46 and above are the last in the respondents age category with 37(22%) and 14(8.33%) respectively. The students

researcher was convinced in that the diversity of the age group would be promising in there search for reliable information.

As to the qualification of the respondents 91(54.2%) are diploma holders 10(6%) are 10+2, 10+3 and BA/BSC and the remaining 67(39.8%) are TTIs and 12+1 years college. Therefore, the researcher believed that relatively respondents had adequate knowledge and understanding for the primary school level.

Table 4: Respondents' Years of Services (Total, in the district and on the Current Job)

Variable	Categories of respondents	Wereda Respondents								School Respondents								Grand Total	
		WEOH		WEOP		Supervisors		Total		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers		Total			
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Total years of service	1-5	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	1	4.5	2	8.7	6	31.6	36	34.6	44	30.1	45	26.8
	6-10	-	-	1	25	-	-	1	4.5	4	17.4	2	10.5	22	21.2	28	19.2	29	17.26
	11-15	-	-	-	-	2	13.3	2	9.1	8	34.8	5	26.3	18	17.3	31	21.2	33	19.6
	16-20	2	40	-	-	3	20	5	22.7	2	8.7	5	26.3	10	9.6	17	11.6	22	131
	21-25	1	20	3	75	2	13.3	6	27.3	6	26.1	1	5.3	15	14.4	22	15.1	28	16.6
	26-30	2	40	-	-	5	33.3	7	31.8	1	43	-	-	3	2.8	4	27	11	6.5
	31 and above	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	5	100	4	100	13	100	22	100	23	100	19	100	104	100	146	100	168	100
Years of Service in the district	Less than 1 Year	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1-3	2	40	1	25	2	13.3	5	22.7	2	8.7	2	10.5	36	34.6	40	27.4	45	26.8
	4-6	2	40	-	-	2	13.3	4	18.2	3	13	5	26.3	21	20.1	29	19.9	33	19.6
	7-9	1	20	-	-	1	6.7	2	9.1	6	26.1	2	10.5	23	22.1	31	21.2	33	19.6
	10-12	-	-	-	-	1	6.7	1	4.5	4	17.4	3	15.8	12	11.5	19	13	20	11.9
	13-15	-	-	1	25	-	-	1	45	4	174	4	21.1	5	4.8	13	8.9	14	8.3
	16and above	-	-	2	50	7	46.7	9	40.1	4	174	3	15.8	7	6.7	14	9.6	23	13.7
	Total	5	100	4	100	13	100	22	100	23	100	19	100	104	100	146	100	168	100
Years of service in the current job	Less than 1year	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1-3	-	40	3	75	7	46.7	12	54.5	12	52.2	9	47.4	36	34.6	57	39	69	41.1
	4-6	2	60	-	-	5	33.3	8	36.4	5	217	2	10.5	17	16.3	24	16.4	32	19
	7-9	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	174	5	26.3	14	13.5	23	15.8	23	13.7
	10-12	-	-	1	25	1	6.7	2	9.1	1	43	1	5.3	8	7.7	10	6.8	12	7.1
	13-15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	43	2	10.5	8	7.7	11	7.5	11	6.5
	16 and above	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	20.1	21	14.4	21	12.5
	Total	5	100	4	100	13	100	22	100	23	100	19	100	104	100	146	100	168	100

Moreover, about 94(55.90%) of the study group had a total experience of more than 11 years with more than 7 years service in the district and above 4 years service on the current job. Therefore, the researcher assumed the study group with better comprehension capacity can elicit better information about the management of school facilities in their respective weredas and schools.

Table 5: Level of Information Communication in School Facility Management

		Wereda Respondents						School Respondents					
		WEOHs Rank		WEOPs		Supervisor		School Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Have you read the MOE 1987 E.C primary School facility standard documents												
	Yes	4	80	1	25	5	38.5	8	34.8	12	63.2	36	34.6
	No	1	20	3	75	8	61.5	15	65.2	7	36.8	68	65.4
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
2	If your answer for question no. 1 is 'No.' what is your reference to achieve the standard?												
	a. Directives from REB and ZED in form of checklist	1	50	-	-	3	23.12	12	38.7	7	33.81	52	41.9
	b. Sharing experience from neighboring districts	1	50	-	-	5	38.5	2	6.5	2	12.53	20	17.7
	c. Knowledge from workshops and seminars					8	61.5	17	54.8	7	38.81	50	40.3
	Total	**2**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**13**	**100**	**31**	**100**	**18**	**100**	**124**	

For the proper management of school facilities, communication plays a significant role, table 5 item no. 1 depicts whether respondents have read school facilities standard document or not, in this regard, of the total Wereda respondents, 4(80%) WEOHs, 1(25%) WEOPs and 5(38.5%) supervisors reported as they have read the MOE 1987 E.C document about primary school facilities standard. However, majority 3(75%) WEOPs 8(61.5%) supervisors and few 1(20%) WEOHs respondents said no. On the other hand, of the school respondents 8(34.8%) principals, 12(63.2%) V. principals and 36(34.6%) teachers asserted as they have read the document whereas a good number of 15(65.2%) school principals, 68(65.4%) teachers and less than half 7(36.8%) vice principals responded the contrary. This clearly indicates as there is a failure in communication. This may slow down implementation and goal achievement.

For the second item in table 5, of the Wereda respondents who haven't read the MOE document WEOHs, Confirmed as they had used knowledge from workshops, seminars and Directives from REB and ZED in the form of Check list as their first means of obtaining information while majority supervisors reported knowledge from workshops, sharing neighboring districts' experience and directives from REB as first second and third respectively. Similarly, of the school respondents principals and vice principals selected synonymously knowledge from workshops and seminars as their first means of obtaining information but for directives from REB principals rated second while vice principals rated it first. Teachers on their part asserted as they use directives from REB as the first, knowledge from the workshop as the second and sharing neighboring districts experience as the third means of obtaining information.

From this one can observe that communication about the school facility standard in the study area is inconsistent and relies mainly on directives and seminars instead of using MOE written

documents for the management of school facilities. This in itself might create a gap in facilities management among weredas and schools.

Table 6: Availability of classroom in relation to student size

No	Items Where do you put your student classroom ratio?	Wereda Respondents						School Respondents					
		WEOHs		WEOPs		Supervisor		School principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Classroom-student ratio 1-4												
	a. 40-50			-	-	2	15.4	-	-	5	26.3	-	
	b. 51-60			-	-	3	23.1	1	4.3	6	31.6	16	15.4
	c. 61-70	3	60	1	25	4	30.8	12	52.2	-	-	45	43.3
	d. 71-80	2	40	2	50	3	23.1	9	39.1	8	12.1	27	26
	e. 81 above	-		1	25	1	7.7	1	4.3			12	11.5
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	Classroom-students ration 5-8												
2	a. 40-50	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	4	21.1	-	-
	b. 51-60	-		-	-	3	23.1	3	13	7	36.8	8	7.7
	c. 61-70	3	60	2	50	7	53.8	7	30.4	4	21.1	45	43.3
	d. 71-80	2	40	1	25	3	23.1	11	47.8	2	10.5	32	30.8
	e. 81 and above	-	-	1	25	-	-	2	8.7	2	10.5	12	11.5
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**

As can be seen from the table 6 item 1 and 2 about classroom student ratio for the primary first cycle, of the total wreda respondents only 5(38.5%) supervisors reported as student class room ratio is between 40-60 while all WEOHs, 3(75%) WEOPs and 7(53.9%) supervisors pointed out between 61-70 and 71-80. Moreover, relatively few number of 1(25%) WEOPs and 1(7.7%) supervisors indicated above 81. On the other hand almost similar proportion of school respondents also confirmed the same truth, for the primary second cycle. From the study result one can clearly see how classrooms have been crowded with students. This may also result in poor quality learning, poor service facilities and achievement.

Table 7: Adequacy of Classroom Facilities

No	School Facilities	School respondents					
		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
3.1	Class room facilities 3.1.1 Classrooms						
	A. V. adequate	-	-	-	-	12	11.5
	B. Adequate	9	39.1	7	36.8	54	51.9
	C. Inadequate	12	52.2	12	63.2	33	31.7
	D. V. Inadequate	2	8.7	-	-	5	4.8
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
3.2	Furniture 3.2.1 Attached desks						
	A. V. adequate	-	-	-	-	6	5.8
	B. Adequate	1	4.3	-	-	23	22.1
	C. Inadequate	15	65.2	9	47.4	52	50
	D. V. Inadequate	7	30.4	10	52.6	23	22.1
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	3.2.2 Teachers chair						
	A. V. adequate	-	-	-	-	4	3.8
	B. Adequate	3	13	2	10.5	23	21.1
	C. Inadequate	8	34.8	9	47.4	47	45.2
	D. V. Inadequate	8	34.8	8	42.1	17	16.3
	E. Not available	4	17.4	-	-	13	12.5
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	3.2.3 Teachers' table						
	A. V. adequate	-	-	-	-	2	1.9
	B. Adequate	5	21.7	3	15.8	12	11.5
	C. Inadequate	6	26.1	8	42.1	53	51
	D. V. Inadequate	12	52.2	8	42.1	32	30.8
	E. Note available	-	-	-	-	5	4.8
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
3.3	Black board 4.3.1 Size for the grade level						
	A. V. adequate	-	-	-	-	10	9.6
	B. Adequate	12	52.2	2	10.5	34	32.7
	C. Inadequate	9	39.1	11	57.9	51	49
	D. V. Inadequate	2	8.7	6	31.6	9	8.7
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**

Table 7 presents the availability of classroom facilities. As depicted under item one, of the total school respondents 9(39.1%) principals, 7(36.8%) vice principals and 66(63.4%) teachers rated availability and classroom facilities were adequate and V. adequate. In contrast, while 14(60.9%) principals, 12(63.2%) v. principals and about 38(36.5%) teachers reported the availability of classrooms in schools generally inadequate and V. inadequate respectively. The response of the teachers for the adequacy of classroom is a bit exaggerated. The researcher assumes failure related the number of student with the standard, the diversity of the schools may create a problem and the carelessness of some respondents in filling the questionnaire may be subject to the problem. Generally, the adequacy of classroom in school is fair although not perfect that the

absence of adequate number of classrooms in school forces to congest a large number of students in a single classroom which may be taken as one cause for the poor quality of education.

Item two of table 7 portrays the adequacy of furniture, in relation to this, the data indicates more than 70% of school principals, vice principals and teachers synonymously asserted that attached desks, teachers' chairs and tables were in adequate in the schools. This clearly shows that the extent to which curriculum implementation process, teachers and students are suffering from the scarcity of this basic equipment and how the classroom teaching learning is negatively affected.

Item three of this table deals with the availability of standard blackboards for the grade level. In this regard, 12(52.2%) principals, 2(10.5%) vice principals and 41(42.3%) teachers judged it to be satisfactory whereas nearly 48% of principals, about more than 90% vice principals and 57.7% teachers complained it was below the average. Principals responses, about the size of the black board is a bit exaggerated as compared to others. This may because of the knowledge they have about the equipment as they are relatively far or distant from the issue than others respondents. On the whole sample schools have a problem in getting standard and quality blackboards for the level. This is intolerable especially for teachers and students at a level where much exercises has been done on the blackboard.

absence of adequate number of classrooms in school forces to congest a large number of students in a single classroom which may be taken as one cause for the poor quality of education.

Item two of table 7 portrays the adequacy of furniture, in relation to this, the data indicates more than 70% of school principals, vice principals and teachers synonymously asserted that attached desks, teachers' chairs and tables were in adequate in the schools. This clearly shows that the extent to which curriculum implementation process, teachers and students are suffering from the scarcity of this basic equipment and how the classroom teaching learning is negatively affected.

Item three of this table deals with the availability of standard blackboards for the grade level. In this regard, 12(52.2%) principals, 2(10.5%) vice principals and 41(42.3%) teachers judged it to be satisfactory whereas nearly 48% of principals, about more than 90% vice principals and 57.7% teachers complained it was below the average. Principals responses, about the size of the black board is a bit exaggerated as compared to others. This may because of the knowledge they have about the equipment as they are relatively far or distant from the issue than others respondents. On the whole sample schools have a problem in getting standard and quality blackboards for the level. This is intolerable especially for teachers and students at a level where much exercises has been done on the blackboard.

Table 8: Adequacy of Library Facilities

No	School Facilities	School Respondents					
		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
8	1 Reading room						
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	10	9.6
	B. good	6	26.1	6	31.6	16	15.4
	C. poor	9	39.1	7	36.8	47	35.5
	D. v. Poor	4	17.4	6	31.6	36	34.6
	E. Not available	4	174	-	-	5	4.8
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	2 Book store						
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	16	15.4
	B. good	6	26.1	2	10.5	14	13.5
	C. poor	5	21.7	10	52.6	49	47.1
	D. v. Poor	10	43.5	7	36.8	16	15.4
	E. Not Available	2	8.7	-	-	9	8.7
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	3 Shelves						
	A. V. good	-	-	2	10.5	10	9.6
	B. good	1	4.3	2	10.5	14	13.5
	C. poor	12	52.2	7	36.8	50	48.1
	D. v. Poor	9	39.1	8	42.1	25	24
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	4 Reference books in quantity						
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	2	1.9
	B. good	-	-	-	-	24	23.1
	C. poor	15	65.2	15	78.9	35	33.7
	D. v. Poor	7	30.4	4	21.1	43	41.3
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	5 Recency of reference books						
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	-	-
	B. good	-		2	10.5	18	17.3
	C. poor	14	60.9	9	47.4	39	37.5
	D. v. Poor	8	34.8	8	42.1	17	16.3
	E. not available	1	4.3	-	-	30	28.8
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	6 Furniture						
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	6	5.8
	B. good	-	-	4	21.1	4	3.8
	C. poor	13	56.5	7	36.8	45	43.3
	D. v. Poor	7	30.4	8	42.1	28	26.9
	E. not available	3	13	-	-	21	20.2
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	7 Library Service						
	A. V. good	-	-	-		10	9.6
	B. good	7	30.4	8	42.1	16	16.4
	C. poor	13	56.5	7	36.8	34	32.7
	D. v. Poor	2	8.7	4	21.1	22	21.2
	E. not available	1	43	-	-	22	21.2
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**

Table 8 above shows respondents view about library facilities, in this regard item 1 describes about the availability of reading room for this 6(26.1%) principal 6(31.6%) vice principals and about 16(25%) teachers responded as good and v. good, however, a good number of 13(56.5%)

principals, 13(68.4%) v. principals and majority 83(70.1%) teachers asserted as reading room in their schools was poor and very poor. Moreover, 4(17.4%) principals and 5(4.8%) teachers revealed as there is no reading room in their school. This indicates that there is a problem in library facilities.

For item four about the availability of books except for 26(25%) teacher respondents who said v. good and v. good. All principals, vice principals and majority of the teachers rated as poor and V. poor. Hence missing this item from a library means missing the whole library.

Table 3.2 item five investigates the availability of furniture in the libraries, of the total respondents 4(21.1%) v. principals and 10(9.6%) teachers reported the availabilities of furniture was good and v. good while all principals, over 15(75%) vice principals and 73(70.2%) teachers confirmed the furniture were poorly and v. poorly available. Besides other 21(20.2%) teachers revealed as totally absent. Furniture is also an important element in the organization of libraries. Not having enough amount of furniture to the level means a problem for the proper functioning of the library. This again negatively affects the classroom teaching learning.

The last item of this table investigates about the library services the schools were rendering, in relation to this, 7(30.4%) principals 8(42.1%) V. principals and 26(25%) teachers reported the services was good and v. good while 16(69.5%) principals 11(57.9%) vice principals and 78(75.1%) teachers commented as the service was generally poor. Thus, even if library facilities were refurbished to the extent possible if the service delivery is a missing it is wastage of resources, when we critically see in to the results of table 8. In all cases show school principals and v. principals were rated for v. good for all items while teachers did the researcher assumes this may because of the number of teachers as teacher respondents are four fold that of principals. Filling the questionnaire without understanding on the part of some teachers may also the cause. Generally, the study result about the organization of libraries was revealed that the libraries were not organized as supposed to be needed. This has an impact on the classroom teaching learning and on students' achievement as well.

Table 9: The Availability of Science Laboratory Facilities

No	School Facilities	School Respondents					
		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
9	Science laboratory and pedagogic centre facilities 1 Science laboratory						
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	-	-
	B. good	-	-	-	-	-	-
	C. poor	-	-	-	-	-	
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-
	E. not available	23	100	19	100	104	100
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100
	2 Science kit						
	A. V. good	5	21.7	-		12	11.5
	B. good	9	39.1	6	31.6	8	7.7
	C. poor	2	8.7	9	47.4	29	27.9
	D. v. Poor	7	30.4	4	21.1	17	16.3
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100

Item 1 in table 9 depicts about the availability of science laboratories, regarding this, the MOE primary school facilities standard incorporates a general science laboratory. However, all principals, vices principals and teachers commented as there was no laboratory service in their respective schools. This clearly shows that how science curriculum implementation was totally impractical and students were forced to learn theories alone.

Item 2 in table 9, presents about the availability of science kits, in relation to this, 14(60.8%) principals 6(31.6%) V. principals and 20(19.2%) teachers rated for good and v. good whereas, majority school principals, vice principals and teachers responded to be poor and v. poor and even 38(36.5%) teachers reported as it was totally absent. Thus from this figure one can deduce that science education that has been given in the schools would have been at risk.

Table 10: Availability of Pedagogic Center Facilities

No	School Facilities	School Respondents					
		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
10	Pedagogic centers						
	1 Workshop room						
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	-	-
	B. good	3	13	2	10.5	4	3.8
	C. poor	2	8.7	2	10.5	22	21.2
	D. v. Poor	16	69.7	11	57.9	18	17.3
	E. not available	2	8.7	4	21.1	60	57.7
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100
	2 Display room for Pedagogic Center						
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	2	1.9
	B. good	8	34.8	6	31.6	12	11.5
	C. poor	2	8.7	-	-	30	28.8
	D. v. Poor	11	47.8	13	68.4	31	29.8
	E. not available	2	8.7	-	-	29	27.8
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100
	3 Coordinators office for Pedagogic Center						
	A. V. good	1	8.7	-	-	6	5.8
	B. good	3	13	6	31.6	17	16.3
	C. poor	9	39.1	11	57.9	40	38.5
	D. v. Poor	8	34.8	2	10.5	6	5.8
	E. not available	2	8.7	-	-	35	33.7
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100
	4 Equipment (work tools)						
	A. V. good	1	4.3	2	10.5	2	1.9
	B. good	1	4.3	4	21.1	21	20.2
	C. poor	19	82.6	11	57.9	32	30.8
	D. v. Poor	2	8.7	-	-	24	23.1
	E. not available	-	-	2	10.5	25	24
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100

Item 1 in table 10 discusses the availability of pedagogic center workshop rooms. To this effect of the total school respondents 5(21.7%) principals, 4(21%) V. principals and 4(3.8%) teachers reported the availability of the room was good. However, majority of the respondents reported to be poor and v. poor. Moreover, 2(8.7%) principals 4(21.1%) vice principals and 60(57.7%) teachers confirmed there is no work shop room. Almost similar situation was portrayed for the display room, coordinators office and equipment in the study. This implies that the inconvenience and total absence of workshop rooms, display rooms, coordinators office and scarcity of equipment may hinder the participation of teachers and students in the production of teaching aids to make classroom teaching practical. Which might also affects the students' achievement.

Table 11: Availability of the School Compound

No	School Facilities	School Respondents					
		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
11	1 Size in relation to student population						
	A. V. good	8	34.8	6	31.6	18	17.3
	B. good	6	26.1	8	42.1	43	41.3
	C. poor	8	34.8	3	15.8	39	37.5
	D. v. Poor	1	4.3	2	10.5	4	21.1
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100
	2 Space fro games foot ball						
	A. V. good	4	17.4	6	31.6	23	22.1
	B. good	9	39.1	8	42.1	36	34.6
	C. poor	3	13	2	10.5	41	39.4
	D. v. Poor	7	304	3	15.8	4	3.8
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100
	3. Valley ball field						
	A. V. good	4	17.4	2	10.5	20	19.2
	B. good	9	39.1	-	-	41	31.4
	C. poor	3	13	8	42.1	43	41.3
	D. v. Poor	7	30.4	9	47.4	-	-
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100
	4. Handball						
	A. V. good	-	-	2	10.5	3	2.8
	B. good	1	4.3	-	-	17	16.3
	C. poor	6	26.1	6	31.6	2	1.9
	D. v. Poor	14	60.9	11	57.9	25	24
	E. not available	2	8.7	-	-	57	26.8
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100
	5. Basket ball						
	A. V. good	4	17.4	2	10.5	4	38
	B. good	-	-	5	26.3	4	3.8
	C. poor	1	4.3	7	36.8	6	5.8
	D. v. Poor	16	69.7	2	10.5	22	21.2
	E. not available	2	8.7	-	-	68	65.4
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100
	6 Suitability for open air teaching						
	A. V. good	-		2	10.5	7	6.7
	B. good	5	21.7	8	42.1	27	26
	C. poor	18	78.3	7	36.8	37	35.5
	D. v. Poor	-	-	2	10.5	21	20.2
	E. not available	-	-	-	-	12	11.5
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100
	7. Shade trees						
	A. V. good	2	8.7	6	31.6	16	15.4
	B. good	9	39.1	8	42.1	33	31.7
	C. poor	7	30.4	2	10.5	23	22.1
	D. v. Poor	1	4.3	-	-	18	17.3
	E. not available	16	69.7	3	15.8	14	13.5
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100
	8. Flowers						
	A. V. good	2	8.7	-		-	
	B. good	2	8.7	8	42.1	12	11.5
	C. poor	11	47.8	7	36.8	39	37.5
	D. v. Poor	6	26.1	4	21.1	31	29.8
	E. not available	2	8.7	-	-	22	21.2
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100
	9. Fence						
	A. V. good	1	4.3	6	31.6	14	13.5
	B. good	13	56.5	11	57.9	23	22.5
	C. poor	9	39.1	2	10.5	46	44.2
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	15	14.4
	E. not available					6	5.8
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100

Table 11 item 1 is about the availability of ample space, in relation to the students' population. to this effect, of the total school respondents 14(60.9%) principals, 14(73.7%) V. principals and 61(58.6%) teachers asserted as there was ample space however, 9(39.1%) principals 5(26%) V. principals and 43(41.3%) teachers judged it was poor and v. poor. It is visible that the former category respondents' result showed the betterment of the situation but when we compare it with the remoteness of the sample areas it is difficult to take it for grant. As the number of student population is ever growing dramatically.

Obviously primary schools are the place where the future professionals are created. As table 3.4 item 2-5 discusses about the space for games. In this regard among the four games: foot ball, volleyball, hand ball and Basket ball incorporated in the study showed the availability of football and valley ball games were relatively viewed better by majority of the respondents as compared to the later two games which according to the majority of respondents rated as poor and v. poor. The study showed that the schools did not give equal emphasis for games as they were parts in the physical education curriculum. This may end up with failure in achieving the goals of the curriculum.

Item 6 of this table, deals with the suitability of the school compound for open air teaching. in relation to this, of the total school respondents 5(21.7%) principals, 10(52.6%) v. principals, and 34(32.7%) teachers reported to be good and v. good while 18(55.7%) teachers rated poor and v. poor. Apart from this 12(11.5%) teachers reported total inconvenience. It is understood that some subjects like physical education, music, arts etc. sometimes demand out of classroom teaching. For this, shade trees, flowers and fences play a significant role though study results about shade trees and flowers indicated poor and v. poor by majority of the three groups of respondents.

The last item on table 11 presents about the availability of fence. The availability of fence was rated by majority of the respondents as good and better. On the whole the study result indicated that shade trees and the availability of flowers had a problem and this might dissatisfy teachers and students and negatively affects the learning.

Table 12: The Adequacy of Office Space and Facilities

No	School Facilities	School Respondents					
		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
12	Office facilities 1. Teachers staff room						
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	5	4.8
	B. good	-		2	105	29	27.9
	C. poor	15	65.2	7	36.8	33	31.7
	D. v. Poor	5	21.7	8	42.1	31	29.8
	E. not available	3	13	2	10.5	6	5.8
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	2. Tables and chairs in m/n to teachers number						
	A. V. good	-		-		3	2.8
	B. good	-		2	10.5	11	10.6
	C. poor	10	43.5	9	47.4	26	25
	D. v. Poor	11	47.8	8	42.1	51	49
	E. not available	2	8.7	-		13	12.5
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	3. Lockers in r/n to teachers number						
	A. V. good	-				-	-
	B. good	3	13	-	-	10	9.6
	C. poor	8	34.8	6	31.6	28	26.9
	D. v. Poor	10	43.5	13	68.4	47	45.2
	E. Not available	2	8.7	-	-	19	18.5
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	4. Principals office						
	A. V. good	4	17.4	-		23	22.1
	B. good	10	43.5	8	42.1	55	52.9
	C. poor	9	39.1	9	47.4	26	25
	D. v. Poor	-	-	2	10.5	-	-
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	5. Department head office						
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	-	-
	B. good	-	-	2	10.5	-	-
	C. poor	6	26.1	9	47.4	30	28.8
	D. v. Poor	15	60.9	8	42	32	30.8
	E. not available	2	8.7	-	-	42	40.4
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	6. Ware house						
	A. V. good	-		4	21.1	11	10.6
	B. good	9	39.1	8	42.1	25	24
	C. poor	6	26.1	7	36.8	41	39.4
	D. v. Poor	8	34.8	-		16	15.4
	E. not available	-	-			9	8.7
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**

Table 12 item 1 spotlights about office facilities, in this, item one describes about the availability of teachers staff room in relation to this, few 2(10.5%) V. principals and 34(32.7%) teachers reported the availability of staff rooms as good and V. good however, majority 20(86.9%) principals, nearly half of 8(42.1%) V. principals and 64(61.5%) teachers rated to be poor and very poor and even 3(13%) principals 2(10.5%) and 6(5.8%) teachers revealed the total absence of teachers staff room further investigation a bout tables, chairs, and lockers in relation to the teachers number commented to be poor by majority of the three groups respondents.

The second item investigates about the availability of principals office regarding this almost majority school principals and teachers and nearly half of the vice principals rated principals' offices were good and v. good while relatively few number of principals, teachers and vice principals condemned it to be poor and very poor. As to the other office related equipments like tables, chairs, shelves and cupboards, the data depicted majority of the three groups of respondents confirmed the in adequacy of the equipments with few exception who rated good. It is believed that principal's offices serve as the center for teachers, non teaching staff, students and the community as whole for different purposes (meeting, consultation, guidance) and the like. Having shortage with the items worth mentioned above means a problem for the proper management of the whole process.

Items 4-6 in this table investigates, the availability of other offices such as department offices and ware houses. Regarding this the majority of the three groups respondents asserted the availability of offices in their respective school were poor with the exception of 12(63.2%) vice principals who rated good and above for the availability of ware houses. Therefore, the study result shows that there was a mismatch between works to be performed and the facilities needs. This may hinder the proper functioning of department heads, clubs and warehouse activities. This may also create wastage as a result of improper placing of office facilities. From this one can deduce that teachers do not have ample space to be prepared for the lessons and to correct students' papers in schools and where to put their instructional provision. This inturn might have an indirect negative effect on the proper delivery of the teaching learning process.

Table 13: Adequacy of Toilet Facilities and Water Supply

No	School Facilities	School Respondents					
		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
13	Toilet facilities 1. For boys						
	A. V. good	1	4.3	4	21.1	12	11.5
	B. good	11	47.8	10	52.6	41	39.4
	C. poor	9	39.1	3	15.8	28	26.9
	D. v. Poor	2	8.7	2	10.5	21	20.2
	E. none	-				2	1.9
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	2. For girls						
	A. V. good	1	4.3	4	21.1	12	11.5
	B. good	7	30.4	8	42.1	33	31.7
	C. poor	7	30.4	3	15.8	34	32.7
	D. v. Poor	8	34.8	4	21.1	25	24
	E. none	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	3. For male teachers						
	A. V. good	1	4.3	-	-	11	10.6
	B. good	8	34.8	10	52.6	33	31.7
	C. poor	6	26.1	5	26.3	30	28.8
	D. v. Poor	8	34.8	4	21.1	18	17.3
	E. none	-	-	-	-	12	11.5
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	4. For female teachers						
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	-	-
	B. good	6	26.1	8	42.1	25	24
	C. poor	8	34.8	7	36.8	32	30.8
	D. v. Poor	9	39.1	4	21.1	27	26
	E. none					20	19.2
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
13.1	Water supply						
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	-	-
	B. good	9	39.8	7	36.8	36	34.6
	C. poor	14	60.9	12	63.2	50	48.1
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	18	17.3
	E. none	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**

The first item on table 13 presents about the availability of sanitary facilities in this regard, the data is compiled on four toilet facilities boys', girls', male and female teachers. In relation to this, the data of the majority of the respondents synonymously shows that more than half percent of the three group respondents asserted toilet facilities for boys were good and very good, however, toilet facilities for girl students rated as poor by majority of principals and teachers even though, 12(63.2%) vice principals reported it to be good and very good.

On the other hand, for the male and female teachers' toilet facilities majority of the three groups respondents asserted as the facilities were poor and v. poor. Few teaches' reported as totally

absent. Therefore, the study result shows a problem in toilet facilities, moreover, as little emphasis was given to girl students and female teachers' toilet facilities as compared to the boys and males. From this one can imagine the problem that might be created on the health and safety of the school community as a result of poor toilet facilities in the campus where relatively large number of people work.

The last item in this table deals with the water supply facilities, in relation to this of the total school respondents 9(39.8%) principals, 7(36.8%) V. principals and 36(34.6%) teachers reported as the water supply of their school was fair enough respectively. However, 14(60.9%) principals, 12(63.2%) vice principals and 68(65.4%) teachers stood in contrast. As further investigation on water supply indicates majority of the schools reported as they use water from river whereas few schools in town get access to pipe water. From this one can understand water supply in schools was poor. This may create poor sanitary conditions which might bring about unhealthy situation.

Table 14: Appropriateness of School Site for the Teaching Learning

No	Items	School respondents					
		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
14	1. Size of the school						
	A. V. good	-	-	4	21.1	20	19.2
	B. good	21	91.3	15	78.9	53	51
	C. poor	2	8.7	-	-	26	25
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	5	4.8
	E. none	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	2. Centrality to students population						
	A. V. good	1	4.3	4	21.1	13	12.5
	B. good	15	65.2	4	21.1	47	45.2
	C. poor	3	13	-	-	33	31.7
	D. v. Poor	4	17.4	9	47.4	9	8.7
	E. none	-	-	2	10.5	2	1.9
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	3. Drainage						
	A. V. good	1	43	2	10.5	11	42.3
	B. good	7	30.4	2	10.5	44	42.3
	C. poor	6	26.1	2	10.5	21	20.2
	D. v. Poor	9	39.1	11	57.9	19	18.3
	E. none	-	-	2	10.5	7	6.7
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	4. General Environment freeness from disturbing noise						
	A. V. good	6	26.1	9	47.4	21	20.2
	B. good	15	65.2	8	42.1	47	45.2
	C. poor	2	8.7	2	10.5	30	28.8
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-
	E. none	-	-	-	-	6	5.8
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**

Table 14 item 1 describes about the appropriateness of the school size in this regard majority of the 21(91.3%) principals, 19(100%) vice principals and 73(70.2%) teachers asserted the school size was good and V. good however, 2(8.7%) principals and 31(29.8%) teachers reported the inappropriateness of the school in accommodating the students population the situation shows an improvement although still data indicates some gap.

With regard to item 2 about centrality of the school site to the students population, 16(69.5%) principals 8(42.2%) v. principals and 60(57.7%) teachers confirmed the centrality to be good and V. good nevertheless, 7(30.4%) principals, 9(47.4%) v. principals and 42(40.4%) teacher respondents refuted centrality of the site to student population by rating poor and very poor. From the study result one can see as there was relative improvement in building schools nearer to student population because of the scheme 'Education for all' although there was a gap.

Item 3 of table 14 is about the drainage of the school site, of the total school respondents 8(34.7%) principals 4(21%) v. principals and 55(52.9%) teacher respondents asserted school site drainage was good and above whereas, 15(65.2%) principals, 15(68.4%) V. principals and 40(38.5%) teachers rated to be poor and V. poor. This shows that schools drainage have a problem. As a result schools established on swampy sites were short lived and create problems during bad weather on kids and also on out of classroom activities.

With regard to the last item on table 14 about the general environment (security, noise and beauty of the scene) majority principals, vice principals and over 68(65.4%) of teachers asserted to be good and V. good whereas, relatively 2(8.7%) principals, 2(10.5%) v. principals and 30(28.8%) reported poor and 6(5.8%) teachers are non respondent. From this, one can understand that the sample schools environment is almost safe from disturbance. This may enhance good teaching learning environment.

Table 15: Appropriateness of Classroom Situation for Teaching and Learning

No	Class room Situation	School Respondents					
		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
15	1. Temperature						
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	9	8.7
	B. good	14	60.9	15	78.9	69	66.3
	C. poor	5	21.7	4	21.1	15	14.4
	D. v. Poor	4	17.4	-	-	11	10.6
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	2. Ventilation						
	A. V. good	1	43	2	10.5	12	11.5
	B. good	16	69.7	17	89.5	65	62.5
	C. poor	5	21.7	-	-	21	20.2
	D. v. Poor	1	4.3	-	-	6	5.8
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	3. Light						
	A. V. good	1	4.3	2	10.5	13	12.5
	B. good	17	73.9	17	89.5	63	60.6
	C. poor	2	8.7	-	-	18	17.3
	D. v. Poor	3	13	-	-	10	9.6
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100
	4. Free from disturbing noise						
	A. V. good	5	21.7	13	68.4	17	16.3
	B. good	14	60.9	6	31.6	48	46.2
	C. poor	4	17.4	-	-	31	29.8
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	4	3.8
	E. None Respondent	-	-	-	-	4	3.8
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	5. Nature of the floor						
	A. V. good	3	13	2	10.5	8	7.7
	B. good	7	30.4	5	26.3	37	35.5
	C. poor	13	56.5	12	63.2	55	52.9
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	4	3.8
	Total	23	100	19	100	104	100

Table 15 deals with the general classroom situation, item 1 investigates about the appropriateness of classroom temperature for the teaching learning. In relation to this 14(60.9%) principals. 15(78.9%) v. principals and 78(75%) teacher respondents asserted the temperature of their classrooms were good and above however only 9(38.1%) principals and 26(25%) teachers said poor and V. poor. This shows that the temperature of classrooms is suitable to impart lessons in the sample schools although it is not perfect.

Table 15 item no 2 portrays about the ventilation of classrooms. In this regard, good number of 17(74%) principals, 19(100%) vice principals and 77(74%) teachers confirmed to be good and above. Whereas, 6(26%) principals, and 27(26%) teachers objected it was poor and v. poor. Form this, it is fair to deduce that classroom ventilation was good in promoting the health and safety of the students and the teachers as well.

As to item 3 in relation to classroom light, majority of the school principals, V. principals and teachers rated good and v. good however, relatively few numbers of school principals and teachers refuted to be poor and very poor. The study result indicates that classroom light is suitability enough for the teaching learning. This may positively assists learning.

Item 4 depicts about the freeness of the classrooms from play ground noise. to this effect 19(82.6%) principals, 19(100%) vice principals and 65(62.5%) teachers claimed to be good and v. good while 4(174%) principals and 28(26.9%) teachers only objected the freeness of the classrooms from disturbing noise. Thus, from the study results one can say that classroom instructions were held in a relatively peaceful situation which may positively support the students' achievement and save teachers teaching time.

The final item of table 15 is about the impact of classroom floor for proper teaching learning to this effect 10(34.7%) principals, 7(36.8%) vice principals and 45(43.2%) teachers judged as good and v. good however, 13(56.5%) principals, 12(63.2%) vice principals and 59(5.7%) teachers complained to be poor and v. poor. Therefore, the result of the study indicates that there is a problem with the floors of the classrooms. This may force students to sit in an inconvenient classroom for relatively along period of time which may create a problem on the students' health and the teaching learning as well.

Table 16: Suitability of Classroom Size and Furniture to the Teaching Learning

No	Item	Wereda respondents						School respondents						Df	Table value of χ^2	Calculated value $D\chi^2$
		WEOH		WIOP		SUP		SP		V.P		Teach				
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
16	To what extent of the following school facilities in line with the changes in the curriculum?															
	1. Classroom size for group teaching															
	A. V. good	-		-	-	1	7.7	-	-	-	-	8	7.7			
	B. good	2	40	2	50	4	30.8	9	39.1	2	10.5	47	45.2			
	C. poor	3	60	2	50	8	61.5	11	47.8	8	42.1	29	27.9			
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	13	9	47.4	20	19.2			
	E. none	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**15**	**25.00**	**32.95**
	2. For team teaching															
	A. V. good	-	-	1	25	-		1	4.3	4	21.1	3	2.8			
	B. good	-	-	-	-	3	23.1	9	39.1	7	36.8	23	22.1			
	C. poor	5	100	3	75	6	62.2	13	56.5	8	42.1	47	45.2			
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	4	30.8	-	-	-	-	31	27.9			
	E. none	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9			
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**20**	**31.41**	**28.53**
	3. Classroom furniture for group work															
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	-	-	-	-	4	3.8			
	B. good	-	-	1	25	3	23.1	1	43	8	42.1	24	23			
	C. poor	3	60	1	25	7	53.8	19	82.6	4	21.1	51	49			
	D. v. Poor	2	40	2	50	2	15.4	3	13	7	36.8	25	24			
	E. none	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**15**	**25**	**21.14**
	4. Furniture for students age															
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	-		-		7	6.7			
	B. good	1	20	2	50	4	30.8	3	13	8	42.1	29	27.9			
	C. poor	4	80	2	50	4	30.8	17	73.9	9	47.4	47	45.2			
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	4	30.8	3	13	2	10.5	21	20.2			
	E. none	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**15**	**25**	**14.18**

Item 1 in the above table discusses about the appropriateness of classroom size. in relation to this of all respondents 2 (40%) WEOH's, 2 (50%) WEOPs, and 5 (38.5%) supervisors confirmed to be good and V. good. Whereas, 3 (60%) WEOHs, 2 (50%) WEOPs and 8(61.5%) supervisors refuted it. On the other hand 9(39.1%) principals, 2 (10.5%) V. principals and 55 (52.9%) teachers reported that classroom size was appropriate however majority of school principals, V. principals and nearly fifty percent teachers condemned the suitability of classroom size of the present day. Therefore, the study shows as classroom size is inappropriate for various method of teaching this may distort the whole effort going on to improve quality education. For item two of table 4.2 regarding classrooms appropriateness for team teaching comparatively few wereda respondents 1 (25%) WEOPs and 3(23.1%) supervisors accepted it was good and very good respectively while majority of the three group respondents condemned its appropriateness. On top of this, from school respondents 10 (44.4%) principals 11 (57.9%) vice principals and 26 (24.9%) teachers expressed their view in favour of it however, more than half percent of principals, 8(42.1%) vice principals and majority of teachers objected it. Hence, the study result shows that there is problem in implementing team teaching due to classroom size and obviously now a days team teaching has been on exercise at primary level especially in the self contained classrooms.

Item 3 of this table investigates about the appropriateness of classroom furniture for group work. In relation to this except for 1 (25%) WEOPS and 4 (30.8%) supervisors who said good and above all WEOH's, majority WEOPS and supervisors confirmed their disagreement by rating poor and very poor. On the other hand 1 (4.3%) principals 8 (42.1%) vice principals, 28(26.8%) teachers conveyed in favor of the existing classroom furniture's. However, comparatively large number of 22 (95.6%) principals, 13 (57.9%) vice principals and 76 (73%) teachers condemned the suitability of the existing classroom furniture for group work. This shows that classroom furniture is unsuitable to perform different kinds of classroom activities. This again affects the teaching learning one way or the other.

For the last item in the table 16 regarding the suitability of classroom furniture for the students age; of wereda respondents 1 (20%l) WEOHs; 2(50%) WEOPs and 5(33.7%) supervisors affirmed to be good, nevertheless majority WEOHs, half WEOPs and above 8(61.6%) supervisors claimed it is not suitable. Form school; of the total respondents 3(13%) principals, 8(42.1%) vice principals and 36(34.6%) teachers reported that the furniture is suitable for students age. Whereas 20(86.9%) principals, 11(57.9%) vice principals and 68(65.4%) teachers

condemned the suitability of furniture to the students age by rating poor and very poor. Therefore, the study result portrays that students are using the existing classroom furniture without ease. This may have its own impact on the deal to secure students full attention towards the lesson and may also affect the physiological development of youngsters as classroom desks are same for all age children.

Moreover, the chi-square test made on the table about the appropriateness of classroom size and furniture to the changes in the curriculum reveals as there is common perception among the groups of the respondents for all items, except for item one on table 4.2 as the calculated value of the items are in the domain of the table value.

Table 17: Appropriateness of Library Facilities to the Classroom Teaching Learning

No	Item	Wereda Respondents						School Respondents						Df	Table value of χ^2	Calculated value $D\chi^2$
		WEOH		WIOP		Supervisors		School Principal		V. Principals		Teachers				
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
17	1. Library facilities space for individual study															
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	-	-	-		10	9.6			
	B. good	-	-	-	25	4	30.8	3	13	11	57.9	26	25			
	C. poor	5	100	1	75	5	38.5	15	65.2	2	10.5	30	28.8			
	D. v. Poor	-	-	3	-	3	23.1	-	-	4	21.1	33	31.7			
	E. none	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	21.7	2	10.5	5	4.8			
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**20**	**31.41**	**20.28**
	2. For group study															
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	-	-	-	-	-	-			
	B. good	-	-	1	25	1	7.7	2	8.7	2	10.5	28	26.9			
	C. poor	2	40	3	75	6	46.2	11	47.8	6	31.6	52	50			
	D. v. Poor	3	60	-	-	5	38.5	5	21.7	11	57.9	19	18.5			
	E. none	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	21.7	-	-	5	4.8			
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**20**	**31.41**	**49.27**

For item 1 in table 17 about the appropriateness of library spaces for individual and group study. In this regard except for 1 (25%) WEOPs and 5 (38.5%) supervisor who said good, all WEOHS majority WEOPs and supervisors condemned the poor level of libraries as a study places, while school respondents also confirmed the same. This clearly shows that libraries are poorly organized in schools, almost in all cases one classroom is used as a library. This doesn't fulfill the library need of students. On the other hand curriculum implementation forces teachers to use variety of methods that require library use. On top of this the chi-square test of item one about library suitability for individual study, signifies there is a common felt needs among the group of respondents however, item two indicates the absence of common understanding among the groups.

Table 18: The Process of Planning New School Facilities

No	Question items	Wereda Respondents						School Respondents					
		WEOHs		WEOPs		Supervisor		School Principals		Vice Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
18	1. The most applicable method of school facility planning in your district?												
	A. Need assessment survey	4	80	-		2	15.4	5	13.8	2	7.4	33	29.5
	B. student enrolment	-	-	2	50	4	30.8	12	33.3	10	37	52	46.4
	C. Availability of budget	1	20	2	50	7	53.8	19	52.7	15	55.6	27	24.1
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**		**100**	**27**	**100**	**112**	**100**
	2. School site selection criteria in the district is based on												
	A. Centrality to student population	5	100	4	100	4	30.8	14	45.2	17	58.6	61	39.1
	B. Take any vacant land donated	-		-	-	4	30.8	6	19.4	2	6.9	31	19.9
	C. The size of the land	-		-	-	4	30.8	6	19.4	8	27.6	40	25.6
	D. Nearness to high way	-		-	-	1	7.7	5	16.1	2	6.9	24	15.4
	Total				-		**100**	**31**	**100**	**29**	**100**	**156**	**100**
	3. New construction in your district is initiated by												
	A. Preparing educational plan and give it to an architect	-	-	-	-	4	30.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
	B. Discussing with an architect	2	40	2	50	4	30.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
	C. By simply informing the need	3	60	2	50	5	38.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 18 item 1 seeks information about how school facilities plans been prepared in schools. In this regard, of the total wereda respondents WEOHs reported as need assessment survey is the first and availability of budget is the second means of obtaining information while WEOPs choose students enrollment and availability of budget as equally important means. Supervisors on their part rated for the availability of budget, students' enrollment and need assessment as first, second and third respectively. One the other hand, of school respondents school principals and vice principals asserted the same with supervisors while teachers make students enrollment first, need assessment the second and availability of budget the last. The information gathered shows as there is lack of common understanding about how plans are prepared. This may create wastage of resources.

For the second item on the table 18 in relation to the site selection criteria, all Wereda respondents synonymously ranked centrality to the student population as their first choice. While also majority school respondents asserted the same, with, some additional options such as the size of school, take vacant land and nearness to highway as second third and fourth reasons respectively. This indicates, as there is an improvement. This will enhance access and helps to address society need for education.

For the last item in the table 18 on how new construction been initiated in their locality majority wereda respondents reported 'simply' informing the need to the architects' as the first choice and discussion prior to construction with the architects' as the second while supervisors alone rated for the preparation of educational plan to be given to the architects. From this one can understand that schools are constructed with less technical involvement of educational experts. This may force schools to stick only to standards instead of adapting schools to the curriculum and society needs.

Table 19: The level of team Work in Facilities Planning

No	Items	Wereda Respondents						School Respondents					
		WEOHs		WEOPs		Super Visor		School Principals		Vice Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
19	1. Have the material resource positions stated in your district?												
	A. Yes	3	60	1	25	4	30.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
	b. No	2	40	3	75	9	69.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
	C. None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**
	2. If your answer for question No. (5.1) is 'No' how do you manage the work?												
	A. by delegating the work	-	-	1	33.3	2	22.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
	B. by forming committee	2	100	1	33.3	1	11.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	C. By sharing the work according	-	-	1	33.3	6	66.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
	D. none	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	**2**	**100**	**3**	**100**	**9**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**
	3. How do you evaluate the team sprit between school board and WEO in planning school facilities												
	A. Very Good	-		1	25	2	15.4	-	-	-	-	10	9.6
	B. Good	-		-	-	4	30.8	-	-	-	-	46	44.2
	C. Poor	4	80	3	75	5	38.5	-	-	-	-	38	36.5
	D. Very Poor	1	20	-	-	2	15.4	-	-	-	-	8	[illegible]
	E. None Response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.9
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**104**	**100**
	4. What do you thing about the team work between architects and WEO in school planning												
	A. Very Good	-	-	1	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	B. Good	-	-	-	-	4	30.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
	C. Poor	3	60	1	25	4	30.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
	D. Very Poor	2	40	2	50	5	38.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**
	5. How do you evaluate the technical support of WEO in school facility planning?												
	A. Very Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	31.6	-	-
	B. Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	13	5	26.3	-	-
	C. Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	47.8	8	42.1	-	-
	D. Very Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	39.1	-	-	-	-
	Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	-	-

Item no. 1 in table 19 investigates whether or not material resource positions in the district were staffed or not, regarding this of the total wereda respondents 3 (60%) WEOHs, 1 (25%) WEOPs and 4(30.8%) supervisors reported the staffing of the positions. While 2 (40%) WEOHs, 3 (75%), WEOPs and majority 9 (69.2%) supervisors complained they were not staffed. The study result signifies the gap in human resource. This may bring about a problem in the planning of school facilities.

The second item of this table treats how lack of experts in the positions were delt with. in this regard of the respondents who complained about the absence of experts majority of the wereda respondents ranked sharing the work as first while others rated for forming committee and deligating second and third respectively. This again shows as there is lack of responsible person for the post which may cause ineffectiveness, delay on the work to be done.

Item, 3 of table 19 shows respondents view about the team work of school board and WEO in the planning of school facilities. In relation to this few 1 (25%) WEOPs and nearly half of the supervisors 6(46.2%) confirmed to be good. Whereas, majority WEOHs, WEOPs and more than (50%) of the supervisors refuted the practice was poor. Apart from this, from schools respondents 56 (53.8%) teachers discussed as the team work between the two parties were good while nearly half of the teachers objected it. Form this one can understand there is a problem in the activity of the two parties which may end up in poor performance of facility planning and management as well.

With the final item presented to school principals and vice principals on table 19 regarding the technical support of WEO, 3(13%) principals and 11(57.9%) vice principals viewed the support was good and very good while majority principals 20(86.9%) and 8(42.1%) vice principals declared the technical support was poor. This forces one to deduce that there is a problem of technical support form the WEO. This may hinder the overall management practice of school facilities and affect negatively the teaching learning process.

Table 20: The Technical Support in Facilities Planning

No	Question items	Wereda Respondents						School Respondents					
		WEOHs		WEOPs		Supervisor		School Principals		Vice Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
20	1. Does the technical design of school facilities take into account the diversity of whether?												
	A. Yes	2	40	2	50	4	30.8	4	30.8	15	78.9	43	41.3
	b. No	3	60	1	25	9	69.2	9	69.2	4	21.1	61	58.7
	C. None	-		1	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	2. If your answer for question No. (1) is 'No', why?												
	A. The architects do not now the situation	1	14.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	20.9
	B. Because not to violet the standard set	2	28.6	-	-	1	10	1	10	2	20	20	23
	C. Lack of technical control during the curriculum	3	42.9	1	50	6	60	6	60	4	40	19	22.1
	D. Due to the capacity of local contractors	1	14.3	-	-	3	30	3	30	4	40	21	24.4
	E. None respondents	-	-	1	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	9.3
	Total	**7**	**100**	**2**	**100**	**10**	**100**	**10**	**100**	**10**	**100**	**86**	**100**
	3. To what extent the technical support make a difference in adapting schools facilities to education needs?												
	A. Very Good	1	20	-	-	2	15.4	1	4.3	4	21.1	6	5.8
	B. Good	-	-	-	-	2	15.4	9	39.1	3	15.8	30	28.8
	C. Poor	4	80	4	100	6	46.2	9	39.1	6	31.6	39	37.5
	D. Very Poor	-	-	-	-	3	23.1	4	17.4	6	31.6	29	27.9
	Total	**4**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	4. Have school constructions in your district completed before the academic year?												
	A. Yes	1	20	3	75	3	23.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	B. No	4	80	1	25	10	76.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**
	5. If your answer for question No. (4) is 'No' why?												
	A. Lack of prior planning	3	23.1	-	-	2	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
	B. Budget delay	2	15.4	1	50	4	20	-	-	-	-	-	-
	C. Lack of technical support form WEO	3	23.1	-	-	4	20	-	-	-	-	-	-
	D. Lack of capacity of coordinating	4	30.8	1	50	6	30	-	-	-	-	-	-
	E. Shortage of Budget	1	77			4	20	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	**13**	**100**	**2**	**100**	**20**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**

Item 1 in table 20 investigates whether the design of school facilities account for the diversity of weather or not, regarding this, of the total Wereda respondents 2(40%) WEOHs, 2(50%) WEOPs and 4(30.8%) supervisors confirmed to be true whereas, 3(60%) WEOHs 1(25%) WEOPs and 9(69.2%) supervisors condemned the situation and 1(25%) WEOP is none respondent. Apart from this of school respondents nearly half principals, majority vice principals and 43(41.3%) teachers asserted in favor of the coherence between technical design and diversity of weather while relatively 12(52.2%) of school principals, 4(21.1%) vice principals and 61(58.7%) teachers claimed the fact. From this it is plausible to conclude that technical design of school facilities were not in line with diversity needs classrooms and other facilities constructed and made in same standard with out considering diversity of weather and individuals difference. This may make facilities not to withstand the wear and tear of weather and short lived. Which may create wastage on resources moreover it may also affect students' health.

Item 2 of table 20 is about possible raised by the respondents as a problem for the technical design of facilities, in relation to this, of wereda respondents majority WEOHs and supervisors reported lack of technical control during construction as the first reasons while majority teachers, principals, and few WEOHs, supervisors and vice principals rated not to violet the standard set and due to the capacity of local contractors as equally possible reasons however, a good number of teachers, few principals and WEOHs reported lack of architects knowledge about the locality as the last possible problem.

Item 3 of the above table deals with the extent to which technical support given to schools help to adapt school facilities to educational needs, in this regard, few WEOHs and 4(30.3%) supervisors reported the adaptation was good and very good however, 4(80%) WEOHs, all WEOPs and majority 9(69.3%) supervisors stood against. On the other hand, more than 50 percent school respondents of the three groups revealed there were no support of adaptation of school facilitates to educational needs. The study result clearly shows there is a problem of adapting school facilities to the changes in the curriculum. This may hinder the application of various methods of teaching that is incorporated as a new input in the curriculum which may in turn negatively influence the teaching learning.

Item 4 of the above table seeks information whether construction of school facilities inline with the academic schedule or not, in relation to this, out of wereda respondents except for 3 (75%) WEOPS and 1 (20%) WEOH and 3 (23.1%) supervisors who said constructions of schools been completed on time majority respondents of WEOHs and supervisors refused the timely completion of school constructions. The statistical data clearly signifies how sever the problem is. As a result of this delay, there is wastage of instructional time that may affect students' achievement.

The last item of this table depicts the reason why school facility constructions are delayed, in this regard of respondents who said no 4(30.1%) WEOHs, 1(50%) WEOPs and 6(30%) supervisors reported lack of capacity of coordinating as the first reason for the delay in school facilities while lack of technical support from WEO and Budget delay is rated equally as second and shortage of budget and lack of prior planning reported as the third reason. From this one can understand as there is a problem of delay in construction due to lack of capacity, technical support and prior planning. This may create wastage in resources and affects the teaching learning.

Table 21: The Finance of School Facilities

No	Items	Wereda Respondents						School respondents					
	1. What is the source of your budget facility planning?	WEOH		WEOP		Supervisor		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
21	a. government grant												
	b. community contribution	4	22.2	4	33.3	6	17.1	10	21.3	6	14	41	23.3
	c. Donor support	5	27.7	4	33.3	13	37.1	16	34	17	39.5	67	38.1
	d. internal revenue	4	22.2	-	-	6	17.1	1	2.1	2	4.6	28	15.9
	e. others	5	27.7	4	33.3	10	28.6	20	42.6	18	41.9	40	22.7
	Total	**18**	**100**	**12**	**100**	**35**	**100**	**47**	**100**	**43**	**100**	**176**	**100**
	2. How does your school get government grant budget												
	a. In cash	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	b. In kind	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	-	19	-	104	-
	c. Response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	**23**	-	**19**	-	**104**	-
	2. How do you evaluate the timely release of government budget in your district?												
	a. V. good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	b. Good	2	40	2	50	3	23.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	c. Poor	3	60	1	75	6	46.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
	d. V. Poor	-	-	1	25	4	30.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
	e. No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3. If your response for item no (3) is poor or v. poor what is the reason?												
	a. lack of capacity	-		-		5	31.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
	b. work load	1	25	2	50	2	12.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	c. Lack of adequate prior planning	2	50	2	50	4	25	-	-	-	-	-	-
	d. Negligence	-		-	-	5	31.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
	e. Other	1	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	**4**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**16**	**100**	-	-	-	-	-	-
	4. Does your district use the granted budget for what it has been all crated for?												
	a. Yes	3	60	4	100	1	7.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
	b. No	1	20	-	-	12	92.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
	c. No response	1	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Do WEO financing have a problem in school facilities gunmen												
	a. Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-	52.2	-	15	78.9	83	79.8
	b. No	-	-	-	-	-	-	47.8	-	4	21.1	19	18.3
	c. No response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.9
	Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	**100**	-	**100**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	5. For a better facility management which level of financing do you from these two choices?												
	a. School financing	2	40	1	25	11	84.6	20	87	13	68.4	83	79.8
	b. Wereda financing	3	60	3	75	1	7.7	3	13	6	31.6	21	20.2
	c. No response	-		-	-	1	7.7	-	-	-		-	-
	Total	**5**	**10**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**

Table 21 item 1 is about the sources of school budget, in relation to this, wereda respondents put internal revenue and community contribution as equally important sources of school budget while they place government grant and donor support as the second. Wereda education planners' also rated equal point for internal revenue, community support and government grant by excluding donor support from the options.

Supervisors on their part reported internal revenue, community contribution and government grant as first; second, and third school budget sources respectively. On the other hand from school respondents, principals put internal revenue in the first place and ordered community contribution, government grant and donor support as second, third and fourth. While teachers rated community contribution as first government grant as second internal revenue, third and donor support as fourth. From this different way of putting sources of school budget one can understand that schools rely on different sources of budget based on their locality social and economic situation with some amount of government assistance for all. This might create differences among schools.

As can be seen in table 21 item 2 about how schools receive their government grant budget almost all school principals, vice principals and teacher respondents synonymously asserted as they receive their schools government grant budget in kind.

Item 3 is about the timely release of government budget, in relation to this 40% percent WEOH's, 50% WEOPs and 23.07% supervisors reported as good while majority of the WEOHs, WEOPs and supervisors complained about delays in budget WEOHs and WEOPs respondents reasoned out lack of adequate prior planning and work load as the first and second reason for the problem of budget delay on the other hand, supervisors selected lack of capacity and negligence as number one problem, lack of prior planning and work load as their second and third reason. The information from the respondents asserted as there was a gap in the scanty school budget administration which may create delay in facilities supply for proper teaching learning.

Item 1 of table 21 investigates whether budget has been used for what it has allocated for, in this regard, 60% of WEOHs and all the WEOPs confirmed as budget is used only for what it has been allocated for however, 20% WEOHs and 92.3% of supervisors objected the idea and revealed as sometimes the budget allocated been converted to travel cost and other budget headings. From this, one can deduce that budget is not used for the purpose it has been allocate for. This may be difficult to bring about sustainable school facilities improvement and becomes a bottleneck to supply the demand for primary education in the run to achieve the Millennium development goal.

For the question presented on table 21 of item 6 to this group of respondents to investigate whether or not WEO financing school budget creates a problem in their school facilities planning, or not of the total school respondents 11(52%) principals, 15(78.9%) vice principals and

83(79.8%) teachers said yes whereas 11(47.8%) principals, 4(21.1%) and 19(18.3%) teachers reacted against.

Moreover, in further inquiry made togather respondents preference on table 21 item seven among the two financing systems (school or wereda financing) for the betterment of school facilities planning, except for 3(60%) WEOHs 3(75%) WEOPs, 1(7.7%) supervisor, from wereda and 3(13%) principals, 6(31.8%) v. principals and 21(20.2%) teachers from school, who favored WEO financing, majority 11(84.6%) supervisor, 20(87%) school principals, 13(68.4%) vice principals and 83(79.8%) teacher respondents depicted as school financing helps to easily identify facilities needs, avoid delay in purchasing develop sense of ownership in their further comments. On the other hand those who said WEO financing is better put for ward cost reduction lack of human resource at school bulk purchase as a reason for their preference. From this one can clearly understand how WEO financing school budget made a problem on schools day to day activities and the need to change this financing situation.

Table 22: The Purchase of School Facilities

No	Item	Wereda Respondents						School Respondents						Df	Table value of χ^2	Calculated value of $D\chi^2$
		WEOH		WEOP		Supervisor		S. Principal		V. Principal		Teachers				
22	1. How do you evaluate the purchase of WEO- in terms of the school needs?	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
	Buying the amount required															
	A. V. good		-	-	-	1	7.7	-	-	2	10.5	-	-			
	B. Good	4	80	3	75	3	23.1	3	13	4	21.1	22	2-1.2			
	C. Poor	1	20	1	25	5	38.5	17	73.9	9	47.4	57	54.8			
	D. V. poor	-	-	-		4	30.8	3	13	4	21.1	25	24			
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**15**	**25**	**29.57**
	2. Buying quality requested															
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	-	-		-	2	1.9			
	B. Good	1	20	1	25	3	23.1	4	17.4	6	31.6	33	31.7			
	C. Poor	3	60	3	75	7	53.8	14	60.4	5	26.3	55	52.9			
	D. V. poor	1	20	-	-	2	15.4	5	21.7	8	42.1	14	13.5			
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**15**	**25**	**24.4**
	3. Buying at a reasonable price															
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	-	-	2	10.5	19	18.3			
	B. Good	4	80	4	100	4	30.8	15	65.2	9	47.4	24	23.1			
	C. Poor	1	20	-	-	6	46.2	3	13	6	31.6	46	44.2			
	D. V. poor	-	-	-	-	2	15.4	5	21.7	2	10.5	15	14.4			
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**15**	**25**	**27.97**
	4. The timeliness of the purchase															
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
	B. Good	1	20	1	25	1	7.7	-	-	4	21.1	-	-			
	C. Poor	3	60	3	75	3	23.1	15	65.2	9	47.4	-	-			
	D. V. poor	1	20	-	-	9	69.2	8	34.8	6	31.6					
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**-**	**-**	**10**	**18.31**	**10.62**
	5. Fairness of distribution															
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	2	1.9			
	B. Good	1	20	3	75	3	23.1	10	43.5	6	31.6	32	30.8			
	C. Poor	3	60	1	25	7	53.8	12	52.2	11	57.9	51	49			
	D. V. poor	1	20	-	-	3	21.1	1	4.3	2	-	19	18.3			
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**105**	**104**	**100**	**15**	**25**	**10.3**

Table 22 item 1 conveys about the purchase of WEO in relation to the school needs regarding buying the amount requested, of the total wereda respondents 4(80%) WEOHs. 3(75%) WEOPs and 4(30.8%) supervisors asserted buying the amount of materials facilities school required was fair whereas 1(20%) WEOHs 1(25%) WEOPs rated poor and majority 9(69%) supervisors both poor and v. poor. On the other hand, of school respondents 3(13%) principals 6(31.6%) vice principals and 22(21.2%) teachers confirmed as buying the amount requested is good however, 20(86.9%) principals 13(68.5%) V. principals and 82(78.8%) teachers claimed the exercise. Moreover, 4(21.1%) are non respondents. Therefore, the result of the study indicates that there is a problem in buying the amount schools requested which inturn affects directly or indirectly the teaching learning process.

Item 2 of this table shows about buying quality items requested in relation to this of the total wereda respondents 1(20%) WEOHs, 1(25%) WEOPs and 4(30.8%) supervisors asserted as the items bought are of good quality, however majority 4(80%) WEOHs, 3(75%) WEOPs and 9(69.2%) supervisors claimed the quality of the items. On the other hand, 4(17.4%) principals, 6(31.6%) v. principals and 35(33.6%) teachers reported as quality items were bought for school. Whereas a good number of 19(82.6%) principals, 13(68.4%) v. principals and 69(64.4%) teachers claimed the practice. Based on the data it is safe to conclude that there is a problem in buying quality items needed this may also ends up in wastage of budget and increase surplus of unwanted facilities burden and personnel's as well as the space where the facilities or materials to be stored.

Item 3 of this table depicts about the buying price in this regard, of the total wereda respondents, majority WEOHs all WEOPs and 5(38.5%) supervisors reported that the price of items is reasonable. However, few WEOHs and 8(61.6%) supervisors complained it. At the same time of school respondents 15(65.2%) principals 11(57.9%) v. principals and 43(41.4%) teachers confirmed that purchase is at a reasonable price, nevertheless, 8(34.7%) principals 8(42.1%) v. principals and 61(58.6%) teachers reported to be poor. From data observed one can see a gap in buying at reasonable price. This may also have a devastating effect on the scanty educational budget.

Item 4 in table 22 indicates the timeliness of purchase, in relation to this, of total wereda respondents very few respondents of the three groups rated good whereas, majority WEOHs, WEOPs and supervisors condemned it as poor and v. poor. Apart from this, except for 4(21.1%) v. principals, who reported to be good majority of the school respondents asserted about the delay

in purchase. Based on the findings of the study it is acceptable to say there is a critical problem that may also have an impact on the timely provision of educational facilities supplies.

The final item of this table shows about the fairness of distribution, in this regard, of the wereda respondent few WEOHs, supervisors and 3(75%) WEOPs rated in favor of fair distribution whereas 4(80%) principals, 1(25%) WEOPs and 10(76.9%) supervisors reported in contrast to it. On the other hand, of school respondents except for 10(43.5%) principals, 6(31.6%) v. principals and 34(32.7%) teachers all the rest confirmed there was no fair distribution. Thus, from the data presented one can observe as there is a problem that may create misallocation of resources which may inturn bring about wastage of resources. On the whole the purchasing of school supplies had a problem in addition to the percentage result and the chi-square test confirmed as there is a common perception among the views of respondents on the problems of buying quality items, the timeliness of purchase, and fair distribution as the chi-square value is less than the table value. However, this is not true for item one and item 4 is about buying the amount required, and buying at reasonable price as the chi-square test result is greater than the table value.

Table 23: Maintenance of School Facilities

No	Question Items	Wereda Respondents						School respondents					
		WEOH		WEOP		Supervisor		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
23	1. Do you plan for school facility maintenance in your district school?												
	A. Yes	4	80	4	100	8	61.5	23	100	19	100	81	[illegible]
	B. No	1	20	-	-	4	30.8	-	-	-	-	23	22.1
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	2. If your answer for question No. (6.1) is 'yes', what type of maintenance?												
	A. Follow up maintenance	-	-	-	-	2	12.5	2	8.5		-	16	19.8
	B. Maintenance in specific time interval.	-	-	4	100	3	37.5	6	26.9	7	-	28	34.6
	C. For maintenance after break down.	4	100	-	-	4	50	15	65.2	12	-	37	45.7
	Total	**4**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**8**	**100**	**23**		**19**	**-**	**81**	**100**
	3. How often do maintenance of your school facilities been done?												
	A. Once a year	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	17.4	4	21.1	10	12.3
	B. Twice a year	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	9.9
	C. Depending on situation	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	52.6	15	78.9	63	[illegible]
	D. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
	Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**81**	**100**
	4. Have the school board teams been trained on how to handle facilities?												
	A. Yes	3	60	3	75	7	53.8	23	100	19	100	85	[illegible]
	B. No	2	40	1	25	6	46.2	-	-	-	-	19	18.3
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	5. How often do you give orientation or training?												
	A. Once a year	1	33.3	-	-	2	28.6	6	26.1	6	31.6	29	34.1
	B. Twice a year	-	-	1	33.3	2	28.6	-	-	-	-	12	14.1
	C. Depending on situation	2	66.6	2	66.6	3	42.9	13	56.5	9	47.4	44	51.8
	D. Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	17.4	4	21	-	-
	Total		**100**	**3**	**100**	**7**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**85**	**100**

Table 23 item 1 is about maintenance planning, regarding this, of wereda respondents 4(80%) WEOHs, 4(100%) WEOPs and 8(61.5%) supervisors asserted as they have a plan. However, 4(30.8%) supervisors denied as there was no plan for maintenance. On the other hand all principals and vice principals and 81(77.9%) teachers confirmed there was a plan while few number of teachers reported there was no. From the observation, one can understand that maintenance planning is going on well in schools however, those who said no claimed shortage of budget as a main reason.

The second item on the table 23 discusses about the type of maintenance, in relation to this, out of the respondents who said there was a maintenance planning for the question offered as to what type of maintenance they practice, all WEOHs respondents and majority supervisors reported as they use emergency maintenance while at the same time WEOPs reported periodic maintenance to be the first and few supervisors favored follow up maintenance as the second option. Moreover, all school respondents synonymously ranked emergency and periodic maintenance the first and second respectively while principals and teacher add follow up as the third choice. Therefore, the study result shows that emergency maintenance is the most applicable type of maintenance in the sample area schools. This shows maintenance is done after facilities are damaged and collapsed which again requires a large sum of educational budget, time and human resources. This may bring about budget shortage.

Item 3 of table 23 indicates the frequency of maintenance. To this effect, of those who said there was maintenance, few school principals, vice principals and teachers reported in favor of yearly maintenance while majority principals, vice principals and teachers asserted as maintenance is held depending on situation. From this it is safe to deduce that maintenance of schools is done inconsistently depending on the situation. This may create damage and deterioration moreover the maintenance to recur a large amount of sum.

Item 4 on same table investigates whether or not training is held on how to handle facilities or not in this regard of Wereda respondents 3(60%) WEOHs 3(75%) WEOPs and 7(53.8%) supervisors reported yes, however 2(40%) WEOPs, 1(25%) WEOPs and 6(46.2%) supervisors denied the delivery of the training. On the other hand out of school respondents all principals, vice principals and majority of teachers asserted the presence of training however few 19(18.3%) teachers objected there was no. From the data observed one can understand the status of training in schools were in a better condition even though it is not perfect.

Item 5 on this table discusses about the frequency of training. Out of wereda respondent who said 'yes' majority respondents rated as training been given depending on a situation. However, few respondents reported 'once a year' as their second choice. On the other hand school respondents also followed similar rrating. Hence, the results of the study show that the dependency of maintenance on situation may bring about inconsistency and work load on practitioners. Moreover, creates the deterioration of facilities.

The last item of this table presents the training about handling school facilities. For this, wereda respondents who said no ranked their possible reasons out of the choices been given, based on this WEOHs rated for failure of planning as the only reason while WEOPs and supervisors ranked failure of prior planning and lack of logistic as equally important reasons for the problem. Besides school respondents commented as orientation been given when problems are encountered. Therefore the information obtained shows there is a problem capacity to plan training and orientations ahead of time. This may bring about wastage of resources.

Table 24: Availability of Custodial Service in School

No	Question item	School Respondents						Df	Table value of X^2	Calculated Value DX^2
		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers				
		No	%	No	%	No	%			
24	1. Do you allocate budget for cleaning equipment?									
	A. yes	5	21.7	-	-	53	51			
	B. No	18	78.3	19	100	41	39.4			
	C. none	-	-	-		10	9.6			
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**4**	**9.49**	**20.53**
	2. Who cleans classrooms?									
	A. Employed custodians	2	8.7	-	-	4	3.8			
	B. Students in turn	21	91.3	19	100	94	90.4			
	C. Delinquent students	-	-	-	-	6	5.8			
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**4**	**9.49**	**9.15**
	2. Who cleans toilets?									
	A. Employed custodians	2	8.7	-	-	4	3.8			
	B. Students in turn	14	60.9	11	57.9	35	33.7			
	C. Delinquent students	7	30.4	8	42.1	65	62.5			
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**4**	**9.49**	**29.36**
	3. How often do the toilet been cleaned?									
	A. daily	-	-	-	-	2	1.9			
	B. In 2-3 days	-	-	-	-	10	9.6			
	C. In 4-5 days	1	4.3	7	36.8	11	10.6			
	D. Once a week	22	95.7	12	63.2	81	77.8			
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**4**	**9.49**	**7.7**
	4. How often do the class been cleaned?									
	A. Daily	12	52.2	9	47.4	37	35.5			
	B. In 2-3 days	2	17.4	2	10.5	6	5.8			
	C. In 4-5 days	-	-	-	-	17	16.3			
	D. In a week	7	30.4	8	42.1	40	38.5			
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**	**6**	**12.59**	**15.65**

Table 24 item 1 investigates whether budget is allocated for cleaning equipment or not in this regard of the total school respondents 5(21.7%) principals and 53(51%) teachers said yes however, 18(78.3%) principals, 19(100%) v. principals, 41(39.4%) teachers reported no and 10(9.6%) teachers are none respondents. For item 1 the responses of principals and teachers seems a bit contradictory. This may because principals know as there is no government budget allocated for cleaning schools. However in some schools students are asked to contribute voluntarily for cleaning equipment by the home room teachers the researcher believes as teachers are talking about this budget. The chi-square test showed as there was a significance difference among the responses of the respondents as the cultivated value 20.53 is greater than table value 9.47 at 4 degree of freedom and $\alpha 0.05$ degree of significance. From this it is possible to conclude that there is a problem in obtaining cleaning materials this may affect the health and safety of schools

Item 2 of this table presents by whom classrooms been cleaned regarding this, majority of the principals, all vice principals and 83(79.8%) teachers reported that classrooms been cleaned by students in turn while few number of principals and teachers informed as it was done by employed custodians and 6(5.8%) teachers revealed that it was performed by delinquent students. On top of this the chi-square test for the item pointed out that there was a common understanding about the way the classrooms been cleaned as the calculated value 9.15 is in the domain of the table value at 4 degree of freedom in the α 0.05 significance level. Therefore, the study result shows that classroom cleaning mainly been done by students however, using students may create a problem on the quality service they are rendering which may in turn might reduce the long life of classroom facilities. Moreover, it may also affect students' health.

Item 3 of this table conveys the cleaning of toilets. In relation to this, of the school respondents 14(60.9) principals, 11(57.9%) V. principals and 33(31.7%) teachers reported as toilets been cleaned by students in turn however, 7(30.4%) principals 8(42.1%) V. principals and 55(52.9%) teachers revealed it has been cleaned by delinquent students and 2(8.7%) principals and 4(3.8%) teachers asserted it is done by employed custodians. From the study result can see as there is a discrepancy between the responses of the principals and teachers. The researcher assumes as the discrepancy is because using delinquent students for cleaning is not acceptable therefore, principals were not honest not to be accountable while teachers telling the truth. Generally, this shows how little emphasis is given for the sanitation of school facilities moreover, this ill practice of giving sanitary work as punishment have a problem for the work to be done and for the moral

of the students too. However, the chi-square test for the item conveyed there was no relationship between the responses of the respondents.

Item 3 of this table is about the frequency of classroom sanitation. To this effect out of the total respondents a good number of principals and V. principal and about 35% of teachers confirmed that classrooms been cleaned daily however, 7(30.4%) principals 8(42.1%) V. principals and 39(37.5%) teachers asserted as it has been cleaned weekly. Besides few number of principals, V. principals and teachers informed that classroom cleaning is done in two-three days. Moreover, the chi-square test about the frequency of classroom cleaning portrayed as there were a common consensus among the views of the respondents. From the data prevailing it is fair to conclude that there is inconsistency in cleaning. This again in the first place reduces the classroom facilities life span apart from this affect the students' health

Item 4 of this table investigates how often toilets been cleaned. In relation to this of the total school respondents majority of principals, vice principals and teachers confirmed as toilets been cleaned once a week while relatively few 1(4.3%) principals 7(36.8%) vice principals and 11(10.6%) teachers asserted 4-5 days. Moreover 10(9.6%) and 2(1.9%) teachers reported that toilets been cleaned two-three days and on daily basis respectively. From this one can understand that in how long toilets been cleaned. This length may create a problem on the facilities and students health in a compound relatively large number of school community reside. Nevertheless the chi-square test depicted as there was significant difference among the responses of the respondents as the calculated value is greater than the table value.

Table 25: The Maintenance of Some Selected School Facilities

No	Items	Wereda Respondents						School Respondents								
		WEDHs		WEDPs		Supervisors		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers		Of	Table value χ^2	Calculated value of $D\chi^2$
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%			
25	1. Painting walls and corridors															
	A. Very Good	-	-	1	25	-	-	1	4.3	2	10.5	12	11.5			
	B. Good	2	40	3	75	5	38.5	3	13	2	10.5	27	26			
	C. Poor	3	60	-	-	5	38.5	17	73.9	7	36.8	16	15.4			
	D. Very Good	-	-	-	-	3	23.1	2	8.7	8	42.1	49	47.1			
	Total	5	100	4	100	13	100	23	100	14	100	104	100	15	25.00	45.82
	2. Maintenance of furniture															
	A. Very Good	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	-	-	-	-	11	10.6			
	B. Good	1	20	1	25	7	53.8	7	30.4	4	21.1	33	31.7			
	C. Poor	4	80	3	75	5	38.5	14	60.9	13	68.4	42	40.4			
	D. Very Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	8.7	2	10.5	18	17.3			
	Total	5	100	4	100	13	100	23	100	14	100	104	100	15	25.00	43.87
	3. Maintenance of window and doors															
	A. Very Good	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	-	-	-	-	10	9.6			
	B. Good	1	20	2	50	7	53.8	9	39.1	9	47.4	35	33.7			
	C. Poor	4	80	2	50	5	38.5	10	43.5	8	42.1	40	38.5			
	D. Very Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	17.4	2	10.5	19	18.3			
	Total	5	100	4	100	13	100	23	100	14	100	104	100	15	25.00	7.74
	4. Shade plants															
	A. Very Good	-	-	-	-	2	15.4	5	21.7	6	31.6	10	9.6			
	B. Good	3	60	3	75	4	30.8	4	17.4	4	21.4	63	60.6			
	C. Poor	2	40	1	25	6	46.2	14	60.9	5	26.3	24	23.1			
	D. Very Good	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	-	-	4	21.4	7	6.7			
	Total	5	100	4	100	13	100	23	100	14	100	104	100	15	25.00	34.31
	5. Fence															
	A. Very Good	-	-	-	-	3	23.1	3	13	2	10.5	10	9.6			
	B. Good	5	100	4	100	7	53.8	14	60.9	17	25.5	28	26.9			
	C. Poor	-	-	-	-	3	23.1	6	26.1	-	-	36	34.6			
	D. Very Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30	28.8			
	Total	5	100	4	100	13	100	23	100	14	100	104	100	15	25.00	35.14

Item 1 in table 25 depicts about the painting of walls and corridors. For this, of wereda respondents 2(40%) WEOHs, 4(100%) WEOPS 5(38.5%) supervisors confirmed as the painting of walls and corridors of their school been good. However, 3(60%) WEOHs and 8(61.6%) supervisors revealed decorating walls and corridors were poor and very poor. On the other hand of the total school respondents 4(17.3%) teachers asserted it was good and V. good nevertheless majority of the principals, vice principals and teachers complained about the poor and V. poor status of school walls. From the result of the study, it is fair to say that there is a problem in

painting school walls and corridors. This may force students to learn in unattractive school environment which might again negatively affect the teaching learning.

With regard to item 2 about the maintenance of furniture few WEOHs and 8(61.5%) supervisors explained the maintenance of furniture was good and above. However, 4(80%), WEOHs 3(75%) WEOPs and 5(38.5%) supervisors claimed to be poor and V. poor. Apart from this, of the total school respondents 7(30.4%) principals 4(21.19%) vice principals and 44(42.3%) teachers reported the maintenance was good and above nevertheless majority of principals, V. principals and teachers complained about the poor status of the maintenance. From this argument one can clearly visualize that the maintenance of furniture is in a better condition even though it is not perfect. This may help students to use well maintained desks and benches and others which may positively assists the classroom teaching by reducing misbehavior and strengthening attention.

Item 3 of table 25 portrays the maintenance of windows and doors in this regard out of the wereda respondents few WEOHs, half of the WEOPs and 8 (61.5%) supervisors asserted the maintenance of windows and doors is good and V. good nevertheless a reasonable number of WEOHs half of the WEOPs and 5(38.5%) supervisors objected the activity. Moreover from the total school respondents nearly 4% principals, v. principals and teachers reported to be good and V. good however nearly 60% principals, vice principals and teachers rejected it as poor and V. poor. From the study result point of view there is an indication of problem in maintaining windows and doors. This may make students to feel uncomfortable in class rooms and above all expose the students to draft air which might again make students in attentive.

Item 4 of this table on its part shows the status of shade plants in the school compounds in relation to this, out of the total wereda respondents 3(60%) WEOHS, 3(75%) WEOPS and 6(46.2%) supervisors' affirmed shade plants been maintained good and V. good in the school compounds however, almost nearly half respondents condemned the activity. Moreover nearly 9(30%) principals, 10(53%) vice principals and 73(70.2%) teachers reported good and V. good whereas, 14 (60.9%) principals, 9(47.7%) vice principals and 31(29.8%) teachers revealed the poor and V. poor status of shade plants in the school. Based on the data one can deduce that the handling of shade plants is fair however, there is a need to be strengthened. The presence of shade trees may protect primary school children from the scorching sun and weather calamities.

The final item of table 25 discusses about the maintenance of fence regarding this majority wereda and school respondents asserted the maintenance of fence was a good whereas, only very

few supervisors from wereda, few principal, and majority 66(63.4%) teachers condemned the practice about maintenance of fences in schools. On the whole, data shows that maintenance of school fence is in a better situation which may contribute to safeguard facilities and reduce interruptions during lessons.

Table 26: The Controlling of School Facilities

No	Question item	Respondents					
		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
26	1. Have the facilities in your school been delivered on records?						
	A. yes	20	87	17	89.5	91	87.5
	B. No	3	13	2	10.5	13	12.5
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	2. Have the facilities been coded?						
	A. Yes	11	47.8	17	89.5	65	62.5
	B. no	12	52.2	2	10.5	35	37.5
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	3. How do you evaluate the custody of your school facility?						
	A. V. good	7	30.4	4	21.1	11	10.6
	B. Good	6	26.1	10	52.6	39	37.5
	C. Poor	10	43.5	3	15.8	54	51.9
	D. V. Poor	-	-	2	10.5	-	-
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	4. If your answer for question no (8.3) is Poor or V. Poor guarded the reason is						
	A. lack of school budget to pay for guards	6	60	4	80	32	59.3
	B. lack of management control	3	30	1	20	22	40.1
	C. mention if any	1	10	-	-	-	-
	Total	**10**	**100**	5	100	**54**	**100**

Refurbishing school facilities will require a large amount of sum. This again demand proper handling and controlling to avoid wastage, regarding this table 8 depicts how respondents view facilities control of their schools. Item one is about receiving school facilities, in relation to this, 20(87%) principals, 17(89.5%) V. principals and 91(87.5%) teachers confirmed as facilities received on a legal basis while 3(13%) principals, 2(10.5%) V. principals and 13(12.5%) teachers reported the contrary. From this one can conclude that there is a better situation that may enhance effective control.

Table 26 item 2 of the above table discusses about the coding of school facilities, for this 11(47.8%) principals, 17(89.5%) vice principals and 63(60.6%) teacher respondents asserted as coding of school facilities was done properly. In contrast 12(52.2%) principal, 2(10.5%) vice principals and 35(33.7%) teachers conveyed as coding of facilities was poorly exercised due to lack of experience, and high turn over of school management team. For item 2 of table 26 data findings show as there is a gap between the responses of principals and teachers and V.

principals. The researcher believes this may because of lack of knowledge on the part of v. principals and teachers about the coding and may be due to the carelessness of some respondents in filling the questionnaire. Generally although the number of respondents who asserted the poor level of coding be seen below average. This amount even may affect the controlling of facilities. Therefore, from this one can see as there is a gap in coding facilities. It is visible from this that not coding school facilities negatively affect proper handling and utilization which may also open the door for vandalism, misplacement and the like.

Similarly, for the last item on the table 26 about the commitment of school guards on facilities control nearly more than half of principal, majority of vice principals and half of the teacher respondents rated very good and good while nearly half of the principals, few vice principals and more than half of the teachers reported to be poor. Moreover those who rated guarding of facilities as poor denoted their reasons ranking lack of budget to employ more guards, lack of control and poor salary from 1 to 3 respectively for the problem.

In a nutshell, controlling of school facilities in the sample area is questionable this may also exposes school properties to theft and vandalism.

Table 27: The Wereda Respondents View about the Roles and Responsibilities of School Decision Makers

No	Items		Wreda Respondents																			
			WEOHs							WEOPs							Supervisors					
			1	2	3	4	5	6	T	1	2	3	4	5	6	T	1	2	3	4	5	6	T
1	Planning of new school facilities	No	4	5	4	4	3	3	23	3	1	1	1	1	1	8	5	7	9	6	3	2	32
		%	17.4	21.7	17.4	17.4	13	13	100	37.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	100	15.6	21.9	28.1	18.8	9.4	6.3	100
2	Budget generation	No	4	5	5	5	4	4	27	-	3	4	2	1	1	11	5	11	10	7	7	4	44
		%	14.8	18.5	18.5	18.5	14.8	14.8	100	-	27.3	36.4	18.18	9.1	9.1	100	11.4	25	22.7	15.9	15.9	9.1	100
		%	13.6	18.18	22.7	22.7	13.6	9.1	100	33.3	33.3	16.6	16.6	-	-	100	20.7	24.1	31	17.2	3.4	3.4	100
3	Communicating school facilities plan	No	3	3	4	4	4	3	22	2	3	2	3	-	-	10	5	7	6	9	2	1	30
		%	23.6	13.6	18.12	21.7	18.18	13.6	100	20	30	20	30	-	-	100	16.6	23.3	20	30	6.6	3.3	100
4	Purchasing school facilities	No	4	5	4	5	1	1	19	1	2	1	2	1	-	7	3	6	10	4	1	1	25
		%	21	26.5	21	23.8	5.3	5.3	100	14.3	28.6	14.3	28.6	14.3	-	100	12	24	40	16	4	4	100
5	Planning maintenance	No	4	5	5	5	1	1	21	-	4	3	3	-	-	10	3	6	8	6	3	3	29
		%	19	23.2	23.2	20.8	4.8	4.8	100	-	40	30	30	-	-	100	10.3	20.7	27.6	20.7	10.3	10.3	100
6	Controlling school facilities	No	5	4	5		3	3	25	-	-	3	3	3	-	9	6	6	8	8	4	2	34
		%	20	16	20		12	12	100	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3	-	100	17.6	17.6	23.5	23.5	11.8	5.9	100

1 = WEO 2 = School Board 3 = PTA

4 = School principal 5 = Teachers 6 = Students

Table 27 shows that respondents' view about who has been more responsible for the managerial functions listed in the table. In this, item one deals with the planning of new school facilities. In this regard, of Wereda respondents 5(21.7%) WEOHs rated school board to be the first while they reported WEO, PTA' and school principals equally the second. On the other hand 3(37.5%) WEOPs ranked, WEO to be the first responsible body in the planning of new schools. Apart from this, of the total respondent 9(28.1%) supervisors rated PTA to be the first and 7(21.9%) school bard the second.

The data obtained showed that there was no common understanding as to whose responsibility the functions were. This may because of lack of information communication. Wereda respondents were the high level practitioners at local level. Therefore, this type of difference may negatively affects the management practices of facilities planning.

For the second item on the table 27 is about budget generation majority WEOPs pointed out school Boards PTAs and school principals as equally important bodies in the generation of budget. While WEOPs rated PTAs, school board and school principal to be the first, second and third. Supervisors on their part selected school board and PTA the first and second in the budget generation. From the respondents rating one can understand as there was a gap in conceptualizing the, mandates given by MOE to each managing body of the school. This again will bring about lack of accountability which affects the work.

Item 3 of this table investigates communicating plans as to whose responsibility was in this WEOHs put school board the first and PTA's the second whereas WEOPs rated school Board and school principals to be equally more responsible. On top of this supervisors viewed this job mainly of PTAs and secondly of school board.

Item 4 of this table also portrays who is more responsible for the purchase of items. In this regard, majority WEOHs placed school board to be the first and WEO, PTAs and school principals been the second. Whereas WEOPs gave equal responsibility to school board and school principals. Apart from this, a good number of supervisors rated PTA to be the first and school board the second. For item 5 of this table the same been followed. From this one can observe as there is a difference of view among respondents.

The last item in this table is regarding the controlling of school facilities WEOHs rated equal point to WEO, PTA and school principals while WEOPs put equal point for school board, PTA and school principals, apart from this supervisors selected for the controlling of school facilities as PTA's and principals were more responsible. This implies that there was a problem in role identification.

Table 28: School Respondents View about the Roles and Responsibilities of School Decision Makers

	Items		School Respondents																			
			School principals							Vice Principals							Teachers						
			1	2	3	4	5	6	T	1	2	3	4	5	6	T	1	2	3	4	5	6	T
1	Planning of new school facilities	No	7	18	17	18	16	10	**86**	9	10	5	8	4	3	**39**	46	52	38	55	38	24	**253**
		%	8.1	20.9	19.8	20.9	18.6	11.6	**100**	23.1	25.6	12.8	20.5	10.3	7.7	**100**	18.18	20.5	15	21.7	15	9.5	**100**
2	Budge generation	No	5	18	19	13	12	11	**78**	-	13	8	5	4	4	**34**	10	65	59	43	28	28	**233**
		%	6.4	23.1	24.4	16.6	15.4	14.1	**100**	-	38.2	23.5	13.2	10.3	10.5	**100**	4.3	27.9	25.3	18.5	12	12	**100**
3	Communicating school facilities plan	No	9	13	13	20	8	7	**70**	3	6	4	14	2	-	**29**	17	35	28	62	13	10	**165**
		%	12.9	18.6	18.6	28.6	11.4	10	**100**	10.3	20.7	13.8	48.3	6.9	-	**100**	10.3	21.2	17	37.6	7.9	6.1	**100**
4	Purchasing school facilities	No	8	17	19	10	5	5	**64**	4	9	11	4	1	-	**29**	21	45	59	31	24	7	**187**
		%	12.5	26.6	29.7	15.6	7.8	7.8	**100**	13.8	31	37.9	13.8	3.4	-	**100**	11.2	27.3	33.1	17.4	12.8	3.7	**100**
5	Planning maintenance	No	5	19	19	16	13	10	**82**	-	11	9	5	3	2	**30**	3	43	52	43	24	13	**178**
		%	6.1	23.2	23.2	19.5	15.9	12.2	**100**	-	36.6	30	16.6	10	6.6	**100**	1.7	24.2	29.2	24.2	13.5	7.3	**100**
6	Controlling school facilities	No	15	15	19	20	23	18	**110**	3	9	6	10	8	2	**38**	13	38	35	52	38	21	**197**
		%	13.6	13.6	17.3	18.18	20.9	16.4	**100**	7.9	23.7	15.8	26.3	21.1	5.3	**100**	6.6	19.3	17.8	26.4	19.3	10.7	**100**

Table 28 presents respondent view about the role of school decision makers. To this effect, item one seeks information about the more responsible body for the planning of new school facilities in relation to this from school respondents significant number of principals 18(20.19%) responded as new school facility planning to be number one school boards and school principal's job while vice principals put school board to be the first and WEO as the second. To this, teachers reported school principals as the first responsible body and board to be the second for the planning of new facilities. In this, teachers rating seems similar, whereas that of vice principals differs. However, according to the MOE (1994) document for educational management that of vice principals were applicable. From this one can deduce as there were no common agreement among the respondents view on the roles of school decision makers. This will create confusion and negatively affects the work.

For Item 3 of table 28 is about communicating plan significant number of the three groups respondents synonymously rated principals to be the first and school board the second. This implies as there was a common knowledge about who communicates plan.

For item 4 of this table is regarding the purchase of facilities. All the three group respondents confirmed that PTAs were the first and school board were the second responsible body for the purchase of school facilities however the MOE Educational organization for finance and community participation document depicts as school board to be responsible on finance matter. Item 5 of this table seeks information the responsible body for planning of maintenance, in this regard, majority school principals rated for school board and PTAs the first with equal point while vice principals and teachers placed school board first and PTAs second.

From this one can understand that there is a gap in clearly identifying the roles of school practitioners. According to the MOE document school board is the higher decision making body while PTAs are technical supporters of the in situational process.

The last item in this table is regarding the responsibilities of controlling resources vice principals and teachers asserted as school principals and school boards were responsible while teachers rated as teachers and school boards were equally the second. Apart from this principals made teachers the first principals the second responsible body in the controlling of resources. This implies there is a problem in understanding about the roles of the decision makers it is clear that teachers are responsible particularly for the teaching materials in the classroom, however, principles are accountable for the over all school property. On the whole from the rating of this table responses are closely related than that of Weredas if not the matter of degree. However what was unique from both tables are the place given to teachers and students in the management of school facilities was very much limited. Therefore from this it is fair to say responsibilities were not clearly understood by respondents.

Table 29: School Board Willingness School Facility Management Activities

No	Items How do you evaluate your school board willingness to participate in the following activities?	Wereda Respondents						School Respondents					
		WEOH		WIOP		Supervisors		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
29	1. Planning new school facilities												
	A. V. good	-	-	1	25	1	7.7	-	-	2	10.5	-	-
	B. good	1	20	3	75	2	15.4	8	34.8	4	21.1	53	51
	C. poor	4	80	-	-	10	76.9	15	65.2	13	68.4	35	33.7
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	-	16	15.4
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	2. Create good school community relations												
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	-	-	2	10.5	4	3.8
	B. good	1	20	2	50	4	30.8	6	26.1	6	31.6	30	28.8
	C. poor	4	80	2	50	8	61.5	17	73.9	11	57.9	59	56.7
	D. v. Poor	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	10.6
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	3. Income generation												
	A. V. good	-	-	1	25	1	7.7	-	-	2	10.5	-	-
	B. good	3	60	-	-	3	23.1	7	30.4	4	21.1	46	44.2
	C. poor	2	40	3	75	8	61.5	15	65.2	13	68.4	48	46.2
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	1	4.3	-	-	8	7.7
	E. none	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	-	2	1.9
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**

Item 1 on table 29 conveys about the willingness and commitment of school board in the planning of new school facilities in this regard, of wereda respondents 1(20%) WEOHs 4(100%) WEOPs and 3(23%) supervisors rated as good and better. However, 4(80%) WEOHs, 10(76.9%) supervisors and 15(62.5%) teachers objected school boards willingness and commitment to be poor. On the other hand, of school respondents 8(34.8%) principals, 6(31.6%) vices principals and 53(51%) teacher confirmed for boards' effort to be good and above. Whereas majority 15(62.5%) principals 13(68.4%) vice and 51(49.1%) teachers condemned it to be poor and worse. The data obtained from the respondent shows as there was lack of willingness and commitment on the part of school boards in the planning of new school facilities. Thus, times student flood is inundating schools to get access, lack of willingness to plan facilities collaboratively means an obstacle to the run towards achieving UPE at 2015.

As can be seen on item 2 of table 29 boards effort to create school community bond been viewed. In this respect, out of the total wereda respondents 1(20%) WEOHs, 2(50%) WEOPS and 5(38.5%) supervisor asserted boards' willingness to create school community relation to be good.

However, 4(80%) WEOHs 2(50%) WEOPS 8(61.5%) supervisors claimed to be poor. A part from this, of school respondents 6(26.1%) principals, 8(32.1%) vices and 34(32.6%) teachers reported the boards willingness to bond school to the community to be good whereas majority 17(73.9%) principals, 11(57.9%) vice principals and 70(67.3%) teacher complained to be poor. From the information collected it is possible to conclude that the commitment of the board to create smooth school community relation was poor. This may cause poor access, high dropout and lack of assistance from the community.

Table 29 item 3 reveals boards willingness in the income generation regarding this few 3(60%) WEOHs 1(25%) WEOPs 4(30.8%) supervisors conveyed boards effort in generating income were to be good and better respectively however 2(40%) WEOHS, 3(75%) WEOPS and 9(69.2%) supervisors rated as poor and even worse. In addition to this of school respondents 7(30.4%) principals 6(31.6%) vice principals and 46(44.2%) teachers rated generally good. In contrast about 16(69.5%) principals, 13(68.4%) vices and 51(49.1%) teachers affirmed to be poor and v. poor 2(1.9%) teachers become none respondents. Therefore, based on the findings it is possible to deduce boards' willingness and commitment in the process of income generation were poor. This may cause budget shortage that may indirectly affect the teaching learning.

Table 30: School Principals Willingness to Involve others in school Facility Management Activities

No	Items How do you evaluate the willingness of principals in the following activities?	Wereda Respondents						School Respondents	
		WEOH		WEOP		Supervisors		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
30	1. School principals participating others in planning								
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	10	9.6
	B. good	2	40	-	-	5	38.5	30	28.8
	C. poor	2	40	3	75	7	53.8	51	47
	D. v. Poor	1	20	1	25	-	-	13	12.5
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	2. Strengthening school community relation								
	A. V. good	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	10	9.6
	B. good	2	40	2	50	6	46.2	36	34.6
	C. poor	2	40	2	50	6	46.2	50	48.1
	D. v. Poor	1	20	-	-	-	-	8	7.7
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	3. Control over resources								
	A. V. good	-	-	1	25	2	15.4	15	14.4
	B. good	4	80	2	50	8	61.5	4.2	40.4
	C. poor	-	-	1	25	3	23.1	38	36.5
	D. v. Poor	1	20	-	-	-	-	9	8.7
	Total	**5**	**100**	**4**	**100**	**13**	**100**	**104**	**100**

Table 30 item 1 shows principals' willingness and commitment in participating others in planning. In this regard, of the four respondents only 1(7.7%) supervisors and 10(9.6%) teachers conveyed to be V. good while 2(40%) WEOHs; 5(38.5%) supervisors and 30(28.8%) teachers supported rating as good. However, 2(40%) WEOHS, 3(75%) WEOPS, 7(53.8%) supervisors and 51(49%) teacher claimed to be poor and the remaining 1(20%) WEOHs, 1(25%) WEOPs and 13(12.5%) teachers refused to accept principals' participating others in planning. From this one can say that principals' willingness and commitment to engage others in planning a problem may bring about lack of team sprit and misunderstanding for the goal attainment.

As can be observed form item 2 principals' willingness and commitment in strengthen school community relations is discussed. In relation to this, of the respondents 1(7.7) supervisors and 10(9.6%) teachers reported that principals effort to bond school with the community was V. good while 2(40%) WEOHS, 2(0) WEOPS 6(46.2%) supervisors and 50(48.1%) teachers asserted principals commitment on the matter as poor while even 1(20%) WEOHs and 8(7.7%) teachers were rated very poor. Therefore, the study result implies that the willingness of principals in

creating good school community relation have a problem. School principals are at the vortex between the school and the society. Having this strategic place with out commitment would retard unquestionably the whole process.

The last item 4 table 30 on its part indicates' the commitment of principals in controlling resources. Accordingly of the total respondents 1(25%) WEOPs, 2(15.4%) supervisors and 15(14.4%) teachers, asserted principals control over resource were V. good majority 4(80%) EOHs, 2(50%) WEOPS 8(61.5%) supervisors and 42(40.4%) teachers reported to be good when as, few 1(25%) vice principal, 3(23.1%) supervisors and 38(36.5%) teachers rated as principals control over resources were poor while the remaining 1(20%) WEOHs and 9(8.7%) teachers suggested it was very poor. Resource control is among the functions of facilities management thus the study finding showed that principals control over resources were good which may reduce cost and proper utilization of facilities.

Table 31: Teachers Willingness to Participate in School Facility Management Activities

No	Items To what extent teaching are willing to participate in the following activities?	School Respondents			
		S. Principals		V. Principals	
		No	%	No	%
31	1. Take part in the planning				
	A. V. good	-		2	10.5
	B. good	6	26.1	8	42.1
	C. poor	14	60.9	2	10.5
	D. v. Poor	3	13	7	36.8
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**
	2. Beautify the school grounds				
	A. V. good	3	13	4	21.1
	B. good	10	43.5	6	31.6
	C. poor	10	43.5	9	47.4
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**
	3. Control resources				
	A. V. good	3	13	-	
	B. good	8	34.8	8	42.1
	C. poor	12	52.2	11	57.9
	D. v. Poor		-	-	-
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**

Table 31 item 1 discusses about the level of teacher willingness to take part in the planning. Only 2(10.5%) vice principals conveyed as V. good while 6(26.1%) principals and 8(42.1%) vice principals said it was good; however, majority principals 14(60.9%) and 2(10.5%) vices asserted teachers commitment to take part in the planning were poor. Furthermore principals and vice

principals respondents accounted for 3(13%) and 7(36.8%) were also claimed it to be very poor. This implies that teachers involvement in the planning had a problem. This might hinder facilities improvement one way or the other as teacher play a key role in the school to mobilize students and their parents as well if they become part of the plan if not the reverse may be true.

Table 31 item 2 presents Teachers commitment in the beautification of school grounds. In this regard majority principals 13(56.5%) and 10 (52.7%) v. principals respectively confirmed their agreement by rating good and above whereas 10(43.5%) principals and 9(47.4%) vice principals asserted as teachers participation were poor. Based on the results it is fair to conclude that relatively teachers' willingness and commitment to take part in beautifying the school were fair with some limitation to be strengthened.

The last item on table 31 investigates about teachers' willingness and commitment in the control of resources. To this point, of the respondents 13(36.1%) principals and 8(42.1%) vice principals confirmed it to be fair and above. However, majority principals 12(52.2%) and 11(57.9%) vice principals condemned it as teachers willingness to control over resources were poor. The statistical data depicts there was a problem in teachers willingness to control over resources. Teachers need to play other roles other than instruction in school teachers are viewed as material managers that distribute resources to their student and should be controllers of that resource. Losing teachers commitment on this means a problem to manage facilities.

Table 32: Students' Willingness to Participate in School Facility Management Activities

No	Items How do you evaluate students' willingness and commitment in the management of school facilities?	School Respondents					
		S. Principals		V. Principals		Teachers	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
32	1. Participate in facilities planning						
	A. V. good	-		-	-	2	1.9
	B. good	5	21.7	2	10.5	29	27.9
	C. poor	4	17.4	10	52.6	57	54.8
	D. v. Poor	14	60.9	7	36.8	16	15.4
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	2. Take part in school maintenance						
	A. V. good	-		2	10.5	13	12.5
	B. good	7	30.4	6	31.6	46	44.2
	C. poor	16	69.7	11	57.9	36	34.6
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	9	8.7
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**
	3. Beautifying their school environment						
	A. V. good	3	13	2	10.5	20	19.2
	B. good	3	13	4	21.1	34	32.7
	C. poor	17	73.9	13	68.4	42	40.4
	D. v. Poor	-	-	-	-	8	7.7
	Total	**23**	**100**	**19**	**100**	**104**	**100**

Regarding the students willingness and commitment to participate in facilities planning of the total respondents only 2(1.9%) teachers rated V. good while 5(21.7%) principals 2(10.5%) vice principals and 29(27.9%) teachers asserted student willingness to participate in facilities planning were good however, majority school principals, vice principals and teachers rated poor and above respectively. Based in the statistical data portrayed it is possible to conclude that students willingness and commitment to take part in the facilities planning in the sample areas were poor. This might slow down facilities improvement moreover it might also bring about poor handling during utilization as there is no sense of ownership on the part of students.

As data obtained from item 2 on table 32 points out the extent of students' willingness to involve in the school maintenance, with regard to this, of the respondents 7 (30.4%) principals 8(42.1%) vice principals and 59(56.7%) teachers conveyed as it was good and better. However, majority of the principals 16(69.7%) nearly more than half 11(57.9%) vice principals and 45(43.3%) teachers Judged it was poor. Hence, from the data it is fair to deduce that there is a problem in students willingness and commitment to take part in the maintenance of schools in the study area which might hurt primarily students as they are forced to sit on broken benches and ragged floors and also be difficult for the school as it forces to incur additional cost.

The last item on the table 32 entertains the extent to which students are willing to involve in the beautification of their school environment. To this point majority of principals, vice principals and nearly half of the teachers accounted for (73.9%, 68.4% and 40.4%) respectively asserted as students' willingness to beautify their environment were poor while 8(7.7%) teachers rated very poor on the other hand relatively few principals and vice principal and about 51.9% teachers reported good and above. Therefore despite the fact that there was lack of awareness students' willingness to involve in the beautification of their environment is problem in the study area.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

This final chapter deals with the major findings of the study out of which the conclusion is drawn and possible solutions are recommended.

4.1 Summary of the Findings

On the basis of the analysis the following were the major findings.

4.1.1 It is believed that school facilities are the most important inputs needed in the schools next to human elements in the provision of functional teaching learning at all levels. In the management of this crucial inputs information communication plays a pivotal role in the management of facilities. However, as the information form the data analysis depicted average number of wereda respondents 3(75%) WEOPs, 8(61.5%) supervisors and 1(20%) WEOHs asserted as that they haven't read the primary school facilities standard document while 8(34.8%) principals, 12(63.2%) vice principals and 36(34.6%) teachers confirmed the same, they expressed as they rely on information the have got from seminars, workshops and checklists from REB and ZED instead.

4.1.2 For the proper delivery of the teaching learning process the availability of classroom, library, pedagogical center and laboratories are indispensable; however, the majority of the school respondents 14 (60.9%) principals, 12 (63.2%) vice principals and 38 (35.5%) teachers asserted as classrooms were not adequate enough. Similarly, more than 70% principals, vice principals and teachers synonymously confirmed that student desks, chairs and blackboards were very scarce. On top of this, majority respondents have complained about the poor status of library pedagogical center facilities and the total absence of laboratories.

4.1.3 School sites are among the determinant factors that enhance or deter in the delivery of equitable education at primary levels. In this regard, school size, centrality to student population the beauty and security of the general environment was rated to be good by majority of the respondents while the drainage of the schools reported to be poor by the majority of 15(65.2%) principals, 14(68.4%) vice principals and 40 (38.5%) teachers.

4.1.4 Obviously classroom condition matters to gain the full attention of students especially that of primary level. The findings of the study depicts the levels of classroom temperature,

ventilation, lighting and freeness from disturbing noise was affirmed to be good by majority of the respondents while the classroom floor of some schools were criticized.

4.1.5 With regard to the compatibility of some school facilities to the teaching learning curriculum. Majority wereda and school respondents asserted that the size of the classrooms were not suitable to apply the methods (group teaching, student centered) propagated in the curriculum. Apart from this, classroom furniture was not suitable to use various forms of sitting arrangements. On top of this respondents complained about the desks and benches as they were designed without taking in to account students age and individual difference. Above all reasonable number of both wereda and school respondents stipulated as the library facilities were not organized with ample reading space, books, furniture and service delivery and school compound is not suitable for out of classroom teaching.

4.1.6 Facility planning is a team work between the school board, WEO, and Architects, however, the findings of this study shows that material resource positions were not adequately staffed the technical support rendered from architects, WEO were reported to be poor to adapt school facilities to the educational needs. Moreover, the constructions of school facilities were not in line with the educational schedule due to lack of prior planning, coordination, budget delay and lack of technical support.

4.1.7 It is well known that budget is an important input in education. The findings of the from a study significant number of respondents shows that there was a delay of government grant budget due to lack of prior planning, work load, lack of capacity and negligence. Moreover, budget is not used for what it has been allocated instead it is diverted to other headings

4.1.8 For better facility planning majority respondents from wereda and school synonymously preferred School financing to WEO financing in order to avoid delay in purchase, to easily identify facilities needs and to develop sense of ownership in managing facilities.

4.1.9 Majority respondents expressed their complaints on the purchase activities such as buying poor quality items, delay in purchase, not buying at a reasonable price and unfair distribution.

14.1.10 The finding of the study showed that school maintenance planning was fair, however, a good number of respondents pointed out schools used emergency maintenance which could be done after facilities been collapsed and damaged with very high cost.

4.1.11 The training that was given at wereda and school level on how to handle school facilities was good. However, respondents' response showed that it has been given when something wrong happened.

4.1.12 High number of respondents 18 (78.3%) principals 19 (100%) vices principals and 41(39.4%) teachers rated as there were no budget for equipments of cleaning as a result of budget shortage. Except for two schools where cleaning been done by employed custodians the remaining used students in turn on a daily basis for classroom, and delinquent students once a week for cleaning toilets respectively.

4.1.13 The findings of the study from significant number of respondents confirmed that receiving of school facilities was done on legal bases, however, facilities were not been coded due to lack of experience. Moreover the custody of school facilities was poor because of shortage of budget to employee guards as a result facilities were not been guarded well.

4.1.14 In an enquiry made to investigate school decision makers (WEO, School board, parent Teacher Association, school principals, Teachers and students) role in some management functions of school facilities. The data finding showed that there is lack of common understanding among respondents about who is more responsible in the activities portrayed.

4.1.15 The findings about the school boards' teachers' and students' willingness to take part in the planning showed to be poor than their involvement in other school activities.

4.1.16 Majority respondents of Wereda and school confirmed principals' willingness to involve others in the planning of school facilities was rated poor.

4.2 Conclusions

After thorough investigation in light of the major findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn.

4.2.1 School facilities are key elements for the realization of educational program. Their availability increases efficiency and effectiveness however, the findings of the study in the site shows as curriculum implementation is suffering from serious shortage of basic school facilities such as classroom, furniture library, laboratories and office facilities. This

poor working environment was dissatisfy teachers and students and result in poor quality education.

4.2.2 It is clear that the education and training policy had undergone various reforms such as training of teachers and curriculum changes, however, respondents reported as classroom learning is hampered severely as a result of the existing inappropriately designed school facilities. This forces teachers to stick to the old teaching methods while at the same time the inappropriateness and inadequacy of school facilities lead students to rely on teachers and classroom texts alone. This again ends up in poor achievement.

4.2.3 The findings of the study shows as school compounds are not well organized in a way that enhance out of classroom teaching (Sport, Music and Arts) for group work and individual study. These in turn affect curriculum implementation and results in poor achievement.

4.2.4 Facility planning is one of the management activity exercised in schools, nevertheless, respondents complaint revealed because of lack of organization in trained human resource, information communication, the technical support made to adapt school facilities to curriculum and societal needs is in problem which inturn affects facility improvement and proper curriculum implementation process.

4.2.5 In the school, finance plays a significant role in facility improvement, however, the study findings from a good number of respondents criticized the existing WEO financing school budget due to budget delay and faulty purchases the proper functioning of the educational program is facing a problem. This results in delay and poor facilities supply and wastage of resources which might negatively affect the classroom teaching learning.

4.2.6 The school facility maintenance held in the schools was mainly dependent on situation instead of following regular schedule and moreover it relies on the maintenance after breakdown rather than following preventive or follow up maintenance. This forces schools to spend relatively high amount of money, time and human resource which may again dwindle the resource to be devoted to other educational programs and affect the teaching learning.

4.2.7 The absence of budget for custodial service would lead students to use other means such as branches of trees. In the long run this may again affects the beauty of the scene. Moreover, it might also affect students health as primary school students are relatively young and sensitive to withstand difficulty.

4.2.8 The controlling of school facilities have been held on legal procedures although they were not managed using coding system due to lack of experience and inadequate training on the part of school principals. This may create a problem on proper handling and controlling. Apart from this school facilities in the study area are open to vandalism and damage as a result of poor control this may bring about wastage of resources.

4.2.9 The study findings from significant number of respondents confirmed that there is no common understanding among the respondents response on the school decision makers' role. This will create confusion as to who is responsible for what to manage and result in poor performance in facility improvement which one way or the other hinder the proper implementation of the educational program.

4.2.10 Principals willingness to involve other school practitioners in the planning of school facilities been seen below average while school boards', teachers' and students' willingness to participate in school plans asserted to be poor, as compared to their involvement in other activities. This will erode the corporate culture of the faculty decreases sense of ownership implementing plan and result in poor achievement.

4.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations have been made with the hope to improve the problems in the management of primary school facilities.

4.3.1 It is understood that resources are scarce, however, needs are limitless. As the study finding indicated classrooms, student benches and desks were scarce, libraries were poorly organized in majority schools and even laboratories were available in no school in the study site. To improve this imbalance participative plans that focuses on priority needs become be a necessity. To this effect, practitioners in school decision making positions should be organized and capacitated by REB through workshops, on the job training and other means possible to enable them to manage scarcity.

4.3.2 Primary education is the foundation for all other levels. Taking this in to account government is making a great effort by training teachers with new methods, changing the curriculum to make a difference. However, the training of teachers and the curriculum needs (student centered teaching group teaching and team teaching) are not in line with the physical facilities now existing. Therefore, to tackle this incompatibility, MOE and REBs educational experts, architects and facility designers need to make further study on how to avert the mismatch between the new teaching methods in the curriculum and the

basic school facility designs by varying the classroom size for small and large group teaching, and to make student desks appropriate to group teaching.

4.3.3 In schools some subjects activities such as sport, music, arts sometimes demand out of classroom teaching. To effectuate this, school compounds should be organized in a way it promotes efficiency and effectiveness of the teaching learning by the involvement of technical experts and the school community.

4.3.4 Primary education budget takes relatively a large sum of finance at federal and regional level. However, when it is distributed to the schools per student it becomes scanty. Finding of the study showed even this very little amount were not used properly because of the system of financing, complaints from respondents showed delay of budget, the purchase of supplies suffer from poor quality items, lack of timeliness, unreasonable price and lack of fair distribution as a result schools respondents were expressed their desire to have school financing system. Therefore, as it is a serious policy issue further study need to be made and MOE and REBs should evaluate their current system as decentralizing responsibilities alone would not make a difference.

4.3.5 Proactive school facilities maintenance contributes a lot to the instructional effectiveness to keep the health and safety of the school community and for the long life span of facilities, and to reduce cost. However, findings of the study depicted that majority schools were used emergency maintenance that depend on situation which requires a large amount human materials, financial and time resource. Therefore, schools had better involve teachers, students and the community in the maintenance of planning so as to develop a sense of ownership in utilization. Moreover, awareness raising need to be given to schools so as to what type of school maintenance should be used.

4.3.6 In keeping the health and safety of schools the involvement of students should be necessary, however, study findings revealed that in some schools toilets have been cleaned by delinquent students once a week. This is ill practice from human right and the professional ethics point of view and cleaning once a week school toilet in a campus where large member of students pass relatively long period of time means a danger for the health and safety. Therefore, students should get orientation on how to use toilets and it has been cleaned inturn frequently.

4.3.7 Controlling of resources contribute to the proper utilization, long life span of facilities, to reduce cost, vandalism and theft. Next to other controlling bodies guards play their role, nevertheless, the study findings show that schools have no guards due to lack of budget.

Therefore, local officials and schools had better raise the awareness of the community trough workshops and other possible means to take the responsibilities of financing.

4.3.8 It is believed that school management is a team activity. However, the findings of the study pointed out that in the sample area principals willingness to participate teachers and students in planning be seen very poor. Thus, MOE, REB and WEO should aware principals the advantages of participating others in planning and also evaluatel the performance from time to time.

4.3.9 For effective performance, willingness is an important. Regarding this, the study findings showed that school boards, teachers and students were not willing to take part in the planning. Hence, both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational mechanisms should be devised by WEO and schools.

REFERENCES

Adams, N. (1987). ***Secondary School Management Today***. London: Century Hutchinson Group Ltd.

Ayalew Shibeshi (1991). Theories of Management Addis Ababa. Teaching Module Unpublished.

Baker, J. and Peter J. (1963). ***School Maintenance and Operation***. Danville Hilliness: Library Congress.

Bender, M. L. et al., (1976). ***Languages of Ethiopia***. London: Oxford University Press.

Bush, Tony et.al., (1980). ***Approaches to School Management***. London. Harper and Row Publisher.

Charles, C. Wilson, M. D. (1964). ***School Health Services***. New York: Library of congress Catalogue.

Clinfton, R.H. (1984). ***Principles of Planned Maintenance***. London: Edward Arnold (publisher) Ltd.

Davis, J. and E. E. Lovels. (1981). ***The Administrator and Education Facilities***. New York: University Press America.

Dobler, Donald W. et al., (1996). ***Purchasing and Materials Management***: Text and Cases 4th ed. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.

Dimmock, Clive (1993). ***School Based Management and School Effectiveness***. London: Library of Congress Cataloging in Pub. Data.

ESDP (2003/04). Programme Implementation Manual (Executive Summary) A.A. Unpublished

Forjella, S.B. (1993). ***Educational Planning for Development.*** New York: St. Martin Press.

Gaynor, Alan and Kibbe (1998). ***Analyzing Problems in Schools and School System***. London: Lawrence Erlbau Associates Publisher.

Getachew Yosef. (1999). Economics of Education Teaching Module A.A. Unpublished.

Goddard, Del and Leask Marilyn (1992). The Search for quality: Planning for Improvement and Managing Change. London: Paul Chapman Pub.

Good, Carter V. (1973). ***Dictionary of Education*** Sanfrancisco: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Gopala Krishan P. and Sundaresan M. (1977). ***Materials Management an Integrated Approach***. Delihi: Prentice Hall.

Green, Howard. (1993). ***The School Management Hand Book***. London: Kogan Page Publisher.

Hailesillasie W. Gerima (2000). Human Resource Management A.A.U Unpublished.

Handy, H.W. and Hussain, K.M (1969). Net Work Analysis for Educational Management. New York: Library of Congress Catalogue.

Herrick, John H. et. al. (1956). ***From School Program to School Plant***. New York: Henery Hot and Company.

Hicks, William V. (1957). ***The Elementary School Principal at Work USA***. Prentice Hall Inc.

http:// file://A: X***future classrooms***: htm/.

http:// www. file. //A:/ Fit EP and OB 20% Building htm:

http://www. ***The Relationship between Environmental Quality of School Facilities and Student Performance***.

http://www. unesco. org/iiep. ***International Institute for Educational Planning***

Hugh Hawes (1979). ***Curriculum and Reality in African Primary Schools***. London: Longman Group Ltd.

John, W. Best (1977). ***Research in Education***. NewDelhi: Prentice Hall.

Kimbrough Ralph B. (1968). ***Administering Elementary School Concepts and Practices***. New York. The Macmillan Company.

Koivual, T. (1983). ***The Development of Education Environment: A Case Study on the City of Helsinioki***. Paris: UNESCO Publication.

Margaret, Weaver (1998). ***Resources Management***. Oxford: Butter Publisher.

Mcclurkin, W.D. (1964). Policy and Practice in School Administration; School Building Planning USA: ***Library of Congress Catalog***.

Meaza Bekele (1966). "A Study of Modern Education in Ethiopia its Foundations, its Development. Its Future with Emphasis on Primary Education. Unpublished P.hd Thesis.

Morphet J. et al. (1972). ***Planning and Providing for Excellence in Education***. New York: citation Press.

Nebiyu Taddesse (2000). Educational finance and Material Management: A.A. Unpublished.

Paisy, Allan (1992). ***Organization and Management in Schools 2nd ed***. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Philip B. Gove (1989). Webster International Dictionary 3rd ed. Ohio: Library of Congress Catalogue.

MOE (1994). Transitional Government of Ethiopia, Education and Training Policy. A.A.

RAO, V. K. and Reddy, R.S. (2005). ***Resources of Effective Teaching***. New Delhi: Commonwealth Publishers.

Ray, Hack and Candoli (2001). ***School Business Administration 7th Education***. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Resnick, Lauren B. and Wirt, John G. (1996). ***Linking School and Work: Roles for Standards and Assessment***. Sanfransisco. Jossey Bass Inc.

Saxe, Richard W. (1980). ***Educational Administration Today: An Introduction***. California: Library Congress.

Smith, Louis M. and Keith, Pat M. (1971). ***Anatomy of Educational Innovation An Organizational Analysis of an Elementary School***. Tornoto: by John Wiley and Sons Inc.

Spear, Eric C. (1994). ***Primary Management and Leadership Towards 2000***. London: Longman.

Stoops, Emery and Others. (1980). ***Hand Book for Educational Adminis***

Practitioner. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. Inc.

Teshome G/Wagaw (1979). ***Education in Ethiopia: Prospect and Re***

University of Michigan.

Thomas, Hywel and Jane Martin (1996). ***Managing Resources for School Improvement***. London: McGraw Hill Company.

Tolbert and Baum (1985). ***Investing in Development***: Lessons of World Bank Experience Washington D.C. Oxford Press.

UNESCO (1985). ***Education in Asia and the Pacific: Reviews Reports and Notes***. Number 22, December 1985 Thailand.

UNESCO IBE (1972). ***Initiatives in Education Paris: Printed by Journal de***. Geneve, S.A.

ት/ሚ (1987). የአፀደ ሕፃናት ፕሮግራምና የመጀመሪያ ደረጃ ት/ቤት ስታንዳርድ. አ.አ. ት.መ.ማ.ማ. ድርጅት::

ት/ሚ (ነሐሴ 1994) የትምህርት አመራር አደረጃጀትነ የሕብረተሰብ ተሳትፎና የፋይናንስ መመሪያ አ.አ. ት/መ.ማ.ማ. ድርጅት::

Appendix -1

Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate Study

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Dear Respondent,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect first hand information on the management of primary school facilities in Arsi Zone, based on the availability of facilities, the appropriateness of facilities to changes in curriculum, the financing system and the management roles and competence. The information you provide will be used only for research purposes and your response will be kept confidential. The success of this study entirely relies on your genuine and honest responses, therefore be kind enough to spare some of your valuable time to answer all the questions.

N.B.

- There is no need to write your name
- Please indicate your response by putting a ("✓") mark in the provided box or write shortage answers for it3ms that require your opinion.

Thank you very much for your cooperation in advance!

Questionnaire to be filled by Wereda Education Office Head, (WEOH), Wereda Education Planning Unit (WEPU) and Supervisors

A. Personal Data

1. Name of your zone _____ District/wereda _____
2. Sex Male ☐ Female ☐
3. Age 18-25 ☐ 26- 35 ☐ 36 -45 ☐ 46 and above ☐
4. Educational level

Below 12 grade	☐	Diploma	12 + Dip. ☐
12 Grade complete	☐		12+2 ☐
T.T.I 12+1	☐		10+3 ☐
T.T.I 10+1	☐		BA/BSC Degree ☐
12+1year college	☐		

Please specify if any other _____

5. Years of experience

Total 1-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-15 ☐ 16-20 ☐

21-25 ☐ 26-30 ☐ 31 and above ☐

In the district 1-3 ☐ 4-6 ☐ 7-9 ☐ 10-12 ☐

13-15 ☐ 16 and above ☐

Service on current position

Less than year ☐ 1-3 ☐ 4-6 ☐ 7.9 ☐

10-12 ☐ 13-15 ☐ 16 and above ☐

Part Two: Level of information Communication in School Facilities Management

2.1. Have you read the MOE's 1987 E.C. kindergarten and primary school standard document?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

2.2. If your answer for question number (1) is 'No' what is your reference to meet the standard?

A. Directives from REB or ZED in a form of check list ☐

B. Copying from neighboring districts ☐

C. Knowledge from workshops and seminars ☐

D. Mention if any other _____

2.3. Please order the reasons given for question number (2) by giving 1 for the most used method and (3) for the least

A. ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐

2.4. What is the average classroom-student ratio of your district?

For 1st cycle 1-4 41-50 ☐ 51-60 ☐ 61-70 ☐

71-80 ☐ 81 and above ☐

2nd cycle 5-8 Less than 40 ☐ 40-50 ☐ 51-60 ☐

61-70 ☐ 71-80 ☐ 81 and above ☐

Part 3: The Appropriateness of School Facilities to the Changes in Curriculum

3.1. To what extent do the existing school facilities managed in a way that responds to the changes made on the curriculum?

No	Key Facilities	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
3.1.	Classroom size				
	3.1.1. for group teaching				
	3.1.2. team teaching				
	3.1.3. suitability of classroom furniture for group work				
	3.1.4. suitability of classroom furniture's for students' age				
3.2	Library				
	3.2.1. enough space for individual study				
	3.2.2. for group study				

Part 4: The Planning of School Facilities in Line with the Curriculum Need

4.1. Which of the following is the most applicable method in your district for school facility planning?

A. Need assessment survey ☐ B. School enrolment rate ☐
C. Availability of budget ☐

4.2. How do you select school site in your district?

A. Centrality to the student population ☐
B. Taking the valiant land donated from the people as it is ☐
C. The size of the land ☐
D. Nearness to the high way ☐
E. Mention if any other _____ ☐

4.3. Are the material resource planning positions staffed in your district?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

4.4. If your answer for question number (9) is 'No' how do you operate the school facilities planning in your district?

A. By delegating ☐ B. With a committee ☐
C. By sharing the work to be done accordingly ☐
D. Specify if any other _____

4.5. If your response for question number (11) is more than one rank your responses by giving '1' for the severely attesting and '4' to the least

A. ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐ D. ☐

4.6. In your district, school construction is initiated by:

A. Preparing educational specification and give it to an architect ☐
B. by discussing with an architect prior to construction ☐
C. By simply informing the need for a primary school ☐
D. Mention if any other _____

4.7. Does the technical design of school facilities take into account the diversity of weather condition?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

4.8. If your answer for question number (14) is 'No', why?

A. the architects do not know the situation well ☐
B. Because not to violet the standard set ☐
C. Lack of technical control during the construction ☐
D. Due to the capacity of local constrictors ☐
E. specify if any other _____

4.9. If your answer for question number (15) is more than one put the reasons in the order of importance by giving '1' for the most possible reason and (4) to the least one.

A. ☐ B ☐ C. ☐ D. ☐

4.10. To what extent is the architects' technical supports make a difference for the adaptation of facilities to educational needs?

A. V. good ☐ B. Good ☐ C. Poor ☐ D. V. poor ☐

4.11. If your answer for question number (18) is poor and v. good, why?

_____

4.12. Have school construction in your district been completed on time?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

Part 5: Finance of School Facilities

5.1. What are sources of your budget for new school construction in your district?

A. Government grant ☐ C. Donor's support ☐

B. Community contribution ☐ D. Internal revenue ☐

E. Specify if any other _____

5.2. If your answer for question number (22) is more than on rank your answers by giving (1) for the high income source and (4) to the lower.

A. ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐ D. ☐

5.3. How do you evaluate the timely release of government budget in your district?

A. V. good ☐ B. Good ☐ C. Poor ☐ D. V. poor ☐

5.4. If your answer for question number (24) is poor or V. poor, what is the reason?

A. Lack of capacity in sharing ☐ D. Negligence ☐

B. Work load ☐ E. Mention if any other ☐

C. Lack of adequate prior planning ☐

5.5. If your answer for question number (25) is more than one rank your responses by giving '1' for the most actual reason and 4 to the least?

A. ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐ D. ☐

5.6. Does your district use the granted budget for what it has been allocated for?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

5.7. If your answer for question number (27) is 'No', why?

_____

5.8. For a better school facility planning which level of financing do you favor among these two choices?

A. School financing ☐ B. Wereda Education office financing ☐

5.9. If your choice for question number (5.8) is 'A', why? _____

_____

5.10. If your choice for question number (5.8) is 'B', why? _____

_____

5.11. To what extent is the purchasing of school facilities in your district in line with schools' needs in terms of the following points?

No	Item	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
5.11.1	Buying the amount				
5.11.2	Buying quality items requested				
5.11.3	Buying at a reasonable price				
5.11.4	The timeliness of the purchase				
5.11.5	Fairness of distribution				

Part 6: Maintenance of School Facilities

6.1. Do you plan for school facility maintenance in your district?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

6.2. If your answer for question No (34. is 'yes) what kind of maintenance do you make?

A. Follow up maintenance ☐

B. Maintenance in specific time interval (semester, annual or 3 years) ☐

C. For maintenance after breakdown ☐

6.3. If your answer for question No (34) is 'No', why _____

_____

6.4. Do you train your school board team in how to handle facilities?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

6.5. If your answer for question number (37) is 'yes', how often?

A. Once a year ☐ C. Depending on situation ☐

B. Twice a year ☐ D. Specify if any other _____

6.6. How do you evaluate the existing status of your district schools maintenance in terms of their quality service?

No	Item maintained	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
6.6.1	Painting walls and corridors				
6.6.2	Maintaining furniture				
6.6.3	Maintenance of doors and windows				
6.6.4	Shade plants				
6.6.5	Fence				

5. Years of experience

Total 1-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-15 ☐ 16-20 ☐

21-25 ☐ 26-30 ☐ 31and above ☐

As principal

1-3 ☐ 4-6 ☐ 7-9 ☐ 10-12 ☐

13-15 ☐ 16 and above ☐

Service on the current position

Less than 1 year 1-3 ☐ 4-6 ☐

7-9 ☐ 10-12 ☐ 13-15 ☐ 16 and above ☐

Part Two: Level of Information Communication in School Facilities Management

2.1. Have you read the MOE's 1987 E.C. kindergarten and primary school standard document?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

2.2. If your answer for question number (1) is 'No' what is your reference to meet the standard?

A. Directives from REB or ZED in a from of checklist ☐

B. Companying from neighboring districts ☐

C. Knowledge from workshops and seminars ☐

D. Mention if any other _____

2.3. Please order the reasons given for question number (2) by giving (1) for the most used method and (3) for the least

A. ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐

2.4. What is the average classroom-student ratio of your district?

For 1st cycle 1-4 A. 40-50 ☐ B. 51-60 ☐

C. 61-70 ☐ D. 71-80 ☐ E. 81 and above ☐

For 2nd cycle 5-8 A. 40-50 ☐ B. 51-60 ☐ C. 61-70 ☐

D. 71-80 ☐ E. 81 and above ☐

2.5. If the following facilities are available in your school rate or evaluate it relation to MOE's standard? (If not leave blank space)

No	School facilities	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
	Classroom Facilities				
2.5.1	Classroom size				
2.5.2	Furniture				
	5.3.1.Attached desks				
	5.3.2 Teacher's chair				
	5.3.3 Teachers table				
2.5.3	Black board				
	5.4.1 Size for the grade level				
2.5.4	Library facilities				
	2.5.4.1 Reading room				
	2.5.4.2 Store for books				
	2.5.4.3 Shelves				
	2.5.4.4 Reference books in quantity				
	2.5.4.5 Recent reference books				
	2.5.4.6 Furniture				
	2.5.4.7 Working hour				
2.6	Science laboratory				
	5.7.1 Science kit				
2.7	Pedagogic centers				
	5.8.1 Work shop room				
	5.8.2 Display room				
	5.8.3 Coordinators office				
	5.8.4 Equipment (workbench, hand tools)				
2.8	School compound				
	2.8.1 Size in relation to the student population				
	2.8.2 Space for different kind of games				
	2.8.2.1 Foot ball field				
	2.8.2.2. Valley ball field				
	2.8.2.3. Hand ball field				
	2.8.2.4. Basket ball field				
	2.8.3. Suitability for open air teaching				
	5.9.4. Shade trees				
	2.8.5. Flowers				
	2.8.6. Fence				
2.10	Office Facilities				
	2.10.1. Teachers staff				
	2.10.1.1. tables and Chairs in relation to teachers number				
	2.10.1.2. Lockers in relation to teachers number				
	2.10.2. Principals office				
	2.10.3. Department head offices				
	2.10.4.Ware house				
2.11	Toilet for students				
	2.11.1. Boys				
	2.11.2. Girls				
2.12	Toilet for teachers				
	2.12.1. Male				
	2.12.2. Female				
2.13	Water supply				

Part Three: The Responsiveness of School Facilities to the Changes in Curriculum

3.1. How do you evaluate your school in terms of the following points?

No	School site selection	V. Good	Good	Poor	V. Poor
3.1.1	Size of school				
3.1.2	Centrality to student population				
3.1.3	Drainage				
3.1.4	General environment (*Free from noise, heavy traffic*)				
	Classroom environment for the teaching learning				
3.1.6	Classroom temperature				
3.1.7	Ventilation				
3.1.8	Lighting				
3.1.9	Free from disturbing noise				
3.1.10	Nature of the floor				

3.2. To what extent do the following school facilities managed in a way that responds to the changes on the curriculum?

No	Key Facilities	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
3.2.1.	Classroom size				
	2.1.1. for group teaching				
	2.1.2. team teaching				
	8.1.3. suitability of classroom furniture for group work				
	8.1.4. suitability of classroom furniture's for students' age				
3.2.2	Library				
	8.2.1. enough space for individual study				
	8.2.2. for group study				

Part Four: The Planning of School Facilities

4.1. Which one of the following is the most applicable method for school facility planning in your district?

A. Need assessment ☐ C. Availability of budget ☐

B. Student enrollment ☐ D. Specify if any other _____

4.2. How do you select school site in your district?

A. Centrality to the student population ☐
B. Taking any vacant land donated from people ☐
C. The size of the land ☐
D. Nearness to the high way ☐
E. Mention if any other _____ ☐

4.3. If your answer for question no (4.2) is more than one order the responses by giving '1' for the most actual reason and up for the less.

A ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐ D. ☐

4.4. Does the technical design of school facilities take in to account the diversity of weather condition?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

4.5. How do you evaluate the technical assistance from the WEO during school facility expansion?

A. V. good ☐ B. Good ☐ C. Poor ☐ D. V. poor ☐

4.6. Does the technical design of school facilities take into account the diversity of weather condition?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

4.7. If your answer for question number (4.6) is no, why?

A. The architects do not know the situation well ☐

B. Because not to violet the standard set ☐

C. Lack of technical control during the construction ☐

D. Due to the capacity of local contractors ☐

4.8. If your answer for question number (4.7) is more than one put the reasons in their order to importance by giving (1) for the most actual problem and (4) for the least one.

A. ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐

4.9. To what extent does the architect's technical support make a difference in adapting school facilities to educational needs?

A. V. good ☐ B. Good ☐ C. Poor ☐ D. V. poor ☐

Part Five: Finance of School Facilities

5.1. What are sources of your budget in school facility construction in your school?

A. Government grant ☐ B. Community contribution ☐

C. Donors support ☐ D. Internal revenue ☐

E. Specify if any other_____

5.2. If your response for question number (5.1) is more than one rank your answers by giving '1' for the high income source and '4' to the lower

A. ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐

5.3. How do you get government grant budget from the WEO?

A. In cash ☐ B. In kind or materials ☐

5.4. If your answer for question number (5.3) is 'B' to what extent do the purchasing of the WEO in line with your material needs in terms of the following?

No	Item	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
5.4.1	Buying the amount required				
5.4.2	Buying quality items requested				
5.4.3	Buying at a reasonable price				
5.4.4	The timeliness of the purchase				
5.4.5	Fairness of distribution				

5.6. Do WEO financing school budget have a problem in school facilities planning?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

5.7. If your answer for question number (5.6) is 'No', why _____

_____

5.8. For better school facility planning which level of financing does your favor among the following two choices?

A. School financing ☐ B. Wereda education office financing ☐

5.9. If your choice for question number (5.8) is 'A' why?_____

_____

5.10. If your choice for question number (5.8) is 'B', why?_____

_____

Part Six: Maintenance of School Facilities

6.1. Do you plan for school facility maintenance in your school?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

6.2. If your answer for question number (6.1) is 'yes' for, what kind of maintenance do you plan?

A. For follow up maintenance ☐

B. For maintenance in particular time interval like (semester, annual) ☐

C. For maintenance after breakdown ☐

6.3. If your answer for question number (6.1) is 'yes', how often?

A. Twice a year ☐ B. Once a year ☐

C. Depending on situation ☐ D. Specify if any other _____

6.4. How do you evaluate the existing status of your school maintenance in terms of their quality service?

No	Item maintained	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
6.4.1	Painting walls and corridors				
6.4.2	Maintaining furniture				
6.4.3	Maintenance of doors and windows				
6.4.4	Door locks				
6.4.5	Shade plants				
6.4.6	Fence				

6.5. Do you school allocate budget for cleaning equipments?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

6.6. If your response for question no (6.5) is 'No' why? _____

_____

6.7. Who responsible for the cleaning of the following school facilities?

No	Facilities	Employed custodians	Students in turn	Delinquent students	Mention if any other
	Classrooms				
	Toilets				

6.8. How often do the following facilities be cleaned?

No	Facilities	Daily	2-3 days	4-5	Once a weak
	Classrooms				
	Toilets				

6.9. Do you orient your students on how they use the school facilities?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

6.10. If your answer for question number (38) is 'yes', how often?

A. Every semester ☐ B. Once a year ☐

C. When something wrong is observed ☐

6.11. If your answer for question number (38) is 'No', why?

_____

_____

Part Seven: The Controlling of School Facilities

7.1. Do the facilities in your school have been received on legal records?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

7.2. If your answer for question number (7.1) is 'No' please comment how things are going on?

_____

_____

7.3. Have the facilities in your school have been coded for better control?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

7.4. If your answer for question number (7.3) is 'No' why? _____

_____

7.5. How do you evaluate the guarding of your school facility?

A. V. good ☐ B. Good ☐ C. Poor ☐ D. V. poor ☐

7.6. If your answer for question number (7.5) is, poor or v. poor why?

A. Lack of schools finance to pay for guards ☐

B. Lack of management control ☐

C. Specify if any other _____

7.7. If your answer for question number (7.6) is more than one order your responses by giving '1' for the more possible reason and (2) for the less one

A. ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐

7.8. Who do you think involves in the following managerial activities of school in facility management in your school? If your response is more than one please indicate by ranking 1st 2nd etc from the most responsible to the least.

	Managerial Functions	WEO	S.B	PTA	S.P	T	St.
7.8.1	Planning of new school facilities						
7.8.2	Budget generation						
7.8.3	Communicating school facility plan						
7.8.4	Purchasing school facilities						
7.8.5	Planning maintenance						
7.8.6	Controlling school facilities						

Key= WEO= Wereda Education Office SP= School Principal
SB= School board T= Teachers
PTA= Parent Teacher Association ST= Students

7.9. To what extent do the following school management teams have the ability to manage the following activities in your school?

No	School Bard	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
7.9.1	Planning school facilities				
7.9.2	Good school-community relation				
7.9.3	Revenue generation				
	Teachers				
7.9.4	To take part in the planning				
7.9.5	Maintenance of school facilities				
7.9.6	Beautify the school grounds				
7.9.7	Control resources				
	Students				
7.9.8	Taking part in the planning of school facilities				
7.9.9	Maintenance of the school				
7.9.10	Beautifying their school environment				

7.10. How do you judge the willingness and commitment of the following school management team in your school?

No	Item	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
	School board				
7.10.1	Planning school facilities				
7.10.2	Budget generation				
7.10.3	Create strong school-community relation				
	Teachers				
7.10.4	To take part in the planning				
7.10.5	Beautify the school grounds				
7.10.6	Control resources				
	Students				
7.10.7	Taking part in the planning of school facilities				
7.10.8	Maintenance of the school				
7.10.9	Beautifying their school environment				

Tank You

Appendix -3

Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate Study

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Dear Respondent,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect first hand information on the management of primary school facilities in Arsi Zone, based on the availability of facilities, the appropriateness of facilities to changes in curriculum, the financing system and the management roles and competence. The information you provide will be used only for research purposes and your response will be kept confidential. The success of this study entirely relies on your genuine and honest responses, therefore be kind enough to spare some of your valuable time to answer all the questions.

N.B.

- There is no need to write your name
- Please indicate your response by putting a ("✓") mark in the provided box or write shortage answers for items that require your opinion.

Thank you very much for your cooperation in advance!

Questionnaire to be filled by teachers

Part One: Personal Data

1. Name of your district Woereda _____ and School
2. Sex Male ☐ Female ☐
3. Age 18-25 ☐ 26-35 ☐ 36-45 ☐ Above 46 ☐
4. Educational level

   Below grade 12 complete ☐ Diploma 10+3 ☐

   Grade 12 complete ☐ 12+2 ☐

   T.T.I 10+1 ☐ BA/BSC Degree ☐

   12+ T.T.I ☐

   12+ 1 ☐

   Specify if any other _____

5. Years of experience

Total 1-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-15 ☐ 16-20 ☐

21-25 ☐ 26-30 ☐ 31and above ☐

As principal

1-3 ☐ 4-6 ☐ 7-9 ☐ 10-12 ☐

13-15 ☐ 16 and above ☐

Service on the current position

Less than 1 year 1-3 ☐ 4-6 ☐

7-9 ☐ 10-12 ☐ 13-15 ☐ 16 and above ☐

Part Two: The Availability of School Facilities

2.1. Have you read the MOE's 1987 E.C. kindergarten and primary school standard document?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

2.2. If your answer for question number (1) is 'No' what is your reference to meet the standard?

A. Directives from REB or ZED in a from of checklist ☐

B. Companying from neighboring districts ☐

C. Knowledge from workshops and seminars ☐

D. Mention if any other _____

2.3. Please order the reasons given for question number (2) by giving (1) for the most used method and (3) for the least

A. ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐

2.4. What is the average classroom-student ratio of your district?

For 1st cycle 1-4 A. 40-50 ☐ B. 51-60 ☐

C. 61-70 ☐ D. 71-80 ☐ E. 81 and above ☐

For 2nd cycle 5-8 A. 40-50 ☐ B. 51-60 ☐ C. 61-70 ☐

D. 71-80 ☐ 81 and above ☐

2.5. If the following facilities are available in your school rate or evaluate it relation to MOE's standard? (If not leave blank space).

No	School facilities	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
	Classroom Facilities				
2.5.1	Classroom size				
2.5.2	Furniture				
	5.3.1.Attached desks				
	1.3.2 Teacher's chair				
	5.3.3 Teachers table				
2.5.3	Black board				
	5.4.1 Size for the grade level				
2.5.4	Library facilities				
	2.5.4.1 Reading room				
	2.5.4.2 Store for books				
	2.5.4.8 Shelves				
	2.5.4.9 Reference books in quantity				
	2.5.4.10 Recent reference books				
	2.5.4.11 Furniture				
	2.5.4.12 Working hour				
2.6	Science laboratory				
	5.7.2 Science kit				
2.7	Pedagogic centers				
	5.8.5 Work shop room				
	5.8.6 Display room				
	5.8.7 Coordinators office				
	5.8.8 Equipment (workbench, hand tools)				
2.8	School compound				
	2.8.3 Size in relation to the student population				
	2.8.4 Space for different kind of games				
	2.8.2.1 Foot ball field				
	2.8.2.2. Valley ball field				
	2.8.2.3. Hand ball field				
	2.8.2.4. Basket ball field				
	2.8.3. Suitability for open air teaching				
	5.9.4. Shade trees				
	2.8.5. Flowers				
	2.8.6. Fence				
2.10	Office Facilities				
	2.10.1. Teachers staff				
	2.10.1.1. tables and Chairs in relation to teachers number				
	2.10.1.2. Lockers in relation to teachers number				
	2.10.2. Principals office				
	2.10.3. Department head offices				
	2.10.4.Ware house				
2.11	Toilet for students				
	2.11.1. Boys				
	2.11.2. Girls				
2.12	Toilet for teachers				
	2.12.1. Male				
	2.12.2. Female				
2.13	Water supply				

Part Three: The Responsiveness of School Facilities to

3.1. How do you evaluate your school in terms of the following points?

No	School site selection	V. Good	Good	Poor	V. Poor
3.1.1	Size of school				
3.1.2	Centrality to student population				
3.1.3	Drainage				
3.1.4	General environment (*Free from noise, heavy traffic*)				
	Classroom environment for the teaching learning				
3.1.10	Classroom temperature				
3.1.11	Ventilation				
3.1.12	Lighting				
3.1.13	Free from disturbing noise				
3.1.14	Nature of the floor				

3.2. To what extent do the following school facilities managed in a way that responds to the changes on the curriculum?

No	Key Facilities	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
3.2.1.	Classroom size				
	2.1.1. for group teaching				
	2.1.2. team teaching				
	8.1.3. for lecture				
	8.1.4. suitability of classroom furniture for group work				
	8.1.5. furniture suitability for individual work				
	8.1.6. suitability of classroom furniture's for students' age				
3.2.2	Library				
	8.2.1. enough space for individual study				
	8.2.2. for group study				

Part Four- The Planning of School Facilities

4.1. Which one of the following is the most applicable method for school facility planning in your district?

A. Need assessment ☐
B. Student enrollment ☐
C. Availability of budget ☐
D. Specify if any other _____

4.2. How do you select school site in your district?

A. Centrality to the student population ☐
B. Taking any vacant land donated from people ☐

C. The size of the land ☐
D. Nearness to the high way ☐
E. Mention if any other _____

4.3. If your answer for question no (4.2) is more than one order the responses by giving '1' for the mos actual reason and up for the less.

A ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐ D. ☐

4.4. Does the technical design of school facilities take in to account the diversity of weather condition?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

4.5. If your answer for question no (4.4) is no, why

A. The architects do not know the situation well ☐
B. Because not to violet the standard set ☐
C. Lack of technical control during the construction ☐
D. Due to the capacity of local contractors ☐
E. Specify if any other _____

4.6. If your answer for question no (4.5) is more than one put the reasons in the order of importance by giving '1' for the most possible and '4' for the least one

A. ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐ D. ☐

4.7. To what extent do the architect's technical supports make a difference for the adaptation of school facilities to educational needs?

A. V. good ☐ B. Good ☐ C. Poor ☐ D. V. good ☐

Part Five: Finance of the School Facilities

5.1. What are sources of your budget in school facility what are sources of your budget in school facility construction in your school?

A. Government grant ☐ B. Community contribution ☐
C. Donor support ☐ D. Internal Revenue ☐
E. Specify if any other _____

5.2. If your response for question no (5.1) is more than one order your answer by giving '1' for the high income source and '4' to the lower.

A. ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐ D. ☐

5.3. How do you get government grant budget from the WEO?

A. In cash ☐ B. In kind or materials ☐

5.4. To what extent is the purchasing of school facilities in your district in line with schools' needs in terms of the following points?

No	Item	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
5.4.1	Buying the amount required				
5.4.2	Buying quality items requested				
5.4.3	Buying at a reasonable price				
5.4.4	Fairness of distribution				

5.5. Do WEO financing school budget have a problem in school facilities planning?

☐ A. Yes ☐ B. No

5.6. If your answer for question no (5.5) is 'No', why

_____

5.7. For a better school facility planning, which level of financing do you favor among the following two if you are an authority?

A. School financing ☐

B. Wereda Education Office Financing ☐

5.8. If your choice for question number (5.7) is 'A', Why? _____

_____

5.9. If your answer for question number (5.7) is 'B' why? _____

_____

Part Six: Maintenance of school facilities

6.1. Do your school plan for facility maintenance?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

6.2. If your answer for question number (6.1) is 'yes', for what kind of maintenance do you plan?

A. For follow up maintenance ☐

B. For maintenance in particular time interval ☐

C. For maintenance after breakdown ☐

6.3. If your answer for question number (6.1) is yes how often?

A. Twice a year ☐ B. Once a year ☐

C. Depending on Situation ☐ D. Specify if any _____

6.4. How do you evaluate the existing status of your schools maintenance in terms of their quality service?

No	Item maintained	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
6.4.1	Painting walls and corridors				
6.4.2	Maintaining furniture				
6.4.3	Maintenance of doors and windows				
6.4.4	Shade plants				
6.4.5	Fence				

6.4. Do your school allocate budget for cleaning equipments?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

6.5. Who is responsible for the cleaning of the following school facilities?

No	Facilities	Employed custodians	Students in turn	Delinquent students	Mention if any other
6.5.1	Classrooms				
6.5.2	Toilets				

6.6. If your response for question no 6.4 is 'No' Why? _____

_____

6.7. How often do the following facilities be cleaned?

No	Facilities	Daily	2-3 days	4-5	Once a week
6.7.1	Classrooms				
6.7.2	Toilets				

6.8. Do you orient your students on how they use the school facilities?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

6.9. If your answer for question number (6.8) is 'yes', how often?

A. Every semester ☐ B. Once a year ☐

C. When something wrong is observed ☐

D. Specify if any other _____

_____

Part Seven- The controlling of School Facilities

7.1. Have the facilities in your school been received on legal records?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

7.2. If your answer for question number (7.1) is 'No' please, comment on how things are going on?_____

7.3. Do the facilities in your school have been coded for better control?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

7.4. If your answer for question number (7.2) is 'No' why? _____

_____

7.5. Have the classrooms been locked after school?

A. Yes ☐ B. No ☐

7.6. If your response for question no (7.5) is 'No' why? _____

_____

7.7. How do you evaluate the guarding of your school facility?

A. V. good ☐ B. Good ☐ C. Poor ☐ D. V. poor ☐

7.8. If your answer for question number (43) is poor or v. good, why?

A. Financial problem to pay for guards ☐

B. Lack of management control ☐

C. Specify if any other _____

7.9. If your answer for question number (7.8) is more than one order by giving '1' for the most possible reason and '4' for the least one.

A. ☐ B. ☐ C. ☐

Part Eight: The Responsibility of School Decision Makers

8.1. Who do you think involves in the following managerial activities of school in facility management in your school? If your response is more than one please indicate by ranking 1st 2nd etc from the most responsible to the least.

	Managerial Functions	WEO	S.B	PTA	S.P	T	St.
8.1.1	Planning of new school facilities						
8.1.2	Budget generation						
8.1.3	Communicating school facility plan						
8.1.4	Purchasing school facilities						
8.1.5	Planning maintenance						
8.1.6	Controlling school facilities						

Key= WEO= Wereda Education Office SP= School Principal
SB= School board T= Teachers
PTA= Parent Teacher Association ST= Students

8.2. To what extent do the following school management teams have the ability to manage the following activities in your school?

No	School Bard	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
8.2.1	Planning school facilities				
8.2.2	Good school-community relation				
8.2.3	Revenue generation				
	Principal				
8.2.4	Participating others in planning				
8.2.5	Strengthening school community relation				
8.2.6	Control over resources				
	Students				
8.2.7	Taking part in the planning of school facilities				
8.2.8	Maintenance of the school				
8.2.9	Beautifying their school environment				

8.3. How do you judge the willingness and commitment of the following school management team in your school?

No	Item	V. good	Good	Poor	V. poor
	School board				
8.3.1	Planning school facilities				
8.3.2	Budget generation				
8.3.3	Create strong school-community relation				
	School principal				
8.3.4	Participating other in planning of school facilities				
8.3.5	Strengthening School community related				
8.3.6	Control over resources				
8.3.7	School facility improvement				
	Students				
8.3.8	Taking part in the planning of school facilities				
8.3.9	Maintenance of the school				
8.3.10	Beautifying their school environment				

Thank You

Appendix 4

3.3.3.2 **ከ1-8ኛ ክፍል ያለው ት/ቤት**

ተ. ቁ.	ክፍሎች	ብዛት	የያንዳንዱ ክፍል መጠን በሜትር ካሬ	ምርመራ
1.	የመማሪያ ክፍል /1ኛ-4ኛ/	4	7x8=56	1-4ክፍል 50 ተማሪዎች በክፍል
	የመማሪያ ክፍል/5ኛ-8ኛ/	4	6.92x7.26=50.24	5ኛ-8ኛ 40 ተማሪ በክፍል
2.	የርዕሰ መምህር ቢሮ	1	4x84x4.05=19.6	
3.	የፅሐፊ ቢሮ	1	2.7x4.84=13.67	
4.	የመምህራን ክፍል/ስታፍሩም/	1	4.05x7-29.40	/ከ5ኛ-8ኛ ክፍል
	የመምህራን ክፍል	1	2.4x7.26=17.42	ከ5ኛ-4ኛ ክፍል/
5.	የመጀመሪያ እርዳታ መስጫ ክፍል	1	4.05x1.84=19.60	
6.	ዕቃ ግ/ቤት/ስቶር/	1	6.72x6.05=40.84	
7.	የጽዳት ሠራተኛ ክፍል	1	1.21x2.7=3.27	
8.	መጸዳጃ ቤት ለመምህራንና ሠራተኞች			
	. የወንዶች	1	3.63x4.05=14.7	
	. የሴቶች	1	2.7x3.63=9.8	
9.	የንባብ ክፍል	1	12.1x6.92=83.73	
	የመጻሕፍት ማስቀመጫ/ስቶር/	1	2x42x6.77=16.34	
10.	ሁለገብ የሣይንስ ክፍል	1	7x15=105/-/ 8x15=/=120	
11.	የትምህርት ማበልጸጊያ ማዕከል	1	7x15=105 8x10=80	የትምህርት መርጃ መሣሪያ ዎች ማዘጋጃ ክፍል ሠርቶ ማሰያና ማዋሸ ክፍል
2.	መጸዳጃ ቤት /ለተማሪ/	8	90x1.20	የብሎኩ መጠን 5.30
3.	የዘበኛ ቤት	1	2.45x2.45=6.8	4.20=22.26
4.	የልዩ ትም/መማሪያ ክፍሎች			
	የመማሪያ ክፍል ስፋት		4x7=28	
5.	የንግግር ወጌሻ መስጫ ክፍል	4x3.5=14		

3.4 **ለልዩ ልዩ ክፍሎች አስፈላጊ መሣሪያ ዎች፤**

3.4.1 **ለአንድ መማሪያ ክፍል**

ተ. ቁ.		ሰይዝ በሴንቲሜትር ከፍታ	ወርድ	ቁመት	ብዛት	ምርመራ
1.	ዲስክ/የመቀመጫው/	45	10	74	25	በ1 ዴስክ 2 ተማሪዎች ይቀመጣሉ።
2.	ጠረጴዛ	80	74	100	1	ለመምህሩ
3.	ወንበር	40	56	78	1	ለመምህሩ
4.	ጥቁር ሰሌዳ	=	500	120	1	
	ማስታወቂያ ሰሌዳ		50	100	1	

3.4.2 **ለንበብ ቤት ወይም ለቤተ መጻሕፍት (ለበለ 8-16) መማሪያ ክፍሎች**

ተ. ቁ.	ዓይነት	ከፍታ	ወርድ	ቁመት/ ርዝመት	ብዛት	ምርመራ
1.	ወንበር	40	56	74	40–80	
2.	ጠረጴዛ	80	100	74	7–14	
3.	መጽሐፍ መደርደሪያ	200	40	150	5–8	
4.	የቆሻሻ ማጠራቀሚያ ቅርጫት				1	መካከለኛ

3.4.4 **በአንደኛ ደረጃ ሁለገብ የሰይንስ ክፍል መገንት የሚገበቸው ዕቃዎች፤**

ተ. ቁ.	የዕቃው ዓይነት	ብዛት
1.	የመምህሩ/ዲሞንስትሬሽን/ጠረጴዛ	
2.	በቀላሉ የሚንቀሳቀሱ የተማሪ ጠረጂዘዎች	10
3.	ኩርሲዎች ወይም ወንበሮች	50
4.	ጥቁጥር ሰሌዳ	1
5.	ማስታወቂያ ሰሌዳ	2
6.	/ሰፋፊ/መደርደሪያ ዎች/ለሥራ ዎች ማስቀመጫ/	4
7.	ቁምሳጥን	1
8.	የንብረት ማስቀመጫ/ትንሽ ክፍል	1
9.	የሳይንስ ኪቶች	2
10.	የውሃ መያዣ ጀሪካን	1

3.4.5 **ለትምህርት ማበልጸጊያ ማዕከል የሚያስፈልጉ መሣሪያ ዎች**

ተ. ቁ.		ሳይዝ በሴንቲሜትር ከፍታ	ወርድ	ቁመት ርዝመት	ብዛት	ምርመራ
1.	ወንበር	40	56	78	3	
2.	ጠረጴዛ	80	74	100	3	
3.	መደርደሪያ	150	40	150	1	
4.	የመሥሪያ ቤንች 2 የእንጨት ሥራ መሥሪያ	ሪ	70	100	3	ከሞርሳ ጋር
5.	ጥቁር ሰሌዳ	=	500	150	1	
6.	ማስታወቂያ መለጠፊያ ሰሌዳ	=	100	200	1	
7.	የቆሻሻ ማጠራቀሚያ ቅርጫት	=	=	=	1	መካከለኛ

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work, has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name Hailiye Ayu

Signature: 

Place Addis Ababa University Faculty of Education
Department of Educational Planning and Management

Date of Submission: July 20, 2007

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as University advisor

Name Ato Melaku Yimam

Signature 

Place Addis Ababa University Faculty of Education
Department of Educational Planning and Management

Date Submission July 20, 2007