



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

**MANAGING SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION IN
GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOLS: THE CASE OF BOLE SUB-CITY,
ADDIS ABABA CITY ADMINISTRATION**

BY: AMBAYE ENQUBAHIR TESFAMICHAEL

DECEMBER, 2025

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

**MANAGING SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION IN
GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOLS: THE CASE OF BOLE SUB-CITY,
ADDIS ABABA CITY ADMINISTRATION**

BY: AMBAYE ENQUBAHIR TESHAMICHAEL

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR
THE REQUIREMENTS OF DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

DECEMBER, 2025

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

**MANAGING SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION
INGOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOLS: THE CASE OF BOLE SUB-
CITY, ADDIS ABABA CITY ADMINISTRATION**

**A Thesis Submitted to Addis Ababa University, in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for The Degree of Masters of Arts in Educational leadership.**

BY:

AMBAYE ENQUBAHIR TESFAMICHAEL

Approved by the Board of Examiners

Name Signature Date

Chairman _____

Advisor _____

Internal Examiner _____

External Examiner _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, **Dr. Dejene Nigusie**, for his unwavering support, expert guidance, and insightful feedback throughout the development of this thesis. His consistent encouragement and constructive suggestions have been instrumental in shaping the quality and direction of my research. I am sincerely grateful for his mentorship and commitment to my academic growth.

Lastly, but not the least, I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to the Bole Sub-City Education Bureau and the leadership of my primary school for granting me the opportunity to conduct this research. Their collaboration and support made it possible to access essential data and insights, which were critical to the success of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents	Page
Declaration	
Thesis Approval Sheet	
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
List of tables and Figures.....	viii
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	ix
ABSTRACT.....	x
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Research Objectives	4
1.3.1 General Objective	4
1.3.2 Specific Objectives	4
1.5 Significance of the Study	5
1.6 Scope of the Study.....	6
1.7 Organization of the Study	6
CHAPTER TWO	7
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURES	7
2.1 General Concept of School Improvement Program	7
2.2 Historical Development of School Improvement.....	9
2.3. Countries Experience in School Improvement Program Implementation	9
2.3.1. South Africa.....	9
2.3.2. Kenya.....	10
2.3.3 Nigeria	11
2.4 Existing Practices of Community Participation in SIP	13

2.5 School Improvement Initiative in Ethiopia	17
2.6 Rationale and Objectives of School Improvement Program	18
2.7 Domains of School Improvement Program.....	19
2.7.1 Teaching and Learning Domain	19
2.7.2 Learning environment domain.....	20
2.7.3 School Leadership and Management Domain.....	20
2.7.4 Community Participation Domain.....	21
2.7.5 The Roles of the School Improvement Committee (SIC) in Managing the Overall Implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP)	22
2.7.6 Strategies for Enhancing Community Participation in School Improvement	25
2.8 Challenges for School Improvement Program	27
2.9 Empirical studies	29
CHAPTER THREE	31
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	31
3.1 Research Design.....	31
3.2 Research Approach	31
3.3 Population of the study.....	32
3.4 Sample size determination and Sampling Techniques	32
Table 3.1 Sampling techniques of the study	33
3.5 Data Collection Methods.....	33
3.5.1 Quantitative Data Collection Tools	33
3.5.2 Qualitative Data Collection Tools	34
3.6 Data Analysis methods.....	34
3.7 Reliability and Validity	35
3.8 Ethical consideration	36
CHAPTER FOUR.....	37
PRESENTATIONS, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	37
4.1 Gender/sex/ of the Respondents.....	37
4.2 Age of the respondents	38
4.3 Level of Education of the respondents	38
4.4 Job Experience of the respondents	39
4.5 Current level of School improvement implementation	39
4.6 Strategies that school leaders used to manage the implementation of SIPs effectively	42

4.7 Concerning Challenges that hinder the implementation of school improvement program (SIP).	45
CHAPTER FIVE	51
SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS....	51
5.1 Summary of Major Findings	51
5.2 Conclusion.....	52
5.3 Recommendations	53
Implications for Future Research	54
REFERENCES	55

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 4.1 Gender/sex/ of the Respondents	37
Table 4.2 Age of the respondents	38
Table 4.3 Level of Education of the respondents	38
Table 4.4 Job Experience of the respondents	39
Table 4.5 Current level of School improvement implementation	39
Table 4.6 Strategies that school leaders used to manage the implementation of SIPs effectively	42
Table 4.7 Concerning Challenges that hinder the implementation of school improvement program (SIP)	45

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

SIP–School Improvement Program

SIC –School Improvement Committee

GEQIP – General Education Quality Improvement Package

MOE – Ministry of Education

PTA – Parent-Teacher Association

KETB – Kebele Education and Training Board

ESDP – Education Sector Development Program

TDP – Teacher Development Program

ICT – Information and Communication Technology

ICSEI – International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement

ISIP – International School Improvement Project

ESI – Effective School Improvement

SPSS – Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

FGDs – Focus Group Discussions

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to assess the managing of School Improvement Plan (SIP) implementation in government primary schools of Bole Sub-City, Addis Ababa City Administration. The researcher has employed a descriptive research design utilizing a survey method to assess how School Improvement Plan (SIP) implementation is managed in government primary schools. Furthermore, the researcher employed mixed methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative approach, with data collected through questionnaires, interviews, and focus group discussions. A total of 128 participants comprising school principals, teachers, and parent representatives were selected by using simple random sampling and purposive sampling methods. The findings revealed encouraging progress in several areas of SIP implementation. Most schools had prepared SIP documents consistent with national guidelines, and noticeable improvements were observed in teaching practices, student discipline, and parental involvement. School leaders and teachers demonstrated growing awareness of SIP objectives, and collaboration between schools and communities contributed to better learning environments. These positive outcomes suggest that SIP implementation is gradually strengthening school accountability and performance. Despite these achievements, significant challenges remained. Schools faced limited financial resources, weak leadership capacity, inadequate monitoring and evaluation, and inconsistent community participation. The study concluded that managing effective SIP implementation requires enhancing school leadership through continuous professional development focused on transformational leadership, participatory management, and data-driven decision-making. Increased resource allocation, stronger stakeholder collaboration, and regular supervision are also essential for sustainable progress. Overall, the research provides practical insights and recommendations to improve SIP planning and execution in Bole Sub-City's primary schools in particular, and contributing to the broader goal of educational quality improvement in Ethiopia in general.

Key variables: *School improvement, community participation, school leadership domain*

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

The term "school improvement" is often used in two contexts. On one hand, it can refer to general efforts aimed at enhancing schools to create better environments for students. On the other hand, it can be used more specifically to describe the strategies and actions that aim to increase student achievement (Demie & McLean, 2016). This research paper primarily focuses on the latter interpretation, using "school improvement" in the technical sense to examine the processes that school principals use to boost student performance.

School improvement planning can only lead to meaningful and lasting change if schools have access to the basic resources they need. Without these resources, the efforts to improve the school may end up being discouraging. One way to strengthen this process is by encouraging active participation from parents and local communities in both the planning and implementation stages of school improvement (MoE, 2011). The success of quality improvement relies heavily on the actions taken by both school staff and the surrounding community. To support this, school staff will be provided with essential tools, such as guidelines for creating improvement plans, along with the necessary resources (like school grants) and training to help them develop their own strategies and address the challenges they face. By combining these efforts, the goal is to see a real and significant improvement in student achievement.

Ethiopia had been making ongoing efforts to expand access to education while simultaneously striving to enhance its quality. Achieving these objectives solely through government resources and initiatives was challenging, which underscores the importance of active community involvement. To harness this potential, Ethiopia's education policy emphasizes decentralized educational management. Authority had been delegated to the Woreda, Kebele, and school levels to promote greater community participation in decision-making, implementation, and monitoring of school activities (MOE, 2002).

In addition to decentralization, Ethiopia had implemented various measures to improve access, equity, and quality in education. Among these efforts was the General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP), developed in 2006 and operational since then. GEQIP focuses on enhancing the quality of education and improving students' academic outcomes through six core components: The School Improvement Program (SIP), expansion of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), Civic and Ethical Education, Teacher Development Program (TDP), Curriculum Improvement, and General Education Management and Leadership Program (MOE, 2007).

The School Improvement Program (SIP) was initially piloted in select regions of Ethiopia in 2006. Drawing on the lessons learned from this pilot, the program was rolled out nationally in 2007 and had since been implemented across the country (MOE, 2007b). According to the School Improvement Framework (MOE, 2007b), the SIP aims to maximize students' academic performance by enhancing the teaching-learning process, focusing on four key domains: teaching and learning, the student environment, leadership and management, and community involvement. Thus, community participation was a crucial element in improving educational quality and student achievement. This research aims to evaluate the role of community participation in implementing the School Improvement Program in government primary schools within Bole Sub-City.

Education plays a critical role in the development of any community, and school improvement plans (SIPs) were a vital tool for enhancing the quality of education. In Ethiopia, the government had established policies to improve the performance of primary schools through the implementation of SIPs. Bole Sub city, as a rapidly developing urban area in Addis Ababa, had its own set of challenges and opportunities when it comes to implementing school improvement strategies. However, there was a limited understanding of how these plans were effectively managed and whether they achieve the desired outcomes in the context of government primary schools in the area. This research intends to investigate how SIPs were managed and implemented in government primary schools in Bole Sub city, focusing on identifying key challenges, management strategies, and assessing the impact on school improvement.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Ethiopia's Education and Training Policy and its implementation documents highlight challenges in both accesses to education and its quality. While efforts were made to address these issues through the development of a new policy (MoE, 2023), improvements were primarily seen in access rather than quality (MoE, 2002). Recognizing the need to enhance educational standards, the focus shifted towards improving inputs and processes that directly impact student learning and foster effective learning environments (MoE, 2007).

The challenges in implementing SIPs had far-reaching consequences on education quality. Many primary schools continue to struggle with poor student performance, high dropout rates, and limited teacher effectiveness due to weak improvement efforts. Studies and reports from the Ministry of Education indicate that while access to primary education had expanded, the quality remains a major concern. The failure to implement SIPs effectively means that students were not receiving the intended benefits of educational reforms (MoE, 2007).

Similar studies had been conducted by Kalayou (2011), Lemmesa Abdi (2016), and Hailu (2010). For example, Lemessa's research concentrated on the implementation of the School Improvement Program (SIP) in primary schools within Ilu Ababor zone, while Hailu focused on evaluating the achievements, challenges, and future prospects of SIP in the Addis Ababa City Administration. In contrast, this study specifically examined aspects of SIP planning and implementation in secondary schools of the Ilu Aba Bor Zone, where these schools were believed to be less effective in executing the program. Despite increased access to education, student performance had not improved as expected.

Jemal (2013) also identified several factors that impede the effective implementation of school improvement programs (SIP), including insufficient training and experience-sharing opportunities, budget constraints, poor communication skills among school principals, lack of community support, absence of participatory decision-making, inadequate teamwork and collaboration, the absence of school-level policies and guidelines, limited commitment from stakeholders, and insufficient school facilities.

The study by Gezahegn Desalegn and Abebe Hunde (2019) was titled "Practices and Challenges of School Improvement Program (SIP) in Secondary Schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone. "This research assesses the implementation of SIP in secondary schools within the Ilu Aba Bor Zone, focusing on the challenges

encountered during the program's execution. The findings indicate that while preparations for SIP implementation were satisfactory, the program faced obstacles such as budget shortages, inadequate monitoring skills among principals, limited community support, and insufficient facilities. The study concludes that there was a gap between policy implementation strategies and actual practices, recommending enhanced training, participatory decision-making, and improved monitoring to bolster the program's effectiveness.

Despite the adoption of SIPs to improve the quality of education, government primary schools in Bole Sub city face a variety of challenges in the effective implementation of these plans. These included insufficient resources, lack of skilled leadership, inadequate teacher training, and inconsistent monitoring mechanisms. The issue of effective management and the ability to overcome these challenges was crucial for the success of SIPs. Therefore, While previous studies had examined the implementation challenges of School Improvement Programs (SIPs) in various contexts, this study presented key distinctions in scope, focus, and approach: Unlike Lemmesa (2016), who studied SIP implementation in primary schools of Ilu Aba Bor Zone, or Berhanu(2010), who focused on Addis Ababa, this study specifically investigates SIP planning and execution in primary schools of Bole sub city, where implementation effectiveness remains a concern. While Gezahegn Desalegn and Abebe Hunde (2019) assessed SIP practices and challenges, this study places greater emphasis on both the planning and implementation aspects of SIP, examining whether initial strategies align with actual execution. While previous studies had shed light on the various barriers to effective SIP implementation, especially in secondary schools, however, this study provides a focused investigation into the government primary schools of Bole Sub-city.

1.3. Research Objectives

This section contains general and specific objectives of the research

1.3.1 General objective

The main objective of this research was to assess managing school improvement plan implementation in government primary schools in Bole sub city.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

1. To explore the current level of implementation of the School Improvement Program in the schools in Bole Sub city
2. To examine the strategies employed by school leaders to manage SIP implementation effectively

3. To identify the challenges faced by school leaders and teachers in implementing SIPs
4. To provide practical recommendations that can help improve how School Improvement Programs are managed in primary schools across Bole Sub City

1.4. Research Questions

This research was guided by the following questions:

1. What is the current level of implementation of the School Improvement Program in the schools in Bole Sub city?
2. What strategies did school leaders use to manage the implementation of SIP effectively?
3. What are the Challenges that hinder the implementation of school improvement program (SIP) in Bole sub city primary schools?
4. What are practical recommendations that can help improve how School Improvement Programs are managed in primary schools across Bole Sub City?

1.5 Significance of the Study

While the research focuses on a sample of government primary schools within Addis Ababa City Administration Bole sub city primary government schools, its importance lies in identifying achievements, challenges, and future prospects in managing the implementation of the School Improvement Program (SIP) and efforts to enhance school performance. Additionally, the study was anticipated to provide recommendations for preserving best practices and addressing challenges to ensure the effective and efficient execution of the program in the future. It was also expected to serve as a basis for similar studies across other regions, shedding light on the topic and drawing the attention of various stakeholders for its successful implementation.

1.6 Scope of the Study

This research was limited to government primary schools within Bole Sub-City, one of the eleven sub-cities under the Addis Ababa City Administration. The focus was on assessing how School Improvement Plans (SIPs) are managed, implemented, and monitored in these schools. Given that SIP implementation involves four key domains—teaching and learning, learning environment, leadership and management, and community participation—the study emphasized managerial and participatory aspects influencing these domains.

Specifically, the research assessed the effectiveness of school leadership, and implementation strategies used in managing SIP activities. It also explored the challenges and enabling factors that affect the efficiency of SIP execution at the school level. The geographical scope was confined to eight selected government primary schools out of sixteen found in Bole Sub-City, representing both densely populated and moderately populated areas to ensure a balanced perspective.

The study did not cover private schools, kindergartens, or secondary schools, as the School Improvement Program (SIP) framework and management structures differ across these levels. Furthermore, the study focused primarily on school-based management practices rather than regional or national policy aspects. By narrowing its focus in this way, the study sought to produce in-depth, context-specific findings applicable to improving SIP management within Bole Sub-City's government primary schools.

1.7 Organization of the Study

This research thesis was organized in to five sections. The first section deals with the introduction which comprises of the background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, objectives of the study, significance of the study, scope of the study, and organization of the thesis. In the second section, Theoretical, empirical as well as the conceptual framework was given. Section three presented highlights of the type of research design and methodology used, source and type of data, sampling method and sample size, instruments and method of data collection as well as methods of data analysis. Chapter four dealt with Data analysis and interpretation. The last chapter presented the summary of major findings, conclusion and Recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURES

This chapter addresses various aspects of school improvement, including the concept and definition of managing school improvement, the rationale and underlying assumptions of the School Improvement Program (SIP), and its guiding principles. It also explores the role of the school improvement committee, the framework for school improvement, key domains and elements, and the school improvement cycle. Additionally, the chapter covers school improvement planning, SIP initiatives in Ethiopia, the relationship between school improvement and teachers' professional development, the necessary conditions for successful implementation, and the challenges associated with the School Improvement Program.

2.1 General Concept of School Improvement Program

People have different ways of understanding and defining the term "school," and authorities also interpret it in various ways. According to Bollen, as cited in Reynolds et al. (1996:12), a school is a complex entity that is part of an even more complex educational system, involving local and national components. He suggests that to fully understand the school system, it's helpful to think of it in terms of an input-process-output model. A school operates as an open system that interacts with both the larger educational framework and the community. This view emphasizes that schools are organizations expected to meet societal demands and engage with the community.

Schools are meant to address the needs of all students, often through inclusive policies, and should continuously work to improve their practices. The core of this improvement process is often referred to as school improvement. Jeilu (2010) defines school improvement as efforts to enhance the input and processes that support teaching, learning, and ultimately, student outcomes. The Educational Improvement Commission (EIC, 2000) also describes a school improvement plan as a roadmap that outlines the changes a school needs to make to raise student achievement, detailing how and when these changes will happen.

School improvement planning is essentially about guiding the school as a system, where changes in one area affect all other parts. The goal is to ensure that students receive high-quality education, not only in terms of academic success but also in their overall development. The planning process involves a deep analysis of the school's strengths, weaknesses, and improvement needs, along with prioritizing and creating

a plan to address these areas. For this to be successful, an effective planning process is crucial for any organization, including schools.

According to DENI (2005:1), the planning process includes confirming the school's ethos, culture, and goals; assessing its current position, strengths, and areas for improvement in teaching and learning; identifying the resources available and how they will be managed; and setting clear targets for future performance. The plan should outline how these improvements will be achieved and how progress will be measured. For schools to provide effective educational programs and use resources efficiently, planning must be central to their administration and integrated into the overall structure of the school.

Moreover, school improvement planning is a collaborative process that relies heavily on the involvement of stakeholders. It involves reviewing the quality of provision, identifying strengths and weaknesses, planning actions to address priorities, and monitoring the outcomes. In conclusion, school improvement planning is not just a top-down process; it's a consultative and collaborative effort where all key stakeholders play a crucial role in ensuring the school's success David (1997).

School improvement aims to enhance school capacity for change and implement reforms, with the ultimate goal of increasing student achievement. It focuses on strengthening organizational capacity and improving educational outcomes. School improvement should not be confused with general educational change, as not all changes necessarily improve student outcomes. Effective improvements involve the school culture and organization (Hopkins, 1994). The International School Improvement Project (ISIP, 1987) defines it as a systematic effort to improve learning conditions in schools, ultimately enhancing educational goals. According to Nowata (2004), school improvement means making schools better places for learning, which depends on the commitment of schools to meet the expectations of students and their families.

A successful SIP involves active participation from children, communities, teachers, and school leaders, identifying school needs and securing resources to address them (Nagwata, 2004). SIP aims to improve teaching and learning processes while considering the broader educational environment, school management, and community involvement. The Ministry of Education (MoE, 2007) stresses that SIP involves self-evaluation of school domains to improve inputs and teaching methods.

2.2 Historical Development of School Improvement

Recent years had shown successful collaboration between the concepts of school effectiveness and school improvement, exploring innovative ways to merge these approaches (MacBeath&Mortimore, 2001; Hopkins & String, 2000). However, international collaboration on these initiatives remained limited until the Effective School Improvement (ESI) Project began to bridge these concepts across countries. Although school improvement projects and initiatives had been discussed at events like the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement (ICSEI), joint international efforts to investigate the universality of effective school improvement across various countries had been rare since 1988. For instance, the "Capacity for Change and Adaptation" initiative aimed to explore the relationship between school effectiveness and improvement to enhance educational outcomes globally.

Hopkins, Ainscow, and West (1994) defined effective school improvement as a strategic educational change that not only improves student learning outcomes but also strengthens a school's ability to manage transformation. This concept integrates insights from various theoretical frameworks, including organizational, curriculum, behavioral, and human resource theories, as well as organizational learning, management theories (Reezigt,2000) were chosen for their potential to offer valuable insights into the intricate process of school improvement. These theories address the interplay between educational elements, such as curriculum design, organizational structures within schools, and the behaviors of participants involved in the process (Scheerens&Demeuse, 2005).

2.3. Countries Experience in School Improvement Program Implementation

This section explores international experiences with the implementation of School Improvement Programs (SIPs). It reviews relevant research findings and literature from countries that have a long history and established practices in school improvement efforts. The countries selected—Kenya, South Africa and Ethiopia—were chosen based on their extensive engagement with SIPs.

2.3.1. South Africa

Efforts to enhance education in South Africa have taken multiple forms. One key strategy has been the decentralization of educational responsibilities and the empowerment of local districts and communities. The country's formal school improvement efforts began in 1994, with two complementary approaches: a government-led reform agenda and a school improvement movement supported by non-state actors, including the private sector and civil society organizations (Chinsamy,2002). This dual approach highlights

the potential of engaging non-governmental stakeholders in a coordinated and structured manner to support education reforms.

Overall, various stakeholders have contributed to school improvement in South Africa by focusing on enhancing teachers' subject knowledge and teaching skills, as well as improving school leadership and governance. These areas have proven to be critical levers for driving meaningful change in the education system (Chinsamy, 2002). The South African experience demonstrates the importance of addressing both instructional quality and school management in achieving effective educational transformation.

2.3.2. Kenya

In Kenya, the school improvement program operates on the premise that effective change happens when the focus is placed on individual schools, teacher development through hands-on methods, and enhanced school management. An evaluation of the program, which involved classroom observations, semi-structured interviews with project administrators, teachers, and parents, as well as informal interviews with staff and teachers, surveys, and pupil tests, found the program to be largely successful. However, it was recommended that the program should continue ensuring professional development strategies, improve the cost-effectiveness of staff development, and provide more targeted training for head teachers. The program's focus on individual schools and child-centered learning was especially effective. Additionally, the new teaching methods did not lower student achievement, and they supported the development of students' non-cognitive and social skills (Harry B., 2000).

Other initiatives aimed at long-term teacher development have also been launched in East Africa since 1985 by the Aga Khan Foundation. These initiatives include the School and District-Wide Improvement Project (SIPS), which has been implemented in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda, following a set of shared strategic principles. These principles emphasize that quality improvement in teaching and learning is most effective when changes are made at the school level, with the entire school as the unit of change. The approach highlights the ongoing professional development of teachers, the importance of school management, and the organizational factors that influence teachers' ability to implement change. It also focuses on preparing schools for the long-term integration of structures and processes that foster continuous improvement. Moreover, the program stresses the importance of partnerships among key education stakeholders to drive sustainable change (Aga Khan Foundation, 2002).

2.3.3 Nigeria

The concept of school improvement in Nigeria was introduced under the Education Sector Support Program in Nigeria (ESSPIN) in 2008. The ESSPIN initiative aimed to tackle some of the persistent quality challenges in Nigeria's education system, particularly in primary and secondary education. The program, which was jointly funded by the Nigerian and UK governments, focused on improving learning outcomes for children of basic education age, initially in six Nigerian states.

According to the Education Sector Support Program in Nigeria (2010), ESSPIN's primary goal was to enhance the quality of education and learning by targeting specific issues at multiple levels within the educational system, from national policy frameworks down to individual schools. The program worked through a multifaceted approach that addressed challenges at the national, state, local government, and school levels.

At the school level, ESSPIN focused on providing structured training materials for teachers, offering professional development to head teachers to improve academic leadership, and helping schools create effective improvement plans. An important element of the program was its emphasis on community involvement, especially through the establishment of school-based management committees (SBMCs). These committees played a key role in fostering collaboration between schools and local communities, ensuring that stakeholders at all levels of education could contribute to and support the school improvement process.

The ESSPIN program was originally scheduled to run from 2008 to 2014, but due to the positive results seen in several states and the continued demand for education reform, the program was extended until January 2017. This extension was based on growing evidence of its success in driving reforms and improving educational outcomes in participating states.

One of the unique aspects of ESSPIN's approach was its focus on the transformation of individual schools. Rather than taking a broad, one-size-fits-all strategy, the program recognized the need for tailored interventions that were closely aligned with the local context and the specific challenges each school faced. The improvement process involved a variety of interconnected interventions, each aimed at raising student achievement and improving overall school performance. These interventions were led by State School Improvement Teams (SSITs), which were small, dedicated teams of education professionals who were selected specifically for their expertise and commitment. The SSITs worked full-time at the state level,

collaborating closely with schools to address the diverse challenges facing education in Nigeria. Their work was grounded in providing continuous professional support for teachers and school leaders, conducting in-school training workshops, and offering follow-up guidance to ensure that improvements were sustained. Overall, ESSPIN's approach was centered on strengthening the capacity of schools, supporting teachers, and fostering local ownership of school improvement initiatives. By addressing the challenges at multiple levels and engaging communities in the process, the program aimed to create long-lasting change that would enhance the educational outcomes of Nigerian students.

The program's success was largely attributed to its comprehensive, integrated approach, which acknowledged that improvements in education require both systemic change and grassroots involvement. Through this holistic model, ESSPIN contributed to the development of more effective school management, better teaching practices, and greater community engagement in the education system, ultimately leading to enhanced learning outcomes for children in Nigeria. Although ESSPIN in Nigeria and the school improvement efforts in Bole Sub-City, Addis Ababa, are operating in very different settings, there are some key similarities in their approaches. Both place a strong emphasis on the involvement of the community, strong school leadership, and ongoing teacher development as central to achieving sustainable improvements in education. However, while ESSPIN had a broader scope, working across multiple states and involving various levels of government, the work in Bole Sub-City is more localized, focusing on specific schools and adapting to the unique needs of that community.

Bole Sub-City can take valuable lessons from ESSPIN's success. For instance, adopting ESSPIN's approach to community engagement ensuring parents, local leaders, and other community members actively participate in shaping the school environment could greatly strengthen school improvement efforts. In addition, ESSPIN's use of data-driven evaluation and teacher training programs could be adapted to better fit the local context of Bole Sub-City, helping to ensure that improvement plans are based on evidence and are continuously refined.

At the heart of both efforts is the recognition that effective leadership is key to transforming schools. School leaders who are well-trained, supported, and empowered to take action can make a huge difference in driving change. Ultimately, whether in Nigeria or Bole Sub-City, success depends on consistent support for both teachers and school leaders, and a community-centered approach that ensures all stakeholders are working together to improve educational outcomes.

2.4 Existing Practices of Community Participation in SIP

From the practices of World Bank in the education sector, the Bank started making extensive efforts to learn about how participation could contribute to improving Bank's education projects. This started in late 1980s, around the time when participation started receiving attention in development field. The Bank has since been aiming to involve different stakeholders and is continuously working with various actors that play important roles in the education sector. According to the World Bank (1999) community participation is a process that facilitates the realization of improving educational quality and the promotion of democracy within society. Through its projects, the World Bank aims at involving communities in various stages; preparation, implementation, and evaluation. Communities are also expected to develop and strengthen these capacities so that they can take over the work the Bank has initiated and continue to carry on. In this sense, the Bank's job is to facilitate the process, providing communities with the necessary knowledge and skills, and making sure communication takes place effectively among different stakeholders, including parents, community members, teachers, and government officials. As the recognition of community participation increases, careful examination of its exercises becomes more important (World Bank,1999).

According to Prew (2009) in Dekker (2010) when one focuses on sub-Saharan Africa, formal schooling is a relatively new concept, let alone school development. Western concepts of school development, which have generally been set within a capitalist, consumerist, individual frame of reference, cannot be lifted wholesale and planted in the developing world. Not only the way of thinking about schooling can differ in developing countries, the role of the community in the school can also differ. The apparent involvement and inclusivity of a wide range of stakeholders in the process of drawing up the plan and its implementation, implies greater and deeper community involvement in sub Saharan Africa in the school and its development process. In addition to the experiences with community participation in school development in sub-Saharan Africa as a concept, there are also experiences with the same subject in a project and research setting. These are experiences within projects that show us what elements are important for a project to succeed. Dekker (2010) cited Jimu (2008) and Pryor (2005) study in Malawian views of community participation as "community involvement in various projects, including education projects, in rural Malawi in the last 40 years do not signify a breakthrough in the problem of rural development. Not only the development agents are important players in the field of community involvement in development, the state also plays a significant role. Community participation for improvement of rural schooling in Ghana is desirable in itself; school development is an important factor to create a community around the school. For this concept to work, the state should be active in trying to

create community participation, rather than looking to the community to develop the school.” In other words, (Pryor, 2005) argues: ‘if you want to build a community round the school, start with the school, not with the community’ 22 Another major factor influencing the successful outcome of a project with community participation, is the existence of a culture of governance that includes all role players from central policy-makers and officials to learners, educators, parents and other members of the community. All actors need to acknowledge that there is a power imbalance between educators and families. Particularly when teachers represent one culture and class background and families have lower incomes and are from different cultures.

Prew (2009) in Dekker (2010) posited a paradigm for school development in the context of a developing country. Within this paradigm, the norm of a school-parent engagement over pedagogical issues as in the West is replaced by imperatives based on full community involvement in the school on the local communities’ own terms. The key elements in this paradigm are that the community should be involved in determining the development priorities in the school, supplying voluntary and paid services to the school, helping the school raise and manage funds, and sitting on and running some school committees. Also, it involves linking the school, community and the local economy in a creative, productive relationship. These include: providing an oversight of school budgeting and teacher attendance and performance; managing student attendance and homework; providing resources for school building, teacher hiring and other school infrastructure and services; and advocating at local and national levels for changes that may improve educational access, retention, and completion. As already mentioned, many of the programs and policies designed to increase community participation have focused on creating formal structures (such as School Committees or Parent-Teacher Associations) through which parents can play a regularized and active role in the school.

Again Kendall (2007) argues that decentralization policies may be implemented to transfer power over school personnel, school budgets, and school planning to parents or local governments. Infrastructure construction support may be predicated on the community providing some percent of the cost of construction, often in labor, before the state or international funds are released. These policies and programs are often large-scale (national or multi-district) and relatively top-down in their design and implementation. School quality has improved as a result of these programs and policies. Less programs have used the 23 technique to empower parents. These programs were effective in improving educational quality, which was measured by the individual communities involved in the programming. These working elements show us that community participation can be useful in school development projects in Africa.

According to Abera (2015), in a decentralized education system, the community participates in decision making, planning, monitoring and evaluating the activities of the school improvement program. It has been conclusively stated that community participation in the SIP has a lot of benefits that include ownership of the school by communities and ability of the communities to support the school financially and materially, and the school becoming environment where democracy is practiced. These reasons and many more made the government to devise that national strategy for community participation in SIP through committees or associations, such as “Kebele” Education and Training Board (KETB), school improvement Committee (SIC), and ParentTeacher Association (PTA) MOE (2002). In relation to school management, the communities or their representatives can participate in planning process, decision making process, monitoring and evaluation as well as creating conducive school environment in the activities of school improvement program.

The World Bank’s involvement in the education sector has evolved over time, particularly since the late 1980s when the importance of participation started receiving global attention in the development field. As noted by the World Bank (1999), community participation is integral to improving educational quality and fostering democracy within society. The Bank has made extensive efforts to incorporate community participation in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of its education projects. Its approach aims to build local capacities so communities can take over and sustain the initiatives long after the Bank's direct involvement ends. In this framework, the Bank serves as a facilitator, ensuring communities have the knowledge, skills, and resources needed for effective communication and collaboration among stakeholders, including parents, teachers, and local authorities.

Prew (2009) in Dekker (2010) highlights that formal schooling is a relatively new concept in sub-Saharan Africa, and thus the concept of school development, including the idea of community participation, must be understood within the context of local realities. Western models of school development, often grounded in capitalist and individualistic values, may not be directly applicable in developing countries. In these contexts, both the perception of schooling and the role of the community in the school system differ significantly.

In sub-Saharan Africa, the involvement of a wide range of community members in school development and decision-making can lead to deeper and more meaningful community engagement. For example, the experiences of community participation in countries like Malawi and Ghana, as noted by Jimu (2008) and Pryor (2005), suggest that effective school development requires active engagement from the state and

external development agents. Without the state's support, community-driven initiatives may lack the resources and structure necessary for lasting change. In Ghana, for example, creating a community around the school starts with the school itself, not just the community, and this requires a strong leadership role from the state.

Effective SIP implementation also depends on the governance culture within the community. As Prew (2009) suggests, a culture of governance that includes all role players—from policymakers to parents and educators—must be cultivated for community participation to succeed. This includes recognizing the existing power imbalances between teachers and families, particularly when cultural and socio-economic backgrounds differ. For participation to be meaningful, all actors must acknowledge these imbalances and work together to address them.

The key to successful school development lies in ensuring that the local community is not merely involved in the process, but that it plays an active role in shaping school priorities, offering resources, and managing school-related tasks. This paradigm, outlined by Prew (2009), suggests that communities should not only participate in planning and decision-making but should also take responsibility for critical activities such as managing school funds, supervising teacher attendance, and advocating for educational policies at both local and national levels.

Kendall (2007) discusses how decentralization policies, which transfer power over school management to local communities or governments, can support improved school quality. In many cases, these policies have been effective in empowering parents and communities, particularly when they are allowed to participate in budgeting, hiring teachers, and overseeing school infrastructure. However, it's important that such programs are not only designed to increase community involvement but also provide the necessary resources and training to ensure their success.

Abera (2015) further emphasizes that in a decentralized education system, community involvement in decision-making, planning, monitoring, and evaluation is crucial to the success of the SIP. Communities, through committees such as School Improvement Committees (SIC), Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs), and local education boards (e.g., Kebele Education and Training Board - KETB), play a pivotal role in creating a conducive learning environment and supporting the financial and material needs of the school.

From the literatures, we can conclude that managing the implementation of School Improvement Programs (SIPs) requires a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach that actively engages the community and various stakeholders, including local governments and the state, at every stage of the program. Key factors for the success of SIPs include inclusive stakeholder participation, where teachers, parents, local leaders, and government officials are all involved in the planning and decision-making processes. Additionally, capacity building is crucial, as it equips community members with the necessary training and resources to manage and sustain school development efforts independently over time. Addressing governance and power dynamics, particularly the existing imbalances between educators and families, ensures that all actors are treated as equal contributors to the development process. Decentralization is another critical element, empowering local communities with the authority to make decisions regarding budgeting, staffing, and infrastructure, which fosters a sense of ownership. Cultural sensitivity is also essential, as it acknowledges the unique context of sub-Saharan Africa, where school development models and community participation may differ from Western approaches. Finally, for SIPs to be effective in the long term, it's important to build systems that support sustainability, allowing communities to continue managing resources and driving improvements in education. Ultimately, the success of SIPs in sub-Saharan Africa depends on a thoughtful balance of local context, active community involvement, and strong governance that ensures sustained collaboration and tangible improvements in educational outcomes (World Bank, 2018; UNESCO, 2014; ESSPIN, 2014).

2.5 School Improvement Initiative in Ethiopia

Ethiopia had undertaken various measures to enhance the quality of education by strengthening and promoting internal school conditions. Based on the Education and Training Policy introduced in 1994, the education management system was decentralized to the grassroots level. A guideline issued by the Ministry of Education in 1994 E.C. outlined the roles and responsibilities of KETB, PTSA, and SIC, enabling them to actively engage in school activities and foster stronger school-community relationships (MOE, SIP Guideline, Amharic Version, 2007).

Moreover, the Ministry of Education (2005) acknowledged that while community contributions in terms of finances and educational materials were progressively increasing, further efforts were required to improve school-community interactions. Despite notable progress in expanding access to schools, the quality of education in Ethiopia remains a significant challenge. National learning assessments reveal this issue, with findings from ESDP III indicating that primary and secondary national examination results for most subjects were below average (MOE, 2005).

In this context, the Ministry of Education (2007) identified critical factors contributing to poor student outcomes, including school management and organization, the availability of textbooks, curricular and instructional materials, and the medium of language instruction. To address these issues and related challenges, the MOE introduced the General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP), aiming to enhance education quality and improve student performance. Drawing on the experiences of high-performing schools within the country and lessons from other nations, Ethiopia introduced the School Improvement Program (SIP) to enhance student learning outcomes. The program's framework and accompanying guidelines emphasize four key domains: learning and teaching, school environment, leadership and management, and community involvement (MOE, SIP Guideline, Amharic Version, 2007).

2.6 Rationale and Objectives of School Improvement Program

According to Hussein and Postlethwaite (as cited in Firew, 2010), the primary aim of most school improvement policies is to enhance the educational process, which includes both teaching methods and subject content. These policies also focus on improving the broader organizational functions of schools that, while not directly related to student achievement, play a crucial role in supporting it. This includes areas like school climate, staffing, and overall school structure. Additionally, School Improvement Programs (SIPs) encourage schools to engage in self-assessment to identify their strengths and weaknesses in performance. The success of SIPs depends heavily on the collaborative efforts of various stakeholders at different levels of the education system, as effective policy improvement requires the interaction and contribution of many participants.

According to Plan International (2004), the School Improvement Program is an education initiative informed by extensive experience in supporting basic education in developing countries. In this context, SIPs align with broader educational goals, particularly supporting the efforts of governments and other organizations to achieve the Education for All objectives by 2015. Specifically, the program aims to provide comprehensive support across all areas of school functioning. Creating a conducive environment for children is essential in supporting school-based plans, enhancing the quality of basic education, and achieving enrollment, attendance, and completion rates that align with the Education for All goals. This includes fostering active participation from students and the community in school governance, as well as ensuring accountability within school management for student enrollment, attendance, learning, and successful completion.

Plan International (2004) highlights several core elements that are crucial for the success of these programs. These elements include ensuring that teachers are both competent and motivated, promoting active learning methods supported by appropriate teaching materials, and encouraging the active involvement of both children and parents in school governance. Additionally, SIPs emphasize the need to create a safe, sound, and effective learning environment, develop a relevant curriculum, empower and support school leaders, and advocate for effective supervision. In this context, schools and educationalists work together to strengthen the school's capacity to manage change, improve teaching practices, and ultimately raise student achievement. Over the past decade, reform programs aimed at building schools' capacity to provide quality education have been developed. According to Hopkins (2002), these reform efforts are often referred to as School Improvement Programs (SIPs).

The primary goal of SIP was to enhance student achievement by improving teaching and learning conditions. SIP encourages schools to become accountable to their communities and stakeholders, including parents and government. Key areas of focus included ensuring competent and motivated teachers, promoting active learning methods, involving children and parents in school governance, and ensuring a safe and effective learning environment (Sathyabalan, 2004). The success of the SIP depends on the strength of each of these areas.

2.7 Domains of School Improvement Program

SIP operates within key domains that focus on improving student outcomes. These domains often included learning and teaching, leadership and management, creating a conducive school environment, and community involvement. These areas serve as frameworks for planning, monitoring, and evaluating school activities, and they guide schools in improving their practices and processes (MoE, 2006; ACT, 2009). This chapter highlights the importance of both structural and systemic improvements in schools to enhance educational outcomes and overcome challenges in SIP implementation.

2.7.1 Teaching and Learning Domain

The teaching and learning domain was central to SIPs, as it directly impacts student performance. Harris (2002) stresses that despite debates about the definition of good teaching; effective instruction remains the most critical determinant of learning outcomes. Teachers play a fundamental role in delivering the curriculum, adapting teaching strategies, and evaluating student progress. However, studies such as Jemal (2013) and Gezahegn Desalegn & Abebe Hunde (2019) indicate that many schools struggle with teacher training, insufficient learning resources, and ineffective instructional methods, limiting the impact of SIPs.

While prior studies emphasize the need for teacher training and resource availability, my study argues that a more structured approach to instructional leadership and professional development programs was required. Training should not be intermittent but rather rooted within the SIP framework, ensuring continuous teacher improvement.

2.7.2 Learning environment domain

Reynolds et al. (1996) highlight that beyond physical infrastructure; a school's psychological atmosphere significantly affects student engagement and learning. The MoE (2007) also emphasizes that well-structured school environments positively impact educational quality. However, research by Kalayou (2011) and Lemessa Abdi (2016) found that in many Ethiopian schools, overcrowded classrooms, poor school facilities, and inadequate student support systems diminish the effectiveness of SIPs.

The Ministry of Education (MOE, 2007) emphasizes that when a school's environment was well-designed to support learning and teaching, it significantly contributes to the overall quality of education. An environment that fosters active student participation and provides a range of learning activities allows for deeper and more meaningful engagement in the learning process. Therefore, schools should strive to create spaces and atmospheres that both motivate and challenge students to actively engage with the learning material and with each other. In summary; the learning environment was a critical factor in educational success. It must stimulate purposeful activities and provide opportunities for diverse learning experiences, all of which were necessary for effective teaching and positive student outcomes. Building on previous research, this study posits that learning environments should be assessed not only in terms of infrastructure but also in relation to student well-being, classroom interaction, and teacher-student relationships. SIPs should incorporate psychological support mechanisms and student-centered learning spaces to enhance engagement.

2.7.3 School Leadership and Management Domain

Effective leadership was a key driver of school improvement. Adesina (1990) outlines the essential functions of educational management, including planning, organization, staffing, evaluation, and development. Harris (2002) asserts that leadership influences school culture and improvement efforts. However, studies by Berhanu Hailu (2010) and Gezahegn Desalegn & Abebe Hunde (2019) found that many Ethiopian school leaders lack the training and skills needed to implement SIPs effectively, leading to weak policy execution.

As Harris (2002) points out, leadership plays a critical role in school improvement strategies, which can ultimately lead to changes in the school culture. A strong leader not only articulates a vision but also helps to shape and define the culture of the school by setting the tone, modeling desired behaviors, and guiding the school community through transformation. Leadership, therefore, was a key driver in the continuous improvement of a school, ensuring that the values, norms, and practices of the institution align with its educational goals. In summary, while management was about the systematic organization of resources to achieve goals, leadership was about vision, influence, and guiding the school community to foster a positive, supportive culture. Both were essential for creating an environment conducive to effective teaching and learning. While previous research highlights leadership challenges, this study argues that school leadership training should go beyond administrative skills to include transformational leadership and data-driven decision-making approaches. SIP success depends on leaders who can inspire, engage stakeholders, and adapt to changing educational needs.

2.7.4 Community Participation Domain

Community engagement was recognized as a crucial element in SIP success. The World Bank (2000) defines community participation as the process where stakeholders influence school decisions and resource allocation. Schaeffer (1994) further emphasizes that participation was both a means to achieve school improvement and an end in itself, fostering empowerment. However, studies such as Jemal (2013) and Lemmesa (2016) indicate that Ethiopian schools often face low parental involvement, poor community-school relationships, and minimal decision-making participation, which weakens SIP effectiveness.

According to the World Bank (2000), as referenced by Morgan (2006), community participation was a process through which stakeholders—such as parents, teachers, students, and local communities—can influence and share control over development initiatives, decisions, and the allocation of resources that affect their lives. This definition highlights the collaborative nature of participation, where the community was not just a passive recipient of educational services but an active contributor to the decisions that shape the school's operations and improvement efforts.

Schaeffer (1994) in reality, participation was often both a means to achieve more effective school management and an end in itself, leading to more engaged and self-sustaining communities. Community participation was a process where stakeholders had a say in decision-making and resource allocation that impacts their schools. It involves empowering communities, which enhances local ownership of educational outcomes. Participation can be both a means to improve schools (by involving the community

in decision-making) and an end (by achieving community empowerment). Effective participation can lead to more relevant and sustainable school improvements because it incorporates local knowledge, values, and priorities. In sum, community participation in school management was essential for creating a collaborative environment where schools and their surrounding communities work together to achieve better educational outcomes. This approach fosters a sense of shared responsibility and encourages more holistic, contextually appropriate solutions to school challenges. While prior research highlights the barriers to community involvement, this study suggests that a structured, institutionalized approach to participation was necessary. Schools should establish formalized community engagement strategies, including parent education programs, school-community committees, and participatory budgeting models. The reviewed literature highlights common SIP challenges such as inadequate resources, weak leadership, poor learning environments, and low community participation. This study sought to bridge that gap by analyzing the interplay between these domains in primary schools of Bole sub city, identifying systemic weaknesses, and proposing integrated solutions to enhance SIP effectiveness.

Epstein, J. L. (2001) stresses that community participation in schools plays a pivotal role in improving student learning outcomes. By engaging in various forms of participation—from attending meetings to being involved in decision-making and service delivery—communities contribute to all aspects of school improvement. Moreover, the four key domains (management, curriculum, community involvement, and school environment) were interconnected, with the central aim being to enhance student achievement. The success of these domains in improving education lies in their alignment with the common objective of improving student results.

2.7.5 The Roles of the School Improvement Committee (SIC) in Managing the Overall Implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP)

The School Improvement Committee (SIC) plays a pivotal role in the management and execution of the School Improvement Plan (SIP), a framework that guides schools through a structured process of self-assessment, planning, implementation, and monitoring. According to the Ministry of Education (MOE, 2010), the SIP process is divided into four key stages: Self-Assessment, Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring. Each stage is designed to foster systematic improvement in schools by involving various stakeholders, including teachers, parents, students, and local government representatives. Below is a more in-depth look at each stage and the specific role of the SIC in ensuring its successful implementation.

Stage 1: Self-Assessment

The first stage of the SIP cycle involves a comprehensive self-assessment of the school's current state using the 29 standards outlined in the SIP framework. This diagnostic phase is essential for gathering data that will inform the development of a strategic plan and an annual action plan. The School Improvement Committee (SIC) coordinates a range of data-gathering activities, including:

1. Teacher interviews
2. Classroom observations
3. Student test results analysis
4. Parent and student self-assessments
5. Review of school records

Data gathered through these methods is crucial for establishing a baseline of the school's performance, highlighting areas that need improvement, and providing a foundation for setting improvement goals. Ensuring the quality and reliability of the data is a central responsibility of the SIC. This requires proper training for all stakeholders involved in the data collection process to minimize biases and inaccuracies. Clear communication from the principal and the committee members is vital to motivate all participants to take the self-assessment process seriously.

Stage 2: Planning

Following data collection, the SIC undertakes a thorough review of the results to identify the school's strengths and weaknesses. The planning phase involves prioritizing areas for improvement and selecting the standards that will form the focus of the school's improvement efforts. According to the Ministry of Education (MOE, 2010), each year, a compulsory standard (Standard 3) must be included in the SIP, and additional standards critical to the school's overall objectives are selected based on the self-assessment findings. The SIC ensures that these priorities are addressed within the framework's six sections, ensuring that each component of the SIP is comprehensive and aligned with the school's long-term improvement goals.

Stage 3: Implementation

The SIC holds responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the strategic and annual action plans. After the planning phase, the committee follows a clear timeline based on the Ministry of Education's guidelines, which includes conducting self-assessments at three intervals throughout the year. The school

principal plays a key role in integrating these activities into the school calendar to ensure that each phase is adequately resourced and scheduled. Regular performance review meetings are held to update the school community and external stakeholders, such as parents and local officials, on the progress of the action plans. These sessions serve as a platform for receiving feedback and adjusting the implementation strategy where necessary.

Stage 4: Monitoring

The final stage in the SIP process involves continuous monitoring and evaluation to assess whether the goals set in the action plans are being achieved. At the end of the first year of implementation, schools are required to conduct another self-assessment to evaluate their progress. The SIC works closely with local district staff and supervisors to carry out this evaluation, using the data collected throughout the year to determine whether the planned improvements are being realized. Adjustments are made to ensure the sustainability of improvements and the continued relevance of the action plan.

School principals are central to the successful execution of the SIP. As both facilitators and leaders, principals ensure that all key stakeholders are actively engaged in the process. Their roles can be classified into three main areas:

1. **Raising Awareness:** Principals play an essential role in raising awareness about the SIP process among all school community members. This includes conducting formal meetings and informal discussions to encourage collaboration and participation. By engaging teachers, parents, and students, principals foster a culture of shared responsibility for the school's improvement efforts.
2. **Building Capacity:** Principals are responsible for ensuring that teachers and other stakeholders possess the knowledge and skills necessary for successful SIP implementation. This includes providing ongoing professional development opportunities for staff and creating leadership training programs that help build capacity at all levels of the school.
3. **Monitoring and Evaluation:** Principals lead the monitoring and evaluation processes by collecting and analyzing data on student performance. They use this data to assess progress toward SIP goals and to guide necessary adjustments. Principals also ensure that a culture of continuous improvement is embedded within the school, where all members of the school community contribute to the ongoing evaluation of the SIP.

In conclusion, the success of the SIP is directly linked to the effectiveness of the SIC in managing the implementation process and the active leadership of the school principal. By fostering collaboration, ensuring capacity building, and maintaining a strong monitoring framework, principals and the SIC ensure that the SIP leads to tangible and lasting improvements in the school environment.

2.7.6 Strategies for Enhancing Community Participation in School Improvement

The active involvement of the community is crucial to the success of any School Improvement Plan (SIP). Schools must implement strategies that effectively engage the local community, including parents, local leaders, and other stakeholders, in all stages of the school improvement process. These strategies not only strengthen the support for school reforms but also ensure that improvements are sustainable over time.

A. Building the Capacity of School Principals and Teachers

As pivotal figures in school management, both principals and teachers need to possess the skills and knowledge to engage the community effectively. Research indicates that effective principals create a culture of collaboration, develop strong relationships with parents, and lead the implementation of strategies that align with the school's mission (MOE, 2005). To achieve this, continuous professional development is essential. Training should include areas such as participatory management, community engagement, and collaborative decision-making. Teachers, in particular, need training to develop a participatory management style that encourages active involvement in planning, budgeting, and school governance (MOE, 2002). According to UNESCO (2002), leaders and educators must be trained in how to manage their autonomy while still fostering collaboration and involving the community.

B. Creating a School Environment Conducive to Participation

For community members to actively participate, the school must create a welcoming and inclusive environment. Schools can establish open communication channels through regular parent-teacher meetings, community forums, and school events. It is essential that these events are accessible to all members of the community. Adjusting the timing and locations of meetings to accommodate the community's schedule can further enhance participation. When the school environment is inviting and respectful, community members are more likely to feel a sense of ownership and responsibility for school activities (Reid, 2000; Swift Morgan, 2006).

C. Defining Clear Roles for Community Members

One of the critical strategies to encourage community participation is defining clear roles for parents and local stakeholders. By outlining the expectations and responsibilities of community members, schools can ensure that participation is meaningful and focused on tangible outcomes. Ongoing dialogue between the school and community members is necessary to maintain understanding of these roles. Awareness campaigns, conducted through newsletters, parent meetings, or social media, are effective tools for communicating these roles and the benefits of community involvement in school improvement efforts.

D. Providing Orientation and Training for Community Representatives

Community representatives may be hesitant to engage actively in school activities if they feel underprepared or lack confidence in their roles. Providing orientation and training for parents, community leaders, and other stakeholders is essential to equip them with the knowledge and skills needed to make informed contributions (UNESCO, 2002). Training on areas such as budgeting, school planning, and monitoring helps empower the community to participate meaningfully in school governance and improvement efforts. The World Bank (1997) notes that training community member's fosters greater engagement and enhances the likelihood of their long-term involvement.

E. Providing Community Services

Schools can also serve as community hubs by offering services that benefit local residents. These services might include student-led community projects, adult education programs, and environmental initiatives such as waste management or traffic safety programs. By offering such services, schools become central to the social fabric of the community, encouraging local involvement and participation. Additionally, schools should establish clear regulations for community activities to ensure that these services align with the school's overall mission and goals (Aggrawal, 1996; Bagin, 2001).

F. Publicizing Achievements and Encouraging Ongoing Participation

To maintain momentum in the school improvement process, it is essential to publicize the achievements and successes of the SIP. This can be done through local media, school newsletters, or community events. Celebrating milestones reinforces the value of community involvement and motivates ongoing participation. Additionally, schools can create open forums for discussion where community members can share their ideas and feedback, further fostering a sense of ownership and commitment to the school's

improvement efforts (MOE, 2005). Incorporating community participation in the SIP process is critical for fostering sustainable educational improvements. By building capacity, creating inclusive environments, defining clear roles, and offering appropriate training, schools can ensure that their improvement efforts are supported by the entire community. When implemented effectively, these strategies not only enhance school performance but also strengthen the social fabric of the local community, creating a shared responsibility for student success and educational outcomes.

2.8 Challenges for School Improvement Program

School improvement program is very complex that it might be hindered by various impediments that challenge the implementation (Stoll and Fink, 1996). These challenges include:” complexity of the program, mobility of teachers and principals, principal’s coordination problems (ineffectiveness of leadership) and sustaining commitment, low support from top level officials and lack of involvement of the stakeholders.” According to Hussen and Postethwore (1994), Challenges to the school improvement may vary in accordance with the variations with the unique features of schools as well as with the external environment in which schools are operating. One simple example, the size of the school is associated with innovative behavior for that smaller schools apparently lack the resources to engage in significant change. However, there are common challenges that most school improvement programs face. These are lack of schedules in schools that permit teachers to meet and work together for sustained periods of time; the demanding nature of teachers work as an increasing number of students arrive at school less well-socialized, less “ prepared to deal with materials, and more frequently from family settings that are not supportive; the aging and often demoralization of teachers due to declining resources, increasing levels of bureaucratization and the rapid and frequent demands for change that come from central authorities. In addition, an organizational structure with in which teachers” work is less autonomous and more integrated with that of other teachers affects the “ development of commitment to change.

Moreover, the continues transfer of teachers, principals and educational administrators at the local level puts pressure on the program to continuously train new staff who may not serve in schools for long (Plan Sudan, 2006). Duffie and Balkon in Marzano (2003), also suggest that, in South Africa the initiatives of SIP were faced by lack of material resources; limited capacity of educational leaders; poor participation and lack of safe environment. Similarly, Harris (in Hopkins, 2002) has noted that 55 the difficulty to change school management and working culture as a problem to the SIP in developing country. In Supporting this, Havelock and Huber man (as cited in Rondinelli et al., 1990), described that promoting change is difficult under any circumstance, but it is especially challenging in developing countries with

uncertain and unstable economic, social and political condition. Most developing countries lack the physical infrastructure and experienced skill professionals needed to assure successful results. In Ethiopia, besides the commitment of the country to improve access education, the school improvement program has launched aiming at improving the quality of education through enhancing student learning achievement and outcomes (MOE, 2007). Hence, student achievement is a reason for any educational change. Unfortunately, because of the process of translating policy in to practice is so difficult to achieve. That is why, the implementing of school improvement program is challenging.

Most of the school principal who are in the leading position did not get adequate educational training leadership. Even those who are trained also are not effective in leading the schools. Due to this reason they lack the ability to design vision and coordinate the school community so as to lead for the attainment of the goals (MOE, 2007).

Schools needs participation of all stakeholder in school plan (strategic and annual plan), but most of the time school plan is prepared by school principals. Therefore, the school mission and vision is not visible to all stakeholders and the intended student's outcome and ethical centered activities are not achieved without participation of stakeholder (MOE, 2007). If students feel safe they attend their schooling with interest. So, schools should be conducive for all students (male and female) ethical improvement and academic achievement. Therefore, schools should be prepared based on the needs and interest of students secured their school environment. Lack of well-training and effective commitment is one of the hindering problems that aggravate the failure of school improvement plan implementation. Including the school directors all school improvement committee members and key stakeholders must have proven themselves as committed and active members of the school improvement committee in all the four implementation stages of the school improvement plan cycle.

Responsibilities are given to the school improvement committee members by the government, parents and community. The school improvement committee members are expected to be committed to act in compliance with the law and to behave in a fair, honest and ethical manner in all school based activities. They are responsible to create conducive learning environment for learners, to raise resources from various government and non-government bodies, to realize measurable improvements in student results, to assess their achievement and report to parents and community in regular basis. In general, they are responsible to ensure the overall success of the school's strategic and annual action plans.

The last but not the least, school improvement committee members are accountable to government, parents and community in broad, Society. They should be asked for their failure and appraise for their fruitful success against achievement of improving the quality of education and student results for all school children. The failure of school improvement committee members is taken place if they are not active participant in any decision making cases, if they are not committed to help the school, if they lack deep understanding about issues concerning students results and if they are reluctant to assist the school improve its student's results. The school directors are required to generate and sustain leadership capacity broad understanding and skillfulness of key stakeholders for the fruitful accomplishment of the school improvement plan implementation.

2.9 Empirical studies

Several empirical studies have examined the implementation of School Improvement Plans (SIPs) in primary schools across Ethiopia and beyond. These studies offer insights into the practical realities, management strategies, challenges, and contextual factors affecting SIP execution.

Tadesse (2017), in his study of selected primary schools in the Oromia Region, found that while SIPs were prepared in accordance with national guidelines, their actual implementation was inconsistent. Leadership capacity played a critical role, as schools led by well-trained and supportive principals were more effective in executing their plans. Regular monitoring and evaluation were also key success factors.

Mekonnen (2018) studied primary schools in Addis Ababa and discovered that the SIP process was often misunderstood or only partially implemented. School leaders faced challenges due to lack of training, insufficient collaboration among staff, and minimal community involvement. He emphasized the need for professional development and participatory decision-making to enhance SIP management.

In the Amhara Region, Abebe (2020) identified misalignment between SIP goals and school realities. His findings revealed that many school leaders lacked the skills to manage data-driven planning or efficiently allocate resources. This study underlined the necessity of strengthening monitoring tools and building the capacity of school leaders.

Berhanu (2021), examining schools in SNNPR, focused on the role of leadership in SIP implementation. He found that transformational and participatory leadership styles were more effective in achieving school improvement goals. Bureaucratic hurdles, however, remained a barrier, as unclear procedures often delayed SIP activities.

Dawit (2019), in his research in Tigray, highlighted that SIPs were sometimes treated as administrative checklists rather than tools for genuine improvement. There was a tendency to replicate plans without tailoring them to the specific needs of each school. He also noted severe resource shortages and weak follow-up mechanisms as major challenges to implementation. International perspectives also confirm these findings. A UNESCO (2016) report on school management in low-income countries indicated that weak leadership, poor accountability systems, and limited community involvement were major barriers to SIP success. The report recommended investing in leadership training and creating systems that support data-based decision-making and local accountability.

These studies consistently point to leadership capacity, stakeholder engagement, data utilization, and resource availability as the core elements influencing SIP implementation success. Despite differences in geographical and institutional contexts, a common challenge is the gap between planning and execution, particularly in resource-constrained government primary schools.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design utilizing a survey method to assess how School Improvement Plan (SIP) implementation is managed in government primary schools within Bole Sub-City, Addis Ababa City Administration. The research specifically examined the accomplishments, challenges, and future prospects of SIP implementation. Additionally, the study focused on how SIP was implemented in primary schools in Bole Sub-City, identifying potential barriers and suggesting strategies to enhance its effectiveness.

A descriptive design was considered appropriate because it seeks to portray an accurate profile of persons, events, or situations as they naturally occur without manipulation of variables (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018). According to Leedy and Ormrod (2019), descriptive studies are valuable when the goal is to observe, describe, and document aspects of a phenomenon as it exists. Similarly, Best and Kahn (2014) emphasize that descriptive research is used to gather information about existing conditions, attitudes, and practices for the purpose of interpretation and comparison.

In this study, the descriptive design allowed the researcher to document the realities of SIP implementation in a natural school setting highlighting how schools manage improvement efforts, the leadership strategies employed, and the obstacles encountered.

3.2 Research Approach

To gain a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the research problem, mixed-methods approach was adopted. This approach integrates both quantitative and qualitative research methods in a single study to complement and enrich one another (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Educational management issues such as SIP implementation involve both measurable practices and human experiences, which cannot be fully captured using a single method (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

The quantitative approach enabled the researcher to collect numerical data through structured questionnaires and statistically analyze them to determine trends and levels of implementation. This method provided objectivity, precision, and generalizability of findings (Kothari, 2004). It was particularly useful for addressing the first and third objectives to explore the current level of SIP implementation and to identify major challenges in implementation.

Conversely, the qualitative approach focused on understanding meanings, perceptions, and experiences of participants regarding SIP management and implementation. Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) were conducted to collect detailed and context-specific information. As Creswell (2014) asserts, qualitative inquiry allows researchers to capture the depth of participants' perspectives, producing richer, human-centered insights that numbers alone cannot convey.

Using a mixed-methods approach enhanced the credibility, validity, and comprehensiveness of the research through triangulation — the process of cross-verifying information from multiple data sources (Denzin, 2012). Quantitative data provided breadth, while qualitative data added interpretive depth, leading to a more holistic understanding of SIP implementation.

3.3 Population of the study

The target population consisted of all stakeholders involved in the planning, execution, and monitoring of SIPs in government primary schools under Bole Sub-City Primary Government schools. According to Bole Sub City Education Bureau (2024) records, there were 16 government primary schools in Bole sub city. In addition to that, there were 16 school principals, 4 supervisors, 90 teachers, 42 parents and community representatives (PTA), and 36 members of the School Improvement Committee (SIC) in government primary schools in Bole Sub city.

3.4 Sample size determination and Sampling Techniques

To select the sample of schools for the study, a combination of probability and non-probability sampling techniques was employed, tailored to the specific characteristics of the population. Out of a total of 16 schools in the study area, 8 schools were selected using simple random sampling, a probability sampling technique that ensures every school had an equal chance of selection, thereby minimizing selection bias and enhancing the representativeness of the sample. In practice, each school was assigned a unique number from 1 to 16, and eight numbers were randomly drawn using a lottery method. This approach ensures that the selected schools are not systematically different from the population, making the findings more generalizable. Simple random sampling was used for teachers, PTA members, and SIC members to ensure every participant had an equal chance of selection, thereby minimizing bias.

Purposive sampling was applied to principals and supervisors due to their unique roles in leadership and oversight of SIP implementation. Therefore, in order to estimate the sample size, the researcher was used the formula set by Yamane, $n = \frac{N}{1 + N(E)^2}$. Therefore, Using Yamane formula (1967), the required sample size for a population of 188 at a 95% confidence level.

Table 3.1 Sampling techniques of the study

No	Target Population	Population size	Sample Size	Percentage	Sampling Technique
1	Teachers	90	61	47.7%	Proportional to sample size
2	PTA	42	29	22.7%	Proportional to sample size
3	School principals	16	11	8.6%	Proportional to sample size
4	Supervisors	4	3	2.3%	Proportional to sample size
5	SIC	36	24	18.8%	Proportional to sample size
Total		188	128	100%	

Source: own survey (2025)

3.5 Data Collection Methods

Various data collection tools were developed to gather both quantitative and qualitative data from different target groups in the selected study areas. The following data collection methods were used to gather relevant data from both primary and secondary sources:

3.5.1 Quantitative Data Collection Tools

In this study, questionnaires played a central role in gathering quantitative data from a large and diverse group of respondents. The goal of using questionnaires was to efficiently collect a wide range of information on the current state of the School Improvement Program (SIP) implementation, while keeping the process cost-effective and minimizing researcher bias. The design of the questionnaire was straightforward and neutral, aimed at gathering data that was directly relevant to the study's objectives. It included a total of 33 questions—31 closed-ended questions and 2 open-ended questions. The closed-ended questions used a Likert scale, which allowed respondents to indicate their level of agreement with various statements about the SIP. The scale offered five options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

The questionnaires were distributed to 100 respondents, who were divided into four groups: 61 teachers from primary schools in the Addis Ababa City Administration Bole Sub-City, 29 PTA members, 10 school principals. Teachers, being directly involved in SIP implementation, offered valuable feedback on the day-to-day challenges and successes of the program. PTA members provided perspectives from the parent community, while school principals, as key decision-makers, shared insights into the strategic and leadership aspects of SIP. Lastly, SIC members, who are responsible for overseeing and monitoring the program's progress, contributed their views on its effectiveness and areas where it could be improved. By including such a diverse range of respondents, the study was able to capture a comprehensive understanding of how SIP is being implemented and perceived from various angles.

The data gathered from the questionnaires were analyzed quantitatively. The Likert scale responses were numerically coded, which allowed for statistical analysis such as identifying trends, calculating mean scores, and comparing responses across different groups. This helped uncover any significant differences in how teachers, PTA members, school principals, and SIC members viewed the SIP. The open-ended responses were analyzed thematically; highlighting recurring ideas and providing deeper insights that complemented the quantitative data.

3.5.2 Qualitative Data Collection Tools

Qualitative data for this study were gathered through interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs). Prior to data collection, all research instruments were translated into Amharic, the local language, to ensure clarity and ease of understanding for the respondents. A total of 16 individuals were interviewed that means 1 school principal 3 supervisors and 12 individuals from SIC members, providing in-depth insights into the implementation of the School Improvement Program (SIP). Additionally, 12 SIC members participated in focus group discussions, offering valuable perspectives on the challenges and successes of the program.

To ensure the quality and accuracy of the data collected, the questionnaires were initially written in English and then translated into Amharic. This translation was done to facilitate better comprehension among all respondents and enhance the overall quality of the data.

3.6 Data Analysis methods

The data was analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively, based on information gathered through survey questionnaires, key informant interviews and focus group discussions. The data was collected from teachers, school principals and school improvement committee (SIC) members. The quantitative primary data was entered into SPSS software (version 20) to facilitate data processing and analysis.

Descriptive statistical methods were used to analyze the processed quantitative data. The rationale for choosing these methods was that they were particularly suited for analyzing and interpreting quantitative data in terms of percentages, frequency, mean, and standard deviation, allowing for a detailed assessment and exploration of the responses.

For the qualitative data, gathered through key informant interviews, focus group discussions, the information was summarized, transcribed, and converted into text through coding, categorizing, and classifying. During the interviews, notes were taken, and to avoid loss of information, the interviews were recorded. The data from the recordings and the interview notes was then being combined. The data collected from various sources was cross-checked and categorized into relevant themes. Ultimately, the data was interpreted and aligned with the findings from the focus group discussions and interviews, before being translated into English. These qualitative data were then being analyzed using narrative analysis techniques to complement and further explain the quantitative findings in detail.

3.7 Reliability and Validity

The validity and reliability of the study data was assessed to ensure the quality and appropriateness of the methods used in the research. These tests were conducted with a sample of 19 individuals, including 15 teachers, 4 school principals, who was not be selected as part of the study sample.

Additionally, the reliability analysis procedure was calculating commonly used measures of scale reliability and provides insights into the relationships between individual items within the scale. Cronbach's alpha was one of the most widely accepted measures of reliability. It was assessing the internal consistency of the items in a scale, indicating the extent to which the items in a questionnaire were related to each other. Cronbach's alpha value was typically range from 0 to 1, with higher values reflecting better internal reliability. A value of 0.7 or above was considered acceptable for ensuring internal consistency (Harir, Robert, & David, 2003).For this study, the reliability of the items was analyzed using the Cronbach's alpha method with SPSS Software (version 20), and it was expected that the Cronbach's alpha value was reach 0.92. This high value was indicating that the study's data were both reliable and valid.

3.8 Ethical consideration

To create a conducive environment for the study, all ethical issues related to the research was carefully considered. The researcher was pay close attention to maintaining the anonymity of respondents by ensuring they were not required to provide their names on the questionnaires. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were asked for their consent before providing any information for the research.

In addition, the researcher was sought oral permission from the respondents to confirm their consent to participate. The primary data collected from various respondents through administrative questionnaires was handled with strict confidentiality to avoid any potential discrimination or gossip, ensuring the privacy of the participants. Respondents was also being informed beforehand about the potential benefits of the research findings in addressing or minimizing the challenges associated with the implementation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP).

The researcher was adhering to a respectful protocol during interviews, being polite and non-directive in the approach. Furthermore, respondents were assured that they can withdraw from the study at any time, without needing to provide any reason, in order to build trust and ensure their comfort with the process. Throughout the study, the researcher was maintaining open and smooth communication with all respondents in the sample schools.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATIONS, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter presents, analyzes, and interprets the data collected from respondents in relation to the management and implementation of the School Improvement Program (SIP) in government primary schools of Bole Sub-City, Addis Ababa. The primary purpose of this chapter is to examine the current status of SIP implementation, identify key challenges, assess leadership strategies, and evaluate stakeholder participation based on the research objectives and questions outlined earlier. In this study, a total of 128 questionnaires were distributed to selected participants, including teachers, school principals, Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) members, School Improvement Committee (SIC) members, and supervisors from government primary schools in Bole Sub-City. All 128 distributed questionnaires were properly filled out and returned, resulting in a 100% response rate.

Table4.1 Gender/sex/ of the Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Male	62	48.4
Female	66	51.6
Total	128	100.0

Source: Own Survey (2025)

Out of 128 total respondents, 62 were male (48.4%) and 66 were female (51.6%). This nearly equal gender representation suggests a balanced distribution of viewpoints in the data collection process. The slight majority of female participants align with the current staffing trend in Ethiopian primary schools, where female participation, particularly at the teaching level, has been increasing in recent years. The balanced input also helps ensure that the findings are not gender-biased and reflect the diverse perspectives of educational stakeholders in Bole Sub-City.

Table 4.2 Age of the respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Valid 18-25	43	33.6
26-35	35	27.3
36-45	42	32.8
46 and above	8	6.3
Total	128	100.0

Source: Own Survey (2025)

The age group distribution shows that 33.6% of respondents were between 18 and 25 years old, 27.3% were aged 26–35, 32.8% were between 36–45, and only 6.3% were 46 and above. This indicates that the majority (about 93.8%) of respondents are within the early to mid-career age brackets (18–45), implying a workforce that is relatively youthful and potentially more adaptive to change and innovation in the school improvement process. However, the low proportion of respondents over 46 may indicate a shortage of highly experienced personnel in school leadership and management roles, which could impact the strategic depth of SIP implementation.

Table 4.3 Level of Education of the respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Valid Diploma	10	7.8
First Degree	77	60.2
Masters	41	32.0
Total	128	100.0

Source: Own Survey (2025)

Regarding educational attainment, 60.2% of the respondents held a first degree, 32% held a master’s degree, and only 7.8% held a diploma. This finding is promising, as it shows that the majority of respondents have qualifications that align with the professional standards required for SIP implementation. Moreover, the relatively high proportion of master’s degree holders (nearly one-third) may positively influence school leadership capacity, particularly in planning and evaluating SIP strategies. The minimal representation of diploma holders suggests an overall trend toward higher academic preparation among school staff in Bole Sub-City.

Table 4.4 Job Experience of the respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Valid Less than 6 years	10	7.8
6-12 years	50	39.1
13-19 years	58	45.3
20 and above	10	7.8
Total	128	100.0

Source: Own Survey (2025)

Respondents' job experience ranged from less than 6 years to over 20 years. The majority had 13–19 years of experience (45.3%), followed by those with 6–12 years (39.1%). Only 7.8% had either less than 6 years or 20 years and above of service. This indicates a well-seasoned respondent pool, with over 84% having more than six years of experience. Such a level of experience provides a strong basis for informed responses, especially in understanding the long-term challenges and trends in SIP implementation. However, the small number of respondents with over two decades of experience may limit historical insights or comparisons with earlier SIP iterations.

To examine the result of the questionnaires that were responded regarding each objectives of the research, the statements were analyzed based on the Likert scale criterion mentioned in the below table. For clearer and more straightforward interpretation of these results, the scales were reassigned as follows (Al-Sayaad, Rabea, & Samrah, 2006, cited in Bassam, 2013).

Table 4.5: Five Scaled Likert Criterion

No.	Mean range	Response Option
1	Strongly disagree	1 to 1.80
2	Disagree	1.81 to 2.6
3	Undecided	2.61 to 3.4
4	Agree	3.41 to 4.2
5	Strongly agree	4.21 to 5

Source: Al-Sayaad et al. (2006, as cited by Bassam, 2013)

Table 4.5 Current level of School improvement implementation

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The school has developed and communicated a comprehensive SIP document.	128	1	5	3.41	1.039
Annual and strategic SIP plans are being implemented according to the planned schedule.	128	1	5	3.29	1.102
There is a clear action plan with assigned responsibilities and timelines.	128	1	4	3.30	.952
Teaching and learning practices in the school are aligned with the priorities outlined in the SIP	128	1	5	3.23	1.074
There has been an improvement in student learning outcomes as a direct result of SIP implementation.	128	1	5	3.42	1.054
Valid N (listwise)	128				

Source: Own Survey (2025)

The results presented in Table 4.5 provide a clear picture of how SIP is currently being implemented in government primary schools of Bole Sub-City. Overall, the responses show a moderate level of implementation, with most of the mean values falling within the “*Undecided to Agree*” range of the Likert scale. A large majority of respondents indicated that their schools have developed and communicated SIP documents, reflected by a mean score of 3.41, which falls within the “*Agree*” category. This suggests that schools are making conscious efforts to prepare the foundational documents required for SIP implementation.

However, when it comes to putting these plans into action, the results are more mixed. The implementation of annual and strategic plans scored a mean of 3.29, and the existence of clear action plans scored 3.30. Both of these fall within the “*Undecided*” range, indicating that while plans exist on paper, their practical execution remains inconsistent. Interviews reinforced this finding, with several principals admitting that SIP documents often serve more as administrative requirements than as tools that actively guide school improvement.

Teaching and learning practices aligned with the SIP priorities received a mean of 3.23, showing that although instructional shifts are happening, the alignment remains partial and varies across schools. Respondents also rated the effect of SIP on student learning outcomes at 3.42, slightly above the “Agree” threshold, suggesting moderate optimism that SIP activities are contributing to better learning results. Taken together, these findings show that SIP foundations—document preparation, goal-setting, and initial planning—are largely in place, but consistent implementation, routine monitoring, and deep engagement of stakeholders require more attention for the program to fully achieve its intended outcomes.

Focus group participants echoed these concerns. Teachers, PTA members, and School Improvement Committee representatives said that while the SIP has helped schools become more organized and goal-oriented, implementation remains inconsistent. They noted that improvements in teaching and learning are visible in some schools, particularly where leadership is strong and collaboration is encouraged, but such successes are not widespread. The other interviewee also felt that SIP activities are often led only by a few individuals, rather than being shared responsibilities among all staff and community members.

Taken together, the interviews and focus group discussions confirm what the quantitative data suggest: Bole Sub-City’s primary schools have made progress in setting up the SIP framework, but real implementation is still a challenge. Sustained leadership, ongoing support, and genuine community participation are needed to turn these plans into real improvements in student learning. These findings echo earlier studies, such as Lemmesa Abdi (2016) in Ilu Aba Bor Zone and Kalayou (2011) in Tigray, both of which showed that while schools had SIP structures in place, their execution was often weak due to limited follow-up and low stakeholder involvement. Like those studies, the present findings highlight that having policies and plans alone is not enough; consistent, inclusive, and well-supported implementation is what truly makes a difference.

Table 4.6 Strategies that school leaders used to manage the implementation of SIP effectively

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The school leaders have developed and communicated a comprehensive SIP document.	128	1	5	430	3.36	1.135
Annual and strategic SIP plans are being implemented according to schedule.	128	1	5	412	3.22	1.072
There is a clear action plan with assigned responsibilities and timelines.	128	2	5	505	3.95	.787
Teaching and learning practices reflect SIP priorities.	128	2	5	504	3.94	.707
Student learning outcomes have improved as a result of SIP implementation.	128	1	5	512	4.00	.972
There is effective delegation of responsibilities among staff for SIP implementation.	128	1	5	404	3.16	1.245
Valid N (listwise)	128					

Source: Own Survey (2025)

Table 4.6 sheds light on the strategies school leaders employ to support SIP implementation. Majority of the respondents acknowledged that school leaders are taking meaningful steps, though gaps remain in collaborative and participatory leadership. Most noticeably, the presence of a clear action plan with assigned responsibilities and timelines received the strongest score of 3.95, approaching the “*Agree*” to “*Strongly Agree*” category. This shows that leaders are good at structuring the SIP process and clarifying the expectations for each activity.

Furthermore, teaching practices reflecting SIP priorities and the improvement in student learning outcomes both scored high, at 3.94 and 4.00 respectively. These results suggest that when SIP strategies are implemented well, they do translate into more focused teaching and better outcomes. In contrast, the mean score for the effectiveness of delegation among staff was notably lower at 3.16, falling within the “*Undecided*” category. This implies that many teachers and staff members are not fully included in carrying out SIP responsibilities. Interviews confirmed that principals sometimes manage SIP activities on their own due to limited time, pressure to produce results, or lack of confidence in staff capacity. Teachers expressed that they often hear about SIP plans but are not always meaningfully involved in shaping or monitoring them. Implementation of annual and strategic SIP plans also scored moderately at 3.22, indicating that while progress is being made, the execution is not yet consistent across schools.

Overall, the analysis suggests that school leaders are strong in planning, setting direction, and aligning teaching with SIP priorities, but they need to strengthen collaboration, delegation, and staff engagement. SIP works best when leadership is not just top-down but involves everyone, from teachers to parents and the wider school community.

Insights from the interviews added depth to these results, most principals and supervisors explained that while regular planning sessions are held and SIP documents are in place, the level of follow-up and delegation remains inconsistent. Several principals admitted that because of workload and time pressures, they often end up managing SIP activities themselves rather than involving their staff fully. Teachers appreciated leaders who promote collaboration, but many said that SIP discussions in their schools are typically limited to a small group of senior staff. One teacher shared, “*We usually hear about the SIP during the annual review meeting, but few of us are actually involved in developing or monitoring it.*” Such experiences highlight the need for more participatory leadership, where everyone in the school feels valued and included in the improvement process.

The focus group discussions (FGDs) reinforced these points. Members of School Improvement Committees (SICs) and Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) noted that principals who regularly communicate, delegate tasks, and involve others tend to achieve better results. Participants emphasized that collaboration, motivation, and transparency are essential for sustaining SIP activities throughout the school year. However, some also mentioned that in a few schools, unclear roles and limited follow-up create gaps in accountability. Teachers in the FGDs agreed that when everyone understands their part in the plan, meetings become more meaningful, teamwork improves, and progress is visible, but when only a few are

active, the process slows and enthusiasm declines. These qualitative findings closely support the quantitative data in Table 4.6, confirming that while schools have made progress in planning and aligning instruction with SIP priorities, challenges remain in engaging all staff and ensuring shared implementation. Similar conclusions were reached by Tadesse (2017), Mekonnen (2018), Abebe (2020), Berhanu (2021), and Dawit (2019), who found that schools with strong, participatory leadership and consistent delegation of responsibilities are more likely to achieve meaningful school improvement. Mekonnen (2018) and Berhanu (2021) also found that when principals hold regular collaborative meetings and involve teachers in decision-making, SIP goals become more effectively linked to daily classroom practice. In contrast, Dawit (2019) observed that when SIPs exist only on paper without real engagement, they have little to no impact on student learning outcomes. When principals not only lead but also inspire, empower, and include teachers and the wider community, school improvement becomes a shared journey rather than an individual responsibility. Turning written plans into real, measurable progress requires a school culture built on teamwork, trust, and collective ownership where everyone contributes to creating a better learning environment for students.

Table 4.7 Concerning Challenges that hinder the implementation of school improvement (SIP).

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
There are insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratories, libraries and pedagogical centers).	128	1	4	402	3.14	.729
There is lack of the necessary awareness of stakeholders for implementation of school improvement program (SIP).	128	1	4	392	3.06	.962
The leader is not competent enough to lead and coordinate efforts to school improvement program (SIP).	128	1	4	440	3.44	.849
There is lack of regular monitoring of school improvement program (SIP) implementation by SIC members, cluster supervisors.	128	1	4	383	2.99	1.083
There is poor performance of SIC member to play their role in the planning and implementation of school improvement program (SIP).	128	1	5	407	3.18	1.226
There should be more frequent and systematic training for all SIP stakeholders.	128	1	5	376	2.94	1.099
Valid N (listwise)	128					

Source: Own Survey (2025)

The challenges highlighted in Table 4.7 reveal several interconnected obstacles affecting SIP implementation in Bole Sub-City. These results reflect issues related to resources, leadership capacity, community involvement, and monitoring systems. A major challenge relates to inadequate school facilities, which scored 3.14. Many schools lack essential resources such as laboratories, libraries, and pedagogical centers. Teachers in focus groups explained that they often rely on outdated materials or crowded

classrooms, making it difficult to fully implement SIP goals related to improving learning environments. Stakeholder awareness also emerged as a challenge, with a mean score of 3.06. Many parents, community members, and even some teachers do not fully understand the purpose of the SIP or their role in supporting it. This limited awareness undermines the collaborative nature of the program and places most of the SIP responsibility on school leaders alone.

The most significant challenge identified was leadership competency, which scored 3.44, the highest across all challenge indicators. This reveals that many school leaders may lack the necessary skills—especially in instructional leadership, strategic planning, delegation, and motivating staff—to effectively lead SIP implementation. Interviewees described principals who focus primarily on administrative tasks rather than guiding improvement activities. Monitoring and supervision also present critical weaknesses. The lack of regular monitoring by the SIC and cluster supervisors scored 2.99, showing that oversight is inconsistent and often limited to document checking rather than providing meaningful feedback or technical support. Similarly, the performance of SIC members scored 3.18, suggesting committees exist but are not functioning effectively due to unclear roles, lack of accountability, or insufficient commitment.

Finally, respondents highlighted the need for more frequent and systematic training, which scored 2.94. Teachers and committee members emphasized that many stakeholders are not well trained on SIP concepts, leaving them unsure of how to contribute effectively. In summary, SIP implementation is challenged by resource shortages, leadership gaps, weak community involvement, and insufficient monitoring and training. Addressing these issues requires targeted capacity building, strengthened support systems, and a more inclusive and participatory leadership approach.

Interview and FGD participants strongly supported this finding, pointing out that teachers, committee members, and parents need continuous professional development and awareness sessions to understand SIP concepts and apply them effectively in their daily school activities. Taken together, these results reveal that the implementation of SIP in Bole Sub-City is challenged by both structural and human factors. Infrastructural shortages, limited stakeholder awareness, weak leadership capacity, and irregular supervision all interact to reduce the effectiveness of the program. The qualitative data from interviews and FGDs confirm that without sufficient resources, skilled leadership, and active community involvement, even well-designed SIP plans struggle to achieve meaningful outcomes.

These findings are consistent with those of Lemmesa (2016) and Mekonnen (2018), who found that lack of facilities, leadership gaps, and inadequate stakeholder participation were major obstacles to SIP success in other regions. Addressing these issues through targeted capacity building, improved resource allocation, and regular follow-up can significantly enhance the sustainability and impact of the SIP in government primary schools.

Table 4.8 Actionable recommendations for improving the management of SIP in Bole Sub city primary schools

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
School leaders need to use data more effectively for planning and decision-making.	128	1	4	371	2.90	1.163
School leadership should be trained in transformational leadership to guide SIP efforts.	128	1	4	409	3.20	.948
Schools should develop annual SIP review workshops involving all stakeholders.	128	1	4	445	3.48	.869
More resources (financial, material, and human) should be allocated specifically for SIP activities.	128	1	4	410	3.20	.983
Recognition and incentives should be introduced for effective SIP contributors.	128	1	5	396	3.09	1.023
Information technology (IT) staff fully supports all functional users during public projects Implementation.	128	1	5	443	3.46	.987
Valid N (listwise)	128					

Source: Own Survey (2025)

As it can be depicted from the above table on actionable recommendations gathered from respondents on how to strengthen the management and implementation of School Improvement Programs (SIPs) in Bole Sub-City's government primary schools, the responses highlight several key areas where targeted actions can help bridge existing gaps and ensure more effective and sustainable SIP outcomes.

The mean scores, interpreted using the five-point Likert scale, reveal a generally positive orientation toward the recommended strategies, though with varying degrees of conviction across items.

The highest level of agreement was observed for the recommendation that schools should conduct annual SIP review workshops, which obtained a mean score of 3.48, falling within the "*Agree*" category. This indicates that respondents strongly believe structured, periodic review forums are essential for evaluating progress, correcting implementation gaps, and fostering a culture of accountability and collaborative reflection. The emphasis on review workshops aligns with national and international evidence suggesting that continuous reflection and shared learning significantly strengthen school improvement processes.

The recommendation to strengthen IT support similarly received a high mean value of 3.46, also categorized as "*Agree*." This suggests that respondents recognize the increasingly central role of ICT in facilitating data management, communication, and monitoring activities within SIP implementation. Improved ICT infrastructure such as reliable internet access, functional computers, and digital reporting tools is seen as a practical necessity for modern school administrative functions.

Recommendations related to transformational leadership training for school principals and SIP committees and increasing resource allocation both yielded mean scores of 3.20, which fall within the "*Undecided to Agree*" range of the scale. Although respondents show moderate support for these recommendations, the values also suggest reservations, possibly reflecting past experiences where leadership trainings and resource allocations were inconsistently implemented or lacked practical relevance. Nonetheless, the results highlight leadership capacity-building and reliable resource provision as important domains that cannot be overlooked.

The recommendation to introduce recognition and incentive systems received a mean score of 3.09, which falls within the "*Undecided*" category. This indicates mixed perceptions regarding the role of incentives in promoting SIP activities. While recognition mechanisms have potential to enhance teacher motivation and encourage active participation, respondents may view them as less urgent than structural or leadership-related interventions.

Finally, strengthening data-driven decision-making obtained a mean score of 2.90—also in the “*Undecided*” range. This finding implies that although data-driven practices are acknowledged as beneficial, schools may lack the skills, tools, or culture necessary to incorporate data effectively into planning and evaluation processes. It also suggests the need for targeted training, simplified data tools, and strengthened monitoring systems.

In general, these results demonstrate that improving the management of SIPs in Bole Sub-City’s primary schools requires a multifaceted approach one that strengthens leadership capacity, promotes stakeholder participation, ensures sufficient resources, and leverages technology. The interviews and focus group discussions reinforced these points, emphasizing that meaningful progress will come when schools build a culture of evidence-based planning, collaboration, and recognition.

These findings align with the works of Berhanu (2021), Mekonnen (2018), and Abebe (2020), who all noted that effective SIP management depends on empowered leadership, clear communication channels, and consistent stakeholder engagement. By institutionalizing regular review mechanisms, providing leadership training, and rewarding commitment, Bole Sub-City’s schools can move beyond compliance toward genuine, sustained improvement in teaching and learning outcomes.

The qualitative data gathered through interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) provide rich insights into the management and implementation of School Improvement Programs (SIPs) in Bole Sub-City’s government primary schools. Participants highlighted several key areas requiring attention to strengthen SIP effectiveness and sustainability.

A prominent theme that emerged was the importance of structured review mechanisms. Teachers and school leaders consistently emphasized that regular review workshops serve as critical platforms for evaluating progress, identifying challenges, and collaboratively planning improvements. FGD participants noted that such forums enable teachers to share experiences, reflect on successes and setbacks, and foster a collective sense of responsibility for school improvement. Interviews reinforced this, with school leaders stressing that review workshops cultivate accountability and continuous learning, moving schools toward a culture of reflective practice rather than mere compliance.

Another recurrent theme was the need to strengthen IT and digital support. Both FGDs and interviews highlighted that inadequate digital infrastructure, including unreliable internet connectivity, outdated computers, and the absence of effective digital reporting tools, significantly hampers the monitoring and management of SIPs. Participants suggested that providing functional ICT resources, coupled with training on digital tools, would enhance communication, data management, and evidence-based decision-making, thereby improving overall program efficiency.

Leadership capacity and resource provision were also emphasized as critical determinants of SIP success. FGD participants noted that prior leadership trainings for principals and SIP committees were sometimes irregular or lacked practical relevance, which limited their impact. Interviewees echoed the need for continuous, contextually relevant leadership development to equip school leaders with the skills to manage programs effectively. Similarly, insufficient instructional materials and inconsistent financial support were cited as significant barriers to implementation, highlighting the necessity of timely and adequate resource allocation.

The discussions further revealed mixed perceptions regarding recognition and incentive mechanisms. Teachers acknowledged that awards and acknowledgment could motivate participation in SIP activities, but many felt that structural improvements and leadership support were more urgent priorities. Interviewees similarly suggested that recognition should complement foundational interventions rather than replace them.

Finally, the use of data for decision-making emerged as an area needing improvement. Participants indicated that schools often lack the culture, skills, and tools required to systematically integrate data into planning and evaluation processes. FGDs emphasized the need for simplified data collection systems and practical guidance, while interviews highlighted the importance of strengthening monitoring and evaluation practices to ensure that evidence informs strategic decisions.

In summary, the interview and FGD findings underscore that strengthening SIPs in Bole Sub-City requires a holistic approach that addresses leadership development, resource adequacy, digital support, regular reflective practices, and a culture of data-informed decision-making. The qualitative evidence highlights the lived experiences of school leaders and teachers, offering a nuanced understanding of the practical challenges and opportunities for enhancing the effectiveness of school improvement initiatives.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of Major Findings

This study examined the management and implementation of the School Improvement Program (SIP) in government primary schools of Bole Sub-City, Addis Ababa City Administration.

Regarding the current level of SIP implementation which is the first objective of the study it reveals that it is moderate, marked by a notable gap between planning and execution. Schools demonstrated strength in planning, as evidenced by the successful development of SIP documents (Mean=3.41) and the establishment of clear action plans with assigned responsibilities and timelines (Mean=3.95), indicating a solid understanding of school improvement processes. However, the execution of these plans was inconsistent, with annual and strategic plans frequently deviating from their intended schedules (Mean=3.22), showing that translating static documents into dynamic, ongoing action remains a challenge. Despite this, some positive outcomes were reported, including alignment of teaching practices with SIP goals (Mean=3.94) and perceived improvement in student learning outcomes (Mean=4.00).

Regarding the challenges faced by school leaders and teachers in implementing SIP, the study identified an interconnected set of challenges that hinder SIP implementation, with leadership capacity at the core. The most critical barrier is the perceived lack of competency among school leaders to effectively coordinate and lead the SIP process (Mean=3.44), indicating a need for stronger transformational leadership skills. Resource limitations were also prominent, with chronic shortages of financial resources and essential infrastructure such as laboratories and libraries (Mean=3.14) significantly constraining implementation. Weak accountability structures, including inadequate monitoring and evaluation by both internal School Improvement Committees (Mean=2.99) and external cluster supervisors, further undermined follow-up and support for planned activities. Ineffective internal management, reflected in poor delegation of responsibilities (Mean=3.16), and community-related challenges, such as low stakeholder awareness (Mean=3.06) and underperforming SIC members (Mean=3.18), compounded the difficulties, leaving schools to bear the responsibility of improvement largely on their own.

Regarding the strategies employed by school leaders to manage SIP implementation effectively, the analysis revealed that school leaders predominantly rely on task-oriented and administrative strategies, while underutilizing transformative and collaborative approaches. Leaders were effective in task-focused strategies, such as developing the SIP document and ensuring teaching practices aligned with SIP priorities, which are essential foundational steps and strategies critical for sustainable change were weakly applied. These included fostering collaboration through effective delegation, building staff capacity through regular professional development, and genuinely engaging parents and the community. This pattern indicates that leadership in these schools is more about managing the plan as a document than leading people to implement it, limiting the SIP's long-term effectiveness.

Finally, the fourth objective of the study which is actionable recommendations for improving the management of SIPs is based on the findings; the study proposes recommendations that address the core challenges identified across the objectives. To close leadership gaps, school leaders should receive transformational leadership training to enhance their ability to inspire and manage change. Strengthening systems through robust monitoring and evaluation frameworks and promoting data-driven decision-making will improve the execution of SIPs and fill accountability gaps. Fostering ownership by institutionalizing stakeholder engagement, including annual review workshops, will help ensure that SIP implementation is collective rather than isolated. Finally, addressing resource constraints through better allocation and mobilization of financial and material support will provide the practical means to execute SIP plans effectively. Overall, the synthesis of these objectives shows that SIP implementation in Bole Sub-City is characterized by well-prepared plans that are inadequately executed due to leadership, systemic, and resource limitations. The recommendations aim to break this cycle by building leadership capacity, establishing supportive accountability structures, and creating a culture of shared responsibility for school improvement.

5.2 Conclusion

The findings of this study underscore that while structural elements of the School Improvement Program such as planning documents and goal-setting frameworks are in place in Bole Sub-City's primary schools, their implementation remains suboptimal. Leadership practices are predominantly managerial rather than strategic or transformational, limiting the capacity of schools to drive sustained improvement. Additionally, the lack of effective stakeholder participation and the absence of robust monitoring and accountability mechanisms further constrain the successful execution of SIP objectives.

Resource constraints, both financial and infrastructural, remain a significant barrier to effective implementation. Although schools are making progress in certain areas, such as SIP awareness and community engagement, the overall process is hindered by systemic challenges, including insufficient training, lack of collaborative planning, and weak institutional support. Thus, there is a clear gap between SIP policy intentions and their practical realization at the school level.

5.3 Recommendations

In response to the Findings identified in the managing implementation of the School Improvement plan (SIP) within Bole Sub-City's government primary schools, the following context-specific recommendations are proposed:

- The Bole Sub-City Education Bureau, in collaboration with the Addis Ababa City Education Bureau, should design and implement continuous professional development programs tailored to the specific needs of school principals, vice-principals, and department heads. These programs should focus on building competencies in transformational and instructional leadership, strategic planning, and evidence-based decision-making. Leadership training should also emphasize practical skills in mobilizing school communities, setting achievable goals aligned with SIP priorities, and managing school performance using student learning data.
- School principals and leadership teams in Bole Sub-City should actively work to institutionalize inclusive participation mechanisms for key stakeholders, particularly Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs), School Improvement Committees (SICs), and community representatives. This can be achieved through formal stakeholder planning meetings, SIP awareness campaigns, and the formation of subcommittees for planning, budgeting, and evaluation. The Bole Sub-City Education Bureau should support these efforts by developing guidelines and providing facilitation training for inclusive stakeholder engagement at the school level.
- The Bole Sub-City Education Bureau must ensure equitable and needs-based allocation of financial, material, and human resources to primary schools for the implementation of SIP. This includes upgrading school infrastructure, providing pedagogical materials, and assigning adequate teaching staff. Additionally, school leaders and SICs should be trained in resource mobilization strategies, including leveraging local community support and partnerships with NGOs or private sector actors. Transparent and accountable financial management systems should be introduced at the school level to ensure efficient use of SIP funds.

- To ensure SIP implementation fidelity, internal monitoring mechanisms should be strengthened within each school, led by trained SIC members. The Bole Sub-City Education Bureau should develop standardized SIP monitoring tools and conduct regular supervision visits to assess progress across the four SIP domains. Cluster supervisors and Woreda-level officials should also be trained to provide constructive feedback and technical support to school leaders based on performance indicators and school self-assessments.
- The Education Bureau should establish a recognition and incentive framework specifically for Bole Sub-City schools. This could include annual awards for high-performing schools in SIP implementation, certificates of merit for outstanding PTA or SIC members, and public acknowledgment of schools that demonstrate effective stakeholder collaboration or innovation. Such recognition can help motivate school communities and promote a culture of accountability and excellence.
- Schools in Bole Sub-City should be encouraged and supported to integrate information and communication technologies (ICT) into SIP management processes. This includes using digital tools for data collection, communication with stakeholders, and online training modules for staff and PTA members. The Education Bureau should pilot ICT-based platforms for SIP reporting and ensure that schools are equipped with the necessary technical infrastructure and training. This innovation will enhance transparency, timeliness, and collaboration in school improvement efforts.

Implications for Future Research

While this study provided valuable insights into the management of SIPs in government primary schools, it also revealed areas that permit further investigation. Future research should explore the impact of transformational leadership training on SIP effectiveness using longitudinal designs. Comparative studies could be conducted across different sub-cities or regions to assess variations in SIP outcomes and identify best practices. Additionally, further inquiry is needed into the role of community dynamics, gender, and cultural factors in shaping stakeholder participation in SIP activities. Researchers are also encouraged to examine the effectiveness of school-based monitoring systems and the extent to which data utilization influences decision-making in SIP planning and execution.

REFERENCES

- Abdi, L. (2016). The status of the implementation of school improvement program in primary schools of Ilu Aba Bora Zone, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Education & Technology*, 3(4), 50–56.
- Abebe, G. (2020). School Improvement Plan Implementation in Amhara Region Primary Schools. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Bahir Dar University.
- Abdurrahman, B. (2011). The Practices of School Improvement Program Planning and Implementation in Selected Government Schools of West Arsi Zone Oromia Regional State.
- Aga Khan Foundation. (2002). School and District-Wide Improvement Project (SIPS). Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda.
- Aggrawal, J. C. (1996). *Theory and Principles of Education*. Vikas Publishing House.
- Berhanu, W. (2021). Leadership and School Improvement Implementation in SNNPR Primary Schools. Unpublished Thesis, Hawassa University.
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2014). *Research in education* (10th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Bagin, D. (2001). *School Public Relations for Educators*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Chinsamy, B. (2002). *Successful School Improvement and the Education System in South Africa*. Jet Education Services.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N. K. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(2), 80–88.
- Dawit, H. (2019). *Challenges of School Improvement Implementation in Tigray Region*. Mekelle University.
- Duffie, K., & Balkon, J. (2003). School leadership and improvement. In Marzano (Ed.), *What Works in Schools*. ASCD.
- Education Sector Support Program in Nigeria (ESSPIN). (2010). *Program Report*. Abuja.
- Edmonds, R. (1982). *Programs of School Improvement: An Overview*. National Institute of Education.
- Epstein, J. L. (2011). *School, family, and community partnerships*. Westview Press.
- Frew, A. (2010). *Practices and challenges of implementation of SIP in primary schools of Jimma City Administration*. Addis Ababa University.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change*, Cassel.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational research* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Havelock, R., & Huberman, M. (1990). Innovation and the problem of change, In Rondinelli et al. (Eds.), *Development Projects as Policy Experiments*. Routledge.
- Harry, B. (2000). *Evaluation of School Improvement Programs in Kenya*. Ministry of Education.
- Harir, A., Robert, P., & David, R. (2003). *Reliability and Validity in Educational Research*. Sage Publications.
- Hopkins, D. (2002). *Improving the quality of education for all* (2nd ed.). David Fulton Publishers.
- Hussen, A., & Postethwore, T. (1994). *School Improvement: A Comparative Perspective*. Routledge.

- Jeilu, A. (2010). School improvement: Enhancing the input and processes that support teaching, learning, and student outcomes. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(2), 56-68.
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Khosa, G. (2010). Sustainable school improvement. Jet Education Services.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology* (2nd ed.). New Age International.
- Kumar, R. (2019). *Research methodology* (5th ed.). Sage.
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2019). *Practical research: Planning and design* (12th ed.). Pearson.
- Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Temple University Press.
- Marsh, C. (1998). *Spotlight on school improvement*. Allen & Unwin.
- Melesew, T. (2005). *Community participation in the management of primary schools*. Addis Ababa University.
- MOE. (2007). *The School Improvement Program (Blue Print)*.
- MOE. (2010). *School Improvement Plan Framework*.
- Reynolds, D. et al. (1996). *Making good schools*. Routledge.
- Robinson, V. (2007). *School leadership and student outcomes*. ACER.
- Schaeffer, S. (1994). *Community participation in education*. World Bank.
- Stoll, L., & Fink, D. (1996). *Changing our schools*. Open University Press.
- Wijesundera, S. (2002). School Improvement. *Educational Action Research*, 10(2).
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row

APPENDICES
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE STUDIES
DEPARTEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANING AND
MANAGEMENT

Appendix I-Questionnaires

Dear respondents:

My name is **AmbayeEnqubahir Tesfamichael**, and I am a student in the MA program in Department of Educational Planning and Management at the Addis Ababa University. This research questionnaire, titled "**Managing School Improvement Plan Implementation in Government Primary Schools: The case of Bole Sub-city, Addis Ababa city Administration.**" was conducted solely for academic purposes and will be handled with strict confidentiality. Your sincere, truthful, and timely responses are crucial for the successful completion of this thesis.

The data collected through this questionnaire will be used for academic research purposes only and will be kept confidential. Your honest and thoughtful responses to the items on the questionnaire will contribute to the success of the study. Therefore, we kindly request that you fill out the questionnaire carefully and truthfully

General direction N.B

- You need not write your name.
- Respond to ranking scale question items by putting **tick (✓)** mark in the corresponding box provided.
- Give a brief and concise response or opinion for open-ended questions.

Part One: Personal information of Respondents

Direction: - Write the required Information or encircle the letter of your response.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|--------|--------------|
| 1. Sex: Male | Female | | |
| 2. Age: 20 – 25 | 26 – 30 | 31– 46 | 46 and above |
| 3. Educational qualifications: | MA/MS | BA/B.S | Diploma |

TTI Other

4. Service year (duration of experience)

1-5 years

6-10 years 1-15 years

16- 20 years

21 – 25 years

26 and above years

Part two

Direction: - This questionnaire is designed to explore the **Current level of implementation of the School Improvement Program (SIP)** in Government Primary School in Bole Sub City. SIP Planning and Management Practices checkmark by putting tick “√” mark in the Corresponding box given below.

5=Strongly Agree (SA),4=Agree (A),3=Undecided (UD),2=Disagree 1=Strongly disagree (DA)

No	Descriptions	Scales				
I	current level of implementation of the School Improvement Program (SIP)	1	2	3	4	5
1.	The school has developed and communicated a comprehensive SIP document.					
2.	Annual and strategic SIP plans are being implemented according to the planned schedule.					
3.	There is a clear action plan with assigned responsibilities and timelines.					
4.	Teaching and learning practices in the school are aligned with the priorities outlined in the SIP					
5.	There has been an improvement in student learning outcomes as a direct result of SIP implementation.					

Part three

Direction:-The following statements were **Strategies that school leaders used to manage the implementation of SIPs effectively**. Please rate the extent to which each activity was implemented by putting tick “√” mark in the Corresponding box given below.

5=Strongly Agree (SA),4=Agree (A),3=Undecided (UD),2=Disagree 1=strongly disagree (DA)

No	Statements on School Leadership Strategies for SIP Management	Scales				
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	School leaders set clear goals aligned with the SIP framework.					
2.	There is effective delegation of responsibilities among staff for SIP implementation.					
3.	Leaders provide regular professional development on SIP-related areas.					
4.	There is continuous monitoring and follow-up of SIP activities.					
5.	Leaders encourage collaborative planning among teachers and staff.					
6.	School Leaders engage community members and parents in SIP activities.					

Part four

Direction: -The following were among expected **challenges that hinder the implementation of school improvement program in primary schools of Bole sub city**. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement for the following statement using the rating scales by putting “√” mark in the Corresponding box given below.

5=Strongly Agree (SA),4=Agree (A),3=Undecided (UD),2=Disagree 1=strongly disagree (DA)

No	Concerning Challenges that hinder the implementation of school improvement program (SIP).	Scales				
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	There is shortage of financial resources (budget) for implementation of school improvement program (SIP).					
2.	There are insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratories, libraries and pedagogical centers).					
3.	There is lack of the necessary awareness of stakeholders for implementation of school improvement program (SIP).					
4.	The leader is not competent enough to lead and coordinate efforts to school improvement program (SIP).					
5.	There is lack of regular monitoring of school improvement program (SIP) implementation by SIC members, cluster supervisors.					
6.	There should be more frequent and systematic training for all SIP stakeholders.					

Part five

This questionnaire is intended to collect ideas and suggestions from stakeholders **on how to improve (actionable recommendations) the management of School Improvement Programs (SIPs) in primary schools**. Your insights are valuable for enhancing SIP effectiveness. Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below and provide specific recommendations where possible with the mark “√”.

5=Strongly Agree (SA),4=Agree (A),3=Undecided (UD),2=Disagree 1=strongly disagree (DA)

No	Statements on Recommendations for SIP Management	Scales				
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	There should be more frequent and systematic training for all SIP stakeholders.					
2.	School leaders need to use data more effectively for planning and decision-making.					
3.	School leadership should be trained in transformational leadership to guide SIP efforts.					
4.	Schools should develop annual SIP review workshops involving all stakeholders.					
5.	More resources (financial, material, and human) should be allocated specifically for SIP activities.					
6.	Recognition and incentives should be introduced for effective SIP contributors.					

Open ended question

1. Please put the major challenges encountered in implementing SIP at your school?
2. What remedial actions should be taken for the problems mentioned above in question No.1?

Thank you for your participation!

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE STUDIES

**DEPARTEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANING AND
MANAGEMENT**

Appendixes-B Interview Questions

The objective of the interview was to collect valuable information on the Managing school improvement plan implementation in government primary schools of Bole sub city. The interview questions were dedicated to identify the major problems at school level and to come up with some solutions and to consider for better learning outcomes. Therefore, you were honestly responding to the interview questions and your responses were strictly confidential.

Part one: - Personal Data

General Information about the interviewer

1. Sex; Male..... Female..... 2.Age.....
3. Educational Level...4. Experience

Part two: The following seven questions were interview guides for school principals and CRC Supervisors

- 1) What was the current practice of school improvement program (SIP) In terms of four domains?
 - a) In terms of Teaching- Learning domain?
 - b) In terms of facilitating conducive learning environment domain?
 - c) In terms of school leadership management domain?
 - d) In terms of community participation domain?
- 2) How do you conduct school self-evaluation in preparing three years' strategic plan?
- 3) How do you evaluate resource mobilization and utilization in implementation of school improvement program (SIP)?
- 4) What were the major challenges in implementing school improvement program in your school?
- 5) What solutions do you suggest for the problem mentioned in question number 4?

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE STUDIES
DEPARTEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANING AND
MANAGEMENT

Appendixes-C Focus Group Discussion

The purpose of this interview guide for focus group discussion was to gather information for the study on the Managing school improvement plan implementation in government primary schools of Bole sub city. So your contribution to the success of this study was highly valued, you were kindly requested to honestly respond to the interview questions presented & researcher would like to assure that your responses were strictly confidential

Number of: Male:

Female:

Schools Name_____

1. How do you evaluate current practices of school improvement program (SIP)?
2. What do you think that enhances Practices of school improvement program Implementation in SIP?
3. Do stakeholders participate in developing school improvement program (SIP) plan, implementation and evaluation