

*Addis Ababa*  
*University*  
*(Since 1950)*



# **The Status of School Improvement Program in Government Primary Schools of Makuey Woreda, Gambella People National Regional State.**

**By**

**Simon Ruach Jiop**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN  
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT**

**Addis Ababa, Ethiopia**

**June, 2018**

## DECLARATION

I, Simon Ruach Jiop declare that this research work entitled, — **The Status of School Improvement Program in Government Primary School of Gambella Regional State:** was an outcome of my own effort and study. As a result, all sources of materials used for the study had been duly acknowledged. I had produced it independently except for the guidance and suggestion of the research advisor. This research had not been submitted for any degree in this university or any other university. It was offered for the partial fulfillment of the degree of MA in Educational Leadership and Management.

By Simon Ruach:

Advisor: Ato: Melaku Yimam:

Signature\_\_\_\_\_

Signature\_\_\_\_\_

Date\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

## CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that this research work, — **The Status of School Improvement Program in Government Primary School of Makuvey Woreda Gambella Regional State** undertaken by Simon Ruach Jiop for the partial fulfillment of Master of Educational Leadership and Management at Addis Ababa University, was an original research work and did not submit earlier for any degree either at this University or any other University.

---

Research Advisor

## APPROVAL

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Simon Ruach Jiop, — **The Status of School Improvement Program in Government Primary School of Makuey Woreda Gambella Regional State:** and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Educational Leadership and Management complied with the regulations of Addis Ababa University met the accepted standards with respected quality.

### Approval of Board of Examiners

	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Melaku Yimam</b>	_____	_____
<b>Advisor</b>	_____	_____
<b>Internal Examiner</b>	_____	_____
<b>External Examiner</b>	_____	_____

Chairman of Department

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

First and for most, I deeply feel great in my advisor Melaku Yimam for his indispensable guidance, advice and comments of this research work. Without his help, this research would not have been realized. In the same way, I could not have preserved through the past two years of intensive study and research and the crafting of this thesis without my wife, brother and sister. It is to them that I dedicated this work. To my wife; w/ro Nyarach, thank you for your great help. To my brothers Ato Thachar and Dobuol thank you for believing in me and for providing me with materials and finance to go through this study. To my sister Nyathiel, thank you for your valuable comments and suggestions. I deeply love you all. You are all my life.

In closing, I want to thank the sampled Woreda Educational officers and schools' administrators as well as those who provided me moral support and encouragement

## ABSTRACT

*This research was designed to examine the school improvement program implementation by focusing on status of school improvement program in selected primary Schools of Makuey Woreda. In order to achieve this purpose, mixed design -both quantitative and qualitative approach was employed as research method in the study. The study was conducted in eight primary schools from a total of 13 primary schools in makuey woreda. The schools were randomly selected by random sampling technique. Teachers and students were selected by simple random sampling technique whereas the School principals, supervisors, woreda education office core process owner, active parents were selected by purposive sampling techniques. To gather data, questionnaires, interviews, FGD, observation and document reviews were employed. After the data were gathered, analysis was made by organizing in tables and computing using frequencies, percentage, mean value, standard deviation. The findings of study indicated that the status of teacher, students and parents participation in planning and implementing SIP was low; the mechanism through which monitoring and evaluation practiced to support SIP implementation was not in position to effectively run SIP. Furthermore the level of participation of community members to offer necessary support was low. In addition most of activities across the four domains were implemented at low level. Hence from the result of the study the overall implementation of SIP was low. Shortage of budget, insufficient school facilities, inability of school improvement committee to properly play their role, inadequate planning, low involvement of stake holders in the implementation of SIP and inadequate monitoring and evaluation were major factors that negatively affect SIP implementation. To alleviate the problems and to improve quality of education it was suggested that wereda education office should allocate adequate budget and schools should design income generating mechanism, fulfill school facilities, making active participation of stakeholders on planning SIP implementation, making school committee functional and strengthening monitoring and evaluation on school improvement program implementation.*

**Key Terms:** *school improvement; school effectiveness; leadership; teaching and learning; community participation; school environment; decision-making;*

## Table Contents

DECLARATION .....	I
CERTIFICATE .....	II
APPROVAL .....	III
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	IV
ABSTRACT.....	V
Table Contents .....	VI
List of Tables .....	IX
ABBREVIATIONS .....	X
CHAPTER ONE .....	1
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. Background of the Study .....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3. Objective of the Study .....	4
1.3.1. General Objective .....	4
1.3.2. Specific Objectives .....	4
1.4. Significance of the Study .....	4
1.5. Delimitation of the Study .....	5
1.6. Limitations of the Study.....	5
1.7. Operational Definitions of Key Terms .....	6
1.8. Organization of the Study .....	6
CHAPTER TWO .....	7
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .....	7
2.1. Overview of School Improvement.....	7
2.1.1. The Rational of School Improvement.....	7
2.1.2. Definitions of School Improvement.....	7
2.1.3. Purpose of School Improvement Program.....	8
2.1.4. Objective of School Improvement Program .....	8
2.1.5. Approaches to School Improvement Programs .....	9
2.1.6. Assumptions of School Improvement.....	11
2.1.7. Conditions Influencing School Improvement .....	12
2.1.8. Domains of School Improvement .....	16
2.1.9. Challenges to School Improvement Program .....	17

2.2.	School Improvement in Ethiopia .....	18
2.2.1.	Overview of SIP in Ethiopia .....	18
2.2.2.	The Purpose and Objectives of SIP in Ethiopia.....	18
2.2.3.	The Purpose of SIP .....	18
2.2.4.	The Objectives of SIP .....	19
2.2.5.	The Domains of School Improvement Program .....	19
2.2.6.	The Phases of School Improvement Program.....	21
2.2.7.	The Phases of School Improvement Program.....	21
2.2.8.	Major Practices in the School Improvement Program.....	22
CHAPTER THREE .....		26
3.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	26
3.1.	The research Design.....	26
3.2.	Research Approach .....	26
3.3.	Sources of Data .....	26
3.3.1.	Primary Dara.....	26
3.3.2.	Secondary Data .....	26
3.4.	Sampling Techniques.....	27
3.4.1.	Sampling Design.....	27
3.5.	Instruments of data collection.....	30
3.5.1.	Questionnaire .....	30
3.5.2.	Interviews.....	30
3.5.3.	Focus Group Discussions.....	30
3.5.4.	Observations .....	31
3.6.	Procedures of Data Collection. ....	31
3.7.	Methods of Data Analysis.....	31
3.8.	Ethical consideration.....	32
CHAPTER FOUR.....		33
4.	PRESENTATION, ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATION .....	33
4.4.	Characteristicseof the Respondents .....	33
4.5.	Analysis and interpretation of findings.....	36
4.5.1.	SIP Planning.....	36
4.5.2.	School improvement program in four domains .....	38
4.5.3.	Monitoring and evaluation of SIP implementation.....	46

4.5.4. The Success to Implement SIP .....	48
4.5.5. Challenges on SIP Implementation.....	50
CHAPTER FIVE .....	53
5.    SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	53
5.4.    Summary .....	53
5.5.    Conclusions.....	55
5.6.    Recommendations.....	56
6.    REFERENCE.....	XI
Appendix- A Questionnaire for Students.....	XIV
Appendix- B Questionnaire for Teachers .....	XVIII
Appendix –C Interview Guide .....	XXIII

## **List of Tables**

Table 3.1: Population of the study .....	28
Table 3.2: sample of teachers and students in each schools. ....	29
Table 3.3: List of Participants .....	29
Table 4.1: Respondents Gender and Age Category .....	33
Table 4.2: Educational Background and Year of Service of Respondents. ....	34
Table 4.3: Respondents Awareness about SIP.....	35
Table 4.4: Teachers and Students Response of School Improvement Planning.....	37
Table 4.5: Response on school leadership and management domain .....	39
Table 4.6: Response on Stakeholders Involvement .....	40
Table 4.7: Response on Teaching-Learning Domain .....	42
Table 4.8: Response on Learning Environment Domain.....	45
Table 4.9: Response on School Improvement Program Monitoring and Evaluation .....	47
Table 4.10: the Successful of the Government Primary School to Implement SIP .....	49
Table 4.11: Teachers and Students Response on the Challenges of the School Improvement Program.....	51
Table 7.1: Observation Check List .....	XXV

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

- CPD** - Continuous Professional Development
- ECI** - Education commission for improvement
- ELIP** - English Language Improvement Program
- ESDP** - Educational Sector Development Program
- GEQIP** - General Education Quality Improvement Program
- IQEA** - International Quality Education for All
- MoE** - Ministry of Education
- SIC** - School Improvement Committee
- SIP** - School Improvement Program
- TDP** - Teachers Development Program
- WEO** - Woreda Education Office

# CHAPTER ONE

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with introductory issues of the study such as the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, operational definition of key terms, delimitation, limitation and the organization of the study.

### 1.1. Background of the Study

Education is a work of preparing a generation for life aiming at helping human being in solving problems ranging from day to day activities to complex social, economic and political challenges. It is an endeavor that develops skill and capacity, eradicates harmful practices and enhances science and technology (MoE, 1991). Schools play a central role in the realizing these purposes of education, as they are institutions where the formal teaching and learning activity takes place. Hence, what is going on in schools could imply the performance of an education system. In this regard, Macbeth said that, ‘‘improving the micro-efficiency of the school has been viewed as a means of addressing some of the Macro problems of the state and society (Cited in Harris, 2005). On the other hand, what is going on in the larger educational system and the external environment highly affects schools’ performance (Ayalew, 1991).

Since the early 1980’s, educators around the world have been facing continual and dynamic changes both in their schools and in those systems that are in support of them. Such a merciless change at schools makes the multiplicity of complex educational demands to be the responsibility of teachers and administrators (Telford, 1996). Such increasingly competitive environment in which schools operate forced them to raise standards and to improve the quality of their service (Harris, 2005). Moreover, more than ever before, there is a need to engage in new ways of thinking about educational problems and ways through which schools can make needed and desired improvements. As a result, school systems throughout the world have become subject to wide ranging reform programs. Consequently, many countries introduced huge reforms to their educational programs.

Many writers define school improvement program in different ways. For example, Barnes defines school improvement as a process of changing specific practices and policies in a way which helps to improve the teaching and learning process (cited in MoE, 2007). In order to change specific practices and policies, people who are engaged in the school improvement

program should have an adequate knowledge of the factors within the schools, that may be changed to produce higher quality of schooling and they should be clearly informed as to what conditions out-side the level of the school are necessary to the improvement (Dimmock, 1993).

In this regard, it must be noted that since schools differ in shape, size, structure, culture, political environment and other dimensions, we cannot have single universally accepted school improvement approach that works in all educational systems and settings. Hence, different countries have developed different school improvement approaches that suit their educational problems (MoE, 2007). Accordingly, the Government of Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE), through the Ministry of Education (MoE) had introduced a school improvement program.

According to the MoE's school improvement program blue print document (2007), the timely and the basic aim of the program is improving students' academic achievement through creating conducive teaching and learning environment with active involvement of parents in the teaching learning process. Whenever such new programs are introduced to the given educational system and they began to be implemented, it is worthy to assess the implementation process so as to identify the strengths and weaknesses in the implementation process. The assessment, not only enables schools and educational leaders to identify the strengths and weakness in the implementation of the school improvement programs, but also provides them with an insight of what measures to be taken to improve the weaknesses and to expand their strengths as well. This in turn helps schools to make best out of the implementation of the programs. Therefore, this assessment was made to know the current status of school improvement program (SIP) in Makuey Woreda Primary Shools in Gam Bella Peoples National Regional State (GPNRS).

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

According to Khosa (2009), the most challenging concern of many countries is the assurance of the provision of quality and relevant education to the citizens. Undertaking different educational initiatives is an important dimension to ensure quality of education. Hence, School improvement becomes one of the major educational initiatives that many countries have developed and implemented, to realize the provision of quality education. But, the implementation of school improvement program in the education is facing many challenges in many parts of the world, especially in developing countries like Ethiopia. Some of the problems faced includes, difficulty to transform time, teaching, physical and financial resources in learning outcomes. Besides that,

poor curriculum delivery; teachers do not complete the curriculum, and pitch their teaching at levels than those demanded by the curriculum. In addition, support and monitoring functions are inadequate and ineffective, and community support of schools is very low.

As a result, alongside ESDPs and GEQIP, the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia has designed and implemented the School Improvement Program (SIP). One of the main focuses of this was strengthening school management and parent and community partnership in order to improve decision-making at school level (MoE 2005: 56). The document outlined the main components of school management and administration as: head-teacher and assistant head-teacher; school management committees at various levels (comprising teachers, students, parents and representatives of the local community); and educational experts and supervisors working at various levels outside the school. These parties are expected to take responsibility for problems and weaknesses that arise in schools,

Thus, this proposition confirms that school improvement program is the corner stone for all school improvement activities. Moreover, it can also be noted that the quality of school improvement program implementation largely depends upon the presence of adequately awareness of stakeholders in the school. However, the current practices showed that educational leaders have no enough capacity to implement SIP. Thus, the absence of adequately awareness of the stakeholders would add to the weak implementation of the school improvement program contribute for the bad quality of education and the program doesn't achieve the expected result so far.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to assess the current status of school improvement program (SIP) in Primary schools in Makuey Woreda, Nuer Zone in Gambella People National Regional State.

In order to attain its purpose, this study tries to answer the following basic questions:

1. What is the current status of school implementation program in Makuey Woreda primary schools?
2. To what extents are the stakeholders are aware about school improvement program?
3. How stakeholders are involved and contribute for the implementation of school improvement program /SIP/ activities in Makuey Woreda primary schools?
4. What are the major challenges that affect implementation of SIP in Makuey Woreda Primary school?

5. What measures need to be taken to make SIP more successful?

### **1.3. Objective of the Study**

#### **1.3.1. General Objective**

The General objective of the study is to assess the current status of School Improvement program (SIP) implementation in Makuey Woreda Primary school.

#### **1.3.2. Specific Objectives**

The study attempt, to address the following specific objectives;

1. To assess the current status of the School Improvement Program (SIP) Implementation.
2. To assess the awareness of stakeholders about school improvement program implementation in makuey woreda primary schools.
3. To assess the stakeholders involvement and the extent of their involvement in SIP implementation.
4. To identify the major problems challenging SIP implementation
5. To suggest possible solutions to solve the problems facing the implementation.

### **1.4. Significance of the Study**

Telford (1999) stated that, at present time in educational world there is a rent less change at both school and system level. Hence, to remain as competent as possible in such dynamic world, schools needs to improve the quality of their outcomes. Even though different efforts are made by government, stakeholders, concerned agencies and individuals at every level to improve the quality of education; due to different factors that hinder their participation, the question of quality education provision still exists. In the educational systems where school improvement program has implemented it's useful to study how the program has being implemented and identifying those major factors that affected the implementation of the program, and what is specifically needed in Makuey Woreda Primary school to make a success out of the entire effort.

In general, the researcher of this paper believes that the findings of this study will have the following significance.

1. It help the stakeholders to have an understanding on how to contribute for the school activities which improve the implementation of SIP in the primary schools.

2. It might enable educational officials and school principals to identify the major activities of schools which are being implemented to achieve expectation outcome in primary schools
3. It might enable educational officials and school principals to identify the challenges observed in implementing SIP.
4. It might provide educational official and principals an insight on the solutions for prevailing problems.
5. It might also serve as a basis for other researchers in conducting scientific inquiry on the area under investigation.

### **1.5. Delimitation of the Study**

Even though SIP was being implemented in all schools of the country, the study was delimited to focus on Government primary schools of Gambella Regional State with specific referral to Makuey Woreda for the purpose of manageability. Moreover, out of the 13 government primary schools (1-8) in the woreda only 8 (61.53%) of them was purposefully selected. The school improvement program in primary schools have various dimensions. To make the study more manageable, the study was delimited to assess the status of the school improvement program in the selected Government primary schools of Makuey Woreda, Nuer Zone in Gambella People National Regional State. How the major activities of school improvement program are implemented to achieve the expected out come, the factors hindered the effective implementation of the program and the possible ways to implement the school improvement program effectively were assessed.

### **1.6. Limitations of the Study**

It would be very difficult to complete a research without facing any difficulties throughout the process. Even though, this research reached its aim, there were some unavoidable limitations. First, there was a possibility of low-level responses from the respondents. The length of the surveys could lead some teachers to quickly and thoughtlessly answer questions to complete the survey. The principals, supervisor's and woreda educational experts interviews as well as school improvement committee's focused group discussions were highly focused. As a result, interview and focused group discussion times might not have been used efficiently. Second, respondents could answer more or less survey questionnaires positively due to the knowledge that the data they gave were used in the study. Some teachers and students respondents might have answered

more positively due to believing their school was being judged; some might have answered less positively for the same reason. Third, there was discrepancy due to answering relative to the other answers. Finally, there was lack of quality information as to why teachers felt as they did during the study.

### **1.7. Operational Definitions of Key Terms**

**Factors affecting school improvement program:** refers to factors that influences school improvement program. Such as involvement of stake holders, school facilities.

**Improvement program in education:** further enhancing its strategic goals of developing and implementing standards to improve the access and quality of education for all children to achieve at high level with long term aim.

**Improvement:** Is the action of providing better than previous situation.

**Program:** Is a schedule or planned serious of events related to the activities in long term aim.

**School improvement Committee:**-It is committee which established from the school community and parents to support implementation of SIP in the schools (MoE, 2006).

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

**Woreda:** A sub-division of a zone and is considered as equivalent to a district.

**Zone:** A sub-division of a region/regional state and consists of a number of woredas.

### **1.8. Organization of the Study**

This study is organized in to five chapters. Chapter one deals with the introduction of the study: background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study and, significant of the study, operational definition of terms, delimitations and limitations of the study. Chapter two consists of the literature review focusing on the relevant literatures about the subject under study. Chapter three covers the research methodology consisting of research design, the target population sample and sampling procedure, source of data, methods of data collection and data analysis method. Chapter four presents the findings and discussions of field work and finally chapter five forwards the conclusions and recommendations of the stud

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

#### **2.1. Overview of School Improvement**

##### **2.1.1. The Rational of School Improvement**

Change usually emerges when there is dissatisfaction with the existing state of affairs. This is also true for educational changes. That is, when there is a sense of unhappiness in the existing operation of schools, Velzen described that; there will be a sustained effort in side of schools to change the conditions for teaching and learning. These changes are directed towards accomplishing new educational goals (cited in Husen and Postlethwaite, 1994). Recently, most education systems and educationalists around the world have been faced with continual and radical change both in their education systems and in particular schools (Telford, 1996).

The dynamic change that the education systems face, more than ever before, demands schools to think about new methods of addressing educational challenges and new approaches in which schools can make needed and desired improvements (Senge in Carlson, 1996). Besides, at no time in history has the world been so interconnected and interdependent as it is today in the age of globalization (Raja, 2003). Hence, high competition occurs in different environments. This, in turn places much greater emphasis up on schools to raise standards and to improve their outcomes (Harris et al, 2008). As a result, the concern for school effectiveness has attracted international interest for some years as school systems worldwide become subject to wide ranging reform programs (Dimmock, 1993).

To this end, schools and educationalists in collaborate, designed to strengthen the schools' ability to manage changes, to enhance the work of teachers, and ultimately to improve students' achievements. Consequently, educationalists have developed reform programs that aimed at strengthening the schools' capacity to provide quality education for its pupils during the past ten years, which Hopkins termed as a school improvement programs (2002).

##### **2.1.2. Definitions of School Improvement**

The most popular and widely accepted definition to school improvement was forwarded by Hopkins (2005). He defined school improvement as “a distinct approach to educational change that enhances students' outcomes as well as strengthen the school's capacity for managing improvement initiatives”. Hopkins further elaborated that school improvement is about raising

students achievement through focusing on the teaching and learning process and those conditions which support it. Another definition for school improvement is given by Van Velzen (in Sammons, 1994).

He described school improvement as a systematic and sustained effort focusing on the change of learning conditions and other similar conditions within school(s) having the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals in more effective ways. In general, school improvement is an educational reform that aimed at changing learning conditions and schools' capacity to bring about pupils' high level achievement. The basic idea behind school improvement is that its dual emphasis on enhancing the school capacity for change as well as implementing specific reforms, both of which have their ultimate goal of increasing in student achievement.

Hence, school improvement is about strengthening schools organizational capacity and implementing educational reform. Another major notion of school improvement is that, school improvement cannot be simply equated with educational change in general. Because many changes, whether external or internal, do not improve students' outcome as they simply imposed. They should rather focus on the importance of culture and organization of the school (Hopkins, 1994). Moreover, Velzen (cited by Renolds) provides the notion that school improvement is not an event or incident; rather it is a process that takes time.

### **2.1.3. Purpose of School Improvement Program**

According to Husen and Postlethwaite (1994:5241), the purpose of most school improvement policies is improving educational process that includes instruction or subject matter. It helps schools to improve their organizational functioning that are indirectly linked to students' achievement, such as school climate, staffing and school organization. Besides, SIP encourages schools to conduct self-enquiry regarding the strengths and weakness of their performance. Moreover SIP helps schools to get a collaborative effort of several stakeholders at different levels of the education system, as the success of an improvement policy largely requires the interaction between many participants.

### **2.1.4. Objective of School Improvement Program**

School improvement, in general, is about strategies for improving the school's capacity for providing quality education. The major concern of SIP is raising students' achievement focusing on the teaching and learning process and conditions that support the process (Hopkins, 2002). Having this general objective of SIP, one can see that specific objectives of school improvement

programs may vary from country to country or from school to school based on the prevailing problems in which particular schools or the education system in general suffer from. For example, SIP in Egypt is carried out with the objective to improve accountability, efficiency and quality of primary education system having the purpose of improving children learning outcomes, increasing enrollment and retention rates, and reducing repetition and dropout rates (plan Egypt, 2007). SIP in Sudan similarly, intended to promote access and utilization of good quality and efficient basic education with focus on geographical and gender equity (plan Sudan, 2006).

The above examples show that, the major problem of schooling in the two countries (at least in those schools covered by the SIP program) is not only the issue of providing quality education but also problems related to access, efficiency and equality of education. That is the reason for these countries' to include the issues of access, efficiency and quality of education in their SIP programs. On the other hand in western countries like UK and Wales, where issues of access, equality and efficiency of education are no more serious problems, the main objectives of SIP is searching for teaching approaches that are effective in achieving high academic standards whilst at the same time enhancing the students' range of learning skills as well as contributing to aspects of personal and social development (Hopkins, 2002).

In general, the above explanation shows that, even though the general aim of SIP seems to be providing quality of education to its entire pupil, particular challenges and problems in which particular nations or schools suffer from determine the objectives of the school improvement programs.

### **2.1.5. Approaches to School Improvement Programs**

Historically, in two different periods, two distinct school improvement approaches existed which Reynolds termed them as the SIP paradigms. He further noted that, two very distinctive intellectual traditions and histories underlined two groups of scholars and hence the two distinctive approaches (1993). The two paradigms have their own distinctive characteristics. In the coming section of this paper, we will discuss them in some detailed way for the purpose of clarification.

#### **2.1.5.1. The 1960's Paradigm**

The 1960's paradigm is the early approaches to school improvement that adopted a technological view in which innovations are brought to school from out-side. The approach is characterized by a top-down orientation; in which the innovations are based up on the knowledge produced by

persons out-side the school, focusing on school's formal organization and curriculum rather than the individual practitioner in which the goals are learning outcomes. In general, the whole improvement program was made on the basis of a positivistic and quantitative evaluation of efforts (Reynolds, 199).

However, during the 1970's and 1980's there has been a major shift in the styles and form of educational change efforts due to specific national contingencies and such international trends as worldwide economic recession, increasing emphasis on assessing results and establishing criteria for school accountability and increasing awareness that school improvement is more complex process than was formerly assumed (Husen and Postlethwaite; 1994). As a result, the world wide failure of the 1960's approach to school improvement came to be true. Reactively, the new school improvement paradigm of the 1980's came out of the recognition of this failure (Reynolds; 1993).

#### **2.1.5.2. The 1980's Paradigm**

This newly movement of school improvement, in contrast to the older approach, has introduced a bottom-up orientation in which those at the school level own the improvement efforts. However, consultants and experts outside school would be allowed to put their knowledge base of researchers and wished to change educational processes than school management and organizational features. The approach allows debates and discussions on out-comes and goals of school improvement program rather than accepting them as a given. In this approach, the improvement is expected to operate at the level of practitioners rather than at school level with a qualitative and naturalistic orientation of evaluation. In general, the approach is based on school in its entirety rather than a part of it (Reynolds; 1993).

However, the reactive nature of the new improvement approach is criticized for its deficiency in actually generating school improvement. Even the proponents of the approach begun to realize that, although schools should own their improvement attempts, outsiders, could also perform a useful function in brining excellent or elite knowledge to the attention of teachers in schools. Despite the critics on the approach, its concepts are reflected in much of the current writings on school improvement and it is substantially accepted internationally (Reynolds; 1994). Most concepts and ideas presented in this paper also reflect the concepts of the new school improvement approach.

### **2.1.6. Assumptions of School Improvement**

School improvement program works from an assumption that schools are most likely to strengthen their competence to give enhanced out comes for all pupils when they adopt ways of working that are consistent with not only their aspirations, but also with the current reform agenda (Hopkins, 2002:05). Having a broader assumption as listed above, particular school improvement projects may have developed their own assumptions. Hopkins and his colleagues has adopted six assumptions to a school improvement program known as IQEA which had been carried out in UK, Wales, Port'oreico and South Korea (1993).

The first assumption is that the school improvement will bring enhanced out comes for both students and staff. Out comes may vary in accordance with the focus of the improvement effort. However, whatever outcome they aspire for, school improvement will make them reality to and fro (1993). Here the assumption underlines that the school improvement should not only goal oriented but also efficient in achieving the goals set by the school.

In order for the SIP to be effective and efficient, it must take the school culture in to account. In this regard, the type of school cultures that must supportive of school improvement are identified to be; collaborative planning, high expectations for both students and staff, exhibiting a consensus on values, support an orderly and secure environment and encouraging teachers to assume the variety of leadership roles. Without the existence of such cultures, it is hardly possible to bring about the desired improvement in schools. The school's background and organization, as the third assumption, are key factors in the school improvement process. If the goals of school improvement are to be realized in schools, organizational factors should also be changed in relation to the change process they often become inhibitors of change otherwise.

The school improvement works best when there is a clear and practical focus for the development effort. The fourth factor assumes that the school's priorities are normally some aspects of teaching and learning which the school has identified from the many changes that confront it. In other words, they are priorities of the school. Most priority setting activities focus on identifying those issues that are few in number, central to the mission of the school, related to the teaching and learning process and leading to specific outcomes for students and staff.

The fifth assumption described that the conditions for school improvement are worked on at the same time as other priorities the school has set itself. Conditions are the frameworks, the roles

and responsibilities and ways of working that enable a school to get work done. All conditions should be given an equal attention, particularly in the initial stage of the improvement. The last assumption according to Hopkins, assumes that a school improvement strategy needs to be developed in order to link priorities to the conditions. This is because the implementation of school improvement program is an equally costly phase of the change process. Hence, effective implementation requires parallel policies and procedures (O'Neil et al, 1995).

### **2.1.7. Conditions Influencing School Improvement**

There are factors that influence any educational change in general, and school improvement in particular. These can be categorized in to three: (a) characteristics of the innovation itself, (b) the internal context of the school and (c) the external context of the school (Hussen and Postlethwaite; 1994).

#### **2.1.7.1. Characteristics of the Change**

The kind and the nature of the improvement program that we introduced in the school system affect its implementation. Because, such characteristics of change as centrality, quality, scope and complexity of the improvement program are associated with its implementation. For example, improvements that are closely related to core educational activities such as instructional processes or and improvements that can provide significant advantages over past practice are more likely to continue over longer periods of time. Moreover, improvements that require involvement of the large proportions of classes are more likely to have a real impact than activities involving minor modifications of existing practices. In general, according to Posch, if improvements are required to create change they must not only be different from the past, but must also be consistent with underlying values and interpretable (Hussein and Postlethwaite, 1994).

#### **2.1.7.2. Internal Conditions of Schools**

The internal context existed in schools also influence the school improvement programs. Internal context of the school refers to such conditions as Staff Development, Involvement, Leadership, Coordination, Enquiry and Reflection, and finally collaborative planning (Hopkins, 2002)

##### **A. Staff Development**

Establishing the professional learning of teachers is central to most notions of school improvement. This is true for that, creating learning opportunities helps the staff to actively

engage in activities expected of them (Huberman and Miles 1994). Besides, the attention to teachers learning is likely to have direct spin-offs in terms of pupils learning. In general, schools will not improve without teachers' development, individually or collectively. Therefore, schools should be able to develop appropriate strategy for staff-development that can provide teachers to learn together, if the whole school is to develop (Hopkins; 2000).

## **B. Involvement**

The success of schools is associated with the sense of identification and involvement extends beyond the teaching staff. In other words, involvement and sense of identification of pupils', parents', non-teaching staffs' and other community members' is as crucial as that of the teaching staff for the success of schools. Because the success of an improvement program (perhaps any other educational program) requires an interaction between many participants at different levels (Hussein and Postlethwaile; 1994). In this regard, Farrar et al stated that, where there is a poor fit between a reform program designed at the national level and the community's expectations for schooling, the actual change is unlikely. Because, communities that have fragmented value systems cannot provide teachers with the kind of positive adult feedback that support innovations (Hussen; 1994: 5243). Hence, any strategy of promoting students' learning needs to give attention to the participation of students, parents, and community members with a particular focus to students' participation.

## **C. Leadership**

Almost all school improvement scholars underline the role of leadership for school improvement. Hopkins for example, argued that, the quality of leadership of the head is the most important single factor in the success of effective schools (2005). From the above explanation, we can see that the role of principals /school leaders/ is so central in the success of school. That is, if the leader fails, the school fails and the vice versa. The role of leadership in the school improvement has some key dimensions. The establishment of a clear vision for teaching and learning is determined to be the first dimension of school leader's role. Because, schools that are clearer with the vision of their own school improvement efforts become more effective consumers and interpreters of reforms (Hopkins, 2002).

In defining vision for teaching and learning, school leaders need to give due attention to the way in which the vision is developed as it is an important as vision itself in generating staff

commitment. As the conditions in which teachers and other become empowered to jointly undertake in the formulation the school's vision is fundamental to the notion of collaboration (Telford; 1996). The second role of leaders is related to their ability in bringing together the best team for the job. As schools that have strong team are more likely to succeed in policy development and implementation than schools in which the team is weak (Hopkins, 2002: Hussen and Postlethwaite 1994).

In this regard, school leaders need to have genuine professional regard for the abilities and inputs of those people around them in order to create an atmosphere of respect and valuing of all members of the community. This in turn helps them to realize the group effectiveness (Telford, 1996). In general, the above explanation makes it clear that leadership is a critical factor of school effectiveness. That is the reason for contemporary education reforms to place a great premium on the effective leadership and management of schools. So far it has been argued that leadership is a key factor in school improvement.

However, it seems so wise to raise such questions as what kind of leadership does really contribute to achieve school improvement goals more effectively Leithwood and Steinbatch (1993), in addressing the question, said that, all leaders cannot make a significant contribution to the improvement of school, rather their contribution differ in the methods they use for this purpose. The question "what kind of method then?" is answered by Hopkins (2005; 56-57) as follows: Complex and dynamic, such as the cultural changes that are required for school improvement are less likely to occur as a result of transactional leadership. A model of leadership more congruent with the requirements of cultural changes is that of transformational leadership which focuses on people involved, their relationships and requires an approach that seeks to transform feelings, attitudes and beliefs.

Here it is clear that, transformational leaders not only manage structures, they also purposefully seek to impact up on the culture of the school in order to change it. As a result, transformational leadership could exist to be in line with a desire to bring about school improvement, rather than simply change the school. However transformational leadership is a necessary but not sufficient condition for school improvement, as it lacks a specific orientation to student's learning. As a result, school improvement writers such as Elmore are seeking for another approach that at the same time focuses on organizational conditions of the school as well as the way teaching and learning are conducted which termed as instructional leadership. This type of leadership

approach is considered to be an inclusive of a range of other leadership skills. In general, schools to be successful need to establish a clear vision for them and regard leadership as a function to which many staff contributes (participatory), rather than a set of responsibilities vested in a single individual. ‘If the principal tries to do all of it, much of it will be left undone by any one’ (Telford: 1996:49).

#### **D. Coordination**

The school’s capacity to coordinate the action of teachers behind agreed policies is an important condition in promoting change. Coordination is about getting groups of teachers, and usually groups with different values and goals to contribute to the good of all. The importance of coordination for school improvement is so vital that schools that have a well-coordinated team are likely to have successful implementation of reform programs (Hopkins, 2002).

#### **E. Enquiry and Reflection**

Enquiry and reflection are important conditions for school improvement. Because they make it easier to sustain improvement effort around established priorities, and are better placed to monitor the extent to which policies actually deliver the intended out-comes for pupils. Since improvement programs must be different from past practices, school generated data must be reviewed in its current use made of and to consider the opportunities for improved future. The enquiry, hence must help to answer questions that need to be addressed by the improvement.

Besides, the data generated through enquiry must consider methods that are feasible and neither intrudes on nor disrupts the school’s patterns of activity and it must serve the purpose of the school. To do so, schools need to adopt a systematic approach to information collection, analysis and interpretation, particularly where the information about the impact, rather than the implementation, of improvement programs is wanted. To sum up, “important opportunities come not where and when we could plan for them, but must be seized on whenever they present themselves. Enquiry helps us to spot them-reflection guides us towards appropriate action” (Hopkins, 2002:43).

#### **F. Collaborative Planning**

According to Husen (1994), effective school improvement requires that those participants to be capable to draw up and agree upon a plan, to be willing and able to make decisions to shape and alter the plan as the realities of the change process. In addition to this, the school improvement

plans need to be clearly linked to the schools' vision for the future. Where there is a lack of congruence between the school's long term plans and particular initiatives, it is difficult to build commitment amongst staff. To solve such lack of congruence wide involvement in the planning process collaborative planning is essential. Because collaborative planning is more than producing plans but it is through which goals emerge, differences can be resolved and a basis for action is created (Hopkins, 2002).

### **2.1.7.3. The External Context**

Schools operate within a context of outsiders, which Jackson and Hopkins have called external opportunities in order to emphasize their positive contribution towards the improvement (2005). They are the change forces and reform directives so often paralyzing, destabilizing or debilitating. This shows that, successful school improvement program cannot be realized without the interaction between many participants. Hussen and Postehwaite, regarding the external context of the school stated as follows: The success of an improvement program requires interaction between many participants at different levels of the education system: government, external support systems, school administrators and staff. While the nature of the improvement effort may be shaped by local preferences and decisions, socially desirable changes are rarely instituted solely as a consequence of intrinsic motivation to improve (1994:5243).

The above explanation shows that, in order to bring socially desirable changes the consideration of external factors is essential. In addition to this, social and community support for change is a frequently neglected factor that is particularly important major innovations (cited in Hussen and Postethwaite, 1994). In general, a school improvement that failed to consider the role of the community for school improvement is nothing but, as Hopkins and Jacksons said, it is "an apartheid of professional development and school improvement" (2006). To avoid the apartheid, the school leadership should develop the schools capacity and greater confidence to work in creative and resourceful ways with external agencies and initiatives (Harris, 2006).

Concerning the above three major factors the school leadership should not only consider them, but should also plan in the way that all the three support one another in a reciprocal relationship, if student's achievement is to be enhanced.

### **2.1.8. Domains of School Improvement**

The domains of school improvement refers to those critical issues that influence the ultimate goals of school improvement-students learning outcomes (MoE; 2007). They are key strategic

areas of school improvement. They are more likely to advance achievement for all students, if they address not only the learning of individual teachers, but also other dimensions of the school capacity (Hopkins, 2002). This indicates that, advanced students' achievement is not a sole domain of teachers' competencies; rather it is the domain of other several aspects. Besides, since the school improvement strategy is required to reflect the specific context of the school, improvement strategies might differ along with different schools (Hopkins, 2002).

However, most improvement policies focus on educational process, which includes instruction that is, learning processes and environments or subject matter contents and other aspects of organizational functioning such as, leadership and management, a school climate, staffing, school organization, and participation in education (Hopkins, 2002, Hussen and Postethwaite 1994, Plan international 2007).

### **2.1.9. Challenges to School Improvement Program**

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 (Hussen and Postethwore, 1994). 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).

## **2.2. School Improvement in Ethiopia**

### **2.2.1. Overview of SIP in Ethiopia**

In Ethiopia, in previous years, due to a great effort exerted to implement the education and training policy, various promising results were registered. In spite of those achievements, still there are problems related to access, quality, equity, relevance as well as leadership and management that require critical interventions, if the education is to be an instrument for the realization of the goals set by the state. Accordingly, the MoE has developed the general education quality assurance package in 2007 so as to ensure the equitable provision of quality education (MoE, 2007).

One of the six programs included in General Education Quality Assurance package is the school improvement program. The program is aimed to bring about a desirable influence up on the promotion of quality education. To this end, the ministry, in collaboration with Regional Education Bureaus had developed school improvement framework in 2007 marking experiences drawn from other countries.

### **2.2.2. The Purpose and Objectives of SIP in Ethiopia**

According to MoE (2007), school improvement is an essential program to the realization of quality education. Hence, it should be implemented in the schools of nationwide. The program is expected to help schools in enhancing the academic performance of their students.

### **2.2.3. The Purpose of SIP**

School improvement program enables schools to undertake self-enquiry regarding their performance using centrally established indicators of successful schools. The ‘enquiry’ in turn enables them to identify their strengths and weaknesses. Based on the data obtained from the ‘self-enquiry’ process, schools become in a good position to develop their strategic plan on the basement of their actual current picture. In addition to this, SIP encourages schools so as to show accountability to their stakeholders. It also provides schools an insight on the extent to which the service they are providing is satisfying to their customers, on how to provide improved education, on the impact to education they are providing as well as on how the education is to be improved in the future (MoE, 2007).

#### **2.2.4. The Objectives of SIP**

The MoE SIP document clearly identified three basic objectives of SIP. These are; highly maximizing students' academic results and their learning capabilities, making schools effective through ensuring good governance and democratic procedures and crating a system that promotes participation and accountability and finally decentralizing the leadership and administration of schools so as to provide them administrative autonomy.

#### **2.2.5. The Domains of School Improvement Program**

The domains of SIP refer to critical issues that the program is meant to make interventions in order to improve students' learning outcome (MoE 2007). There are four but interrelated domains. Each consists of three sub-domains and several standards and indicators.

##### **2.2.5.1. Teaching and Learning**

The teaching and learning domain, having sub-domains such as: the work of teaching, learning and assessment, and curriculum; mainly focuses on the roles and responsibilities of teachers. First of all, teachers are expected to plan, to make adequate preparation and present learning activities. To this end, teachers need to have an adequate academic and professional knowledge. Besides, they are required to apply appropriate teaching methods that help in teaching large and diversified classroom. Here, the preparation and utilization of teaching aids from locally available materials is another concern of teachers. Hence, in order to get teachers in such position, their appointment (assignment) will be made in such a way that their qualification could fit with the level they are teaching. To enable them adequate trainings will be provided (MoE. 2007).

In order to ensure, whether students acquired adequate knowledge or not, teachers need to conduct timely and continuous assessment. Class works, home works, short tests, individual or group works should be provided timely by teachers. They need to record students' results and give timely feedback as soon as possible. On the basis of students' result, they need to prepare tutorials for low achievers, made discussions with parents and evaluate and modify their teaching methods.

Moreover teachers should work to rein active learning in the classroom to make the teaching and learning process more effective. They should encourage active participation of students in leaning activities and facilitate educational trips and visits to the field. This helps students to get

an opportunity to apply what they have learnt in classrooms. Finally, teachers are highly expected to appreciate and treat individual differences amongst their learners with respect to age, sex, learning capabilities and special needs in all their activities (MoE, 2007).

#### **2.2.5.2. School Leadership and Administration**

In our context, school leadership consists of principals, vice principals, school committees composed of teachers, students, parents and different groups of the community as well as educational leaders in different levels that are found out of schools. These bodies are expected to be vanguard in the school improvement program. Since, primarily accountability for the failure of schools and responsibility of suggesting possible solutions lies on the shoulder of the leadership of the school, the school leadership should be organized in decentralized way. Besides proper and timely support and training will be rendered to the leadership (MoE, 2007)

#### **2.2.5.3. Parent-Community and School Relations**

Parents, community members, and NGO's play a vital role for the success of school improvement. Accordingly, various activities are identified to be carried out in promoting the participation of these key stakeholders. The participation of parents is justified for they have children in schools. Hence, they need to make a discussion with school leaders on issues pertaining students' discipline, dropouts and participation. Teachers and school principals are expected to encourage parents to follow the learning of their children and to make regular visits to schools.

Moreover, parents, other community members and NGO's will be given with a system through which they could support the improvement program financially or in kind. Because, the government alone cannot avail all the inputs required for effective teaching and learning. In this regard, different mechanisms will be established in order to raise the awareness of the parents-community and in turn to promote their sense of ownership on issues of education.

#### **2.2.5.4. Safe and Healthy School Environment**

According to MoE (2007:29), the safe and healthy nature of schools' environment enhances students learning out comes. Hence, in the school improvement program, a greater effort is exerted to make our schools safe and healthy. The school environment must be healthy in which students can learn without any type of fear of rape, physical harassment, and abduction, in which students' discipline is maintained, in which a teacher-student relationship is healthy and smooth.

Besides, educational facilities such as classrooms, textbook, references, libraries, science kits, laboratory chemicals, sport materials, plasma TVs, and ICT centers will be facilitated.

Infrastructures and sanitations such as: water supply, electric power (where the service exists), toilets will be availed. To sum up, the above four domains are the key areas in which the school improvement program focuses. Of the four domains, the teaching and learning domain is given a particular attention as it mainly determines the success of schools in promoting students' learning out-comes (MoE, 2007).

#### **2.2.6. The Phases of School Improvement Program**

MoE has developed school improvement framework, a system consists of several tools and processes by which schools able to conduct self-enquiry, develop strategic plan, implement the plan, monitor and control the progress and report to the stakeholders.

The SIP framework identified that, the process of SIP is not only continuous, and cyclical but also modified on the basis of information obtained from both external evaluation and self-enquiry which the school itself conducted at the end of each year as well as at the end of three years. The strategic plan of school improvement program covers three years. There are activities to be performed as per years. The following diagram briefly depicts activities to be performed within three years.

#### **2.2.7. The Phases of School Improvement Program**

MoE has developed school improvement framework, a system consists of several tools and processes by which schools able to conduct self-enquiry, develop strategic plan, implement the plan, monitor and control the progress and report to the stakeholders. The SIP framework identified that, the process of SIP is not only continuous, and cyclical but also modified on the basis of information obtained from both external evaluation and self-enquiry which the school itself conducted at the end of each year as well as at the end of three years. The strategic plan of school improvement program covers three years. There are activities to be performed as per years. The following diagram briefly depicts activities to be performed within three years.

In the first year of the SIP such major activities as: preparation, collection of information, system survey, deciding performance level of the school, designing SIP plan, implementation of the plan, monitoring and evaluation as well as reporting are conducted. In the second year, schools evaluate the improvements achieved in line with the goals set and priorities identified. To this

end, new issues or priorities that might be considered will be identified and modification of the plan will be made. Besides, standards on which self-enquiry was not conducted in the first year will be selected and finally, report will be prepared and presented. In the third year, while the implementation is on effect, schools monitor those improvements observed through self-enquiry. Moreover, external bodies evaluate the performance of schools and provide them with the feedback.

### **2.2.8. Major Practices in the School Improvement Program**

The school improvement program cycle takes a three years' time. In these three years, there are major practices to be served. In this senior essay the researcher presents them as follows for the purpose of clarity.

#### **2.2.8.1. Preparation**

In the preparation stage, schools are concerned with the issue of "How to Start SIP". The very stage of SIP is about the establishment of SIP committee and identifying those strengths and weaknesses observed regarding schools' performance in relation to the four domains. SIPC is a committee on which the overall responsibility of SIP is vested upon. SIPC is organized from the members representing teachers, students, non-teaching staff, parents and other community members. The number of committee members ranges from five to ten in accordance with the size of the school. The principal of the school is the chairman of the committee.

The principal, in collaboration with those key stakeholders (teachers, parents, non-teaching staff, students, PTA's and KETMB) is responsible to facilitate and organize awareness creation programs to various NGO's and religious sectors concerning the importance of SIP and strongly work to get their cooperation to the success of the program. The SIPC might organize sub-committees under its chain of command. All the members of the SIPC need to be aware that, the ultimate goal of their activity is on improving the learning outcomes of students and to do this, cooperation and team spirit are essentials. The SIPC need to develop procedures and schedule for its own meetings (MoE, 2007:16).

#### **2.2.8.2. Self Enquiry**

The very purpose of school improvement is about improving students learning and their learning outcome at higher level. Hence, schools primarily need to conduct self-enquiry on the weaknesses and strengths of their current performance. This gives them the actual current picture and a basis for future improvement. Self-enquiry is an essential means for schools to create a

sense of responsibility and accountability for students' learning and to practically show their accountability to their stakeholders, to assess the extent to which they are satisfying the needs of their students and the impact of their services as well as future directions of improvement. This can only be achieved, whenever schools conduct a self-enquiry genuinely and transparently. The information gained from the enquiry should serve to identify the weaknesses and strength, should help to identify priorities of the school, and should be used to plan activities that are aimed at achieving the improvement.

Besides, the enquiry should give an insight on what measures should be taken to improve the weakness. In this regard, schools could be able to identify an activity with higher impact on the improvement. In conducting effective self-enquiry, schools need to take into consideration the following issues. The self-enquiry should enable schools to identify the extent to which they are serving their learners and they should be part of the key leadership system. The self-enquiry to be effective should be based on brad data and it should take the perceptions' and participation of key stakeholders in to account. Moreover, the data obtained from self-enquiry must help to identify few key areas as well as that few activities that are parts of priorities which take long time to achieve at the goals.

### **How to Conduct Self-Enquiry**

In conducting self-enquiry, schools make use of the self-enquiry format. The self-enquiry format has four parts for each of the four domains. Under each domain, there are sub-domains, standards and indicators. There are also rating scales of four point to determine the level at which the school appears and to indicate how to rate schools' performance. Schools need to rate their performance on the basis of indicators presented under each domain. In rating scale, schools are expected to record the values of each indicator, because it helps them in identifying their priorities. Moreover, the self-enquiry process must be simple, accurate, clear and genuine. It must not be a bureaucratic process. Indicators must be answered with clear decision. This enables schools to get the contribution of teachers and school community in the development of school improvement plan.

### **Identifying the Priorities**

The major issues, in the process of identifying priorities, are identifying how the school is strongly moving to promote students results and raising standards through creating conducive

learning environment. On the basis of data obtained from self-enquiry, schools need to focus on the teaching-learning domain taking the three sub-domains of the main domain as indicators. This helps to identify priorities. The sub-domain under the three other domains can be taken as supportive domains. This helps to determine the tactics, time-line, and responsible bodies in the development of the plan. Here, it must be noted that, priorities must be relevant and can be achieved (MoE, 2007).

### **2.2.8.3. Designing School Improvement Plan**

After the school priorities are once identified SIPC can design the school improvement plan. SIPC make the use of various planning tools in developing the plan. The format includes, goals, objective, priorities, implementation techniques, timeline, responsible bodies, monitoring and evaluation and ways of modification to the plan. Once, the SIPC has developed the plan and get the approval of all stakeholders, the next stage is about organizing various task forces that are responsible for the development of action plan for each domain. In the formation of taskforces, the principal should encourage parents, teachers, students and other stakeholders to take active part. Besides, the principal need to encourage the involvement of department heads, PTA members, students' council, in the development of the action plans. She/he (principal) should create ways through which taskforces exchange information with SIPC. The taskforces, while developing action plans, need to consider several issues. These are:

**Setting Goals**-in the preparation of goal statements, taskforces need to revise issues raised in the self-enquiry. The revision enables them to analyze the information on which the priorities are identified. And the goal must be that can be achieved within a specific period of time, and call for the active involvement of stakeholders that can move the schools to the higher level of performance. To sum up, goals must be SMART, and stated in simple and clear language.

- ✓ **Identifying most import priorities**- the achievement of a given goal is realized, when particular attention is provided to the most important priorities. Hence, taskforces need to consult the school data so as to identify the most important priorities.
- ✓ **Designing strategies**-the strategies designed must get an approval of all stakeholders in effectively addressing the domains.
- ✓ **Identifying Indicators**-indicators identified must be in the position to measure students' learning outcomes and teachers' teaching performances.

- ✓ **Setting Timeline**-activities in the plan must be presented with the specific period of implementation time. They can be planned in semester, year or three years and should get the approval of principals, teachers, SIPC and PTA.
- ✓ **Assigning Responsible-bodies**-Responsibilities of performing particular activities should be assigned to particular bodies: PTA, principal, teachers and students.
- ✓ **Status update**-in order to ensure continuous and sustained school improvement, update strategy must be considered.
- ✓ **Revision of the plan**-evaluation of the implementation conducted by the end of each year, as a result revision of priorities, and timelines can be made. Hence, the action plan taskforce need to consider the revision techniques (MoE, 2007).

#### **2.2.8.4. The Implementation of School Improvement Plan**

When the SIPC ensures that priorities are well identified and the plan is ready, the school improvement plan comes to effect. Here, the important thing is assuring whether, the existing practices and ways of doing are in harmony with the new plan. Besides, the school leadership needs to ensure the availability of necessary resources from the external and internal sources so as to realize the effective implementation of the plan. Moreover, the schools need to provide a progress report while the program is taking place. Through the communication the school bridges with its stakeholders, it can draw continuous support from its stakeholder. Magazines, bulletins, posters and stickers can be used for the purpose of communication so as to ensure the genuine participation of stakeholders (MoE, 2007).

#### **2.2.8.5. Evaluation of SIP**

School improvement program is not a linear rather it is cyclical. Hence, it requires continuous evaluation and thereby possible modification. Evaluation of the program is conducted in two ways. On the one hand, the school itself conducts annual evaluation on the implementation of the program. On the other hand, external bodies conduct an evaluation at the end of the third year. Hence, based on the data and information obtained from both evaluations schools make possible modifications of the program (MoE, 2007:03). The information obtained from both evaluations could serve as a basis for further planning.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This chapter is concerned with research methodology, presented the research design, research method, Sampling technique (Population, sample frame, sample unit and sample size), source of data (primary data and secondary data), instrument of data gathering (questionnaire, interview, focused group discussion and field observation), data analysis and ethical consideration.

#### **3.1. The research Design**

Quirk (1979) stated that the design and methodology of a research is determined by the purpose of the study. The purpose of this study was to assess the status of school improvement program in government primary schools of Makuey Woreda, Nuer Zone, Gambella People National Regional State. Hence, descriptive survey design was used because it is appropriate to obtain an accurate description of the existing practices and major problems encountered in the implementation of School Improvement Program

#### **3.2. Research Approach**

In undertaking this study, to offset the weakness of the approaches and to benefit from the strength, the mixed or combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches was used. Because combining both the approaches provides relevant data and helps to compare the results from two different perspectives and to be more confident of the results.

#### **3.3. Sources of Data**

The data for this study was collected from both primary and secondary sources. To achieve the objective of this study both primary and secondary data sources were collected from various sources. These sources are explained as under:

##### **3.3.1. Primary Dara**

Primary data was obtained from principals, primary school cluster supervisors, Woreda educational focal person, school improvement committee members and teachers who have adequate exposure to the implementation of SIP in Makuey Woreda primary schools.

##### **3.3.2. Secondary Data**

Data which is accessible, reliable, adequate and relevant to the study will be collected through document review. The secondary data was obtained from related document of SIP guide line by reviewing relevant policy documents and guidelines such as Education Sector Development

Program and the School Improvement Program Blue Print and Implementation Manual. For this purpose, the documents of school improvement program were revised from these sources.

### **3.4. Sampling Techniques**

This study use both probability and non-probability sampling techniques. Non-probability sampling (purposive and expert sampling) was used to select woreda educational bureau core process owner, supervisors, principals, teachers and key informant (active parents). On the other hand, probability (simple random) sampling method was used to select schools and the students; the share of each student was decided using quota sampling.

Among the 13 schools found in Makuey Woreda, 8 schools were selected by the researcher using simple random sampling technique. The reason behind selecting simple random sampling technique was that all schools in the defined population would have equal and independent chance of being included in the sample.

#### **3.4.1. Sampling Design**

The proposed or target population of this study is the total number of students in all 13 primary schools found in Makuey Woreda which is 7,363, the number of teachers 232, Woreda educational office staffs 93. The total number of the target population is 7,688. The sampling units of the study were constituted by students, principals, supervisors, teachers, woreda educational experts and parents. From these sampling units, the sample size was determined using sampling techniques and was used as the units of analysis.

Table 3.1: Population of the study

No	Name of School	Number of Students	Number of Teachers	Total
1.	Nyine-nyang	1300	30	1330
2.	Gier	700	20	720
3.	Puok-kueth	856	33	889
4.	Longjiok	575	17	592
5.	Kondey	450	15	465
6.	Tormo-rok	360	13	373
7.	Bil Ker	353	14	367
8.	Batokdol	330	16	346
9.	Bil Dak	705	18	723
10.	Adura	366	13	379
11.	Wunthow	358	14	372
12.	Koat Gaar	480	16	496
13.	Jiongol	530	13	543
	Total	7,363	232	7595
	Woreda Education Office Staffs	93		93
	Grand Total			7688

### 3.4.1.2. Sample determination

The sample of students and teacher of each school was determined by use of quota sampling. The school with high number of teachers and students was also having the highest number of participant of samples. The number of the samples was determined the following formula:

$$S = \frac{n * th}{TH}$$

Where:

S = Sample to be taken from each primary school

n = Total sample size

th= Total number of students in each primary school

TH = Total number of students in all eight (8) selected primary schools

Table 3.2: sample of teachers and students in each schools.

School	Students	Calculation	Sample	Teachers	Calculation	Sample
Nyine-nyang	1300	$\frac{86 * 1300}{5087}$	22	30	$\frac{60 * 30}{158}$	11
Gier	700	$\frac{86 * 700}{5087}$	12	20	$\frac{60 * 20}{158}$	8
Puokueth	856	$\frac{86 * 856}{5087}$	14	33	$\frac{60 * 33}{158}$	12
Kondey	450	$\frac{86 * 450}{5087}$	8	15	$\frac{60 * 15}{158}$	6
Batokdol	330	$\frac{86 * 330}{5087}$	6	16	$\frac{60 * 16}{158}$	6
Tor-morok	360	$\frac{86 * 360}{5087}$	6	13	$\frac{60 * 13}{158}$	5
Bildak	705	$\frac{86 * 705}{5087}$	12	18	$\frac{60 * 18}{158}$	7
Adura	366	$\frac{86 * 366}{5087}$	6	13	$\frac{60 * 13}{158}$	5
Total			86	60		

Table 3.3: List of Participants

No	Participant	Number of Participants	Sampling Technique
1	Students	86	Purposive/Expert Sampling
2	Teachers	60	
3	Principals	16	
4	Supervisors	2	
5	Education office	1	
5	Parents	32	
Total		197	

### **3.5. Instruments of data collection**

In this study, questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussion, observation checklist and document analysis were employed as data collection instruments. The researcher believed that the combinations of different instruments were useful to obtain adequate information for assessing the status, practices and challenges of school improvement program implementation.

#### **3.5.1. Questionnaire**

The questionnaires were prepared by the researcher to access the required information from teachers and students on the basis of theoretical ground about the status of the schools improvement program. The questionnaire comprised of both close-ended and open-ended type questions. The researcher used five point Likert response set ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The questionnaire was divided into two sections. The first list section collected the background information of the respondents. The second section was used to measure teachers and students view about the status of school improvement program. All the questionnaires were prepared in English.

#### **3.5.2. Interviews**

Interviews was administered by using an interview guide, because it can help to generate a wide range of ideas. Interviews also guarantee an immediate feedback and thus can generate reliable data. So, face-to-face questions were asked and comments were made to meet the objectives. All interviews were conducted in person, and each interview took approximately 20-to-35 minutes. The results of interview were employed to substantiate the results gathered through questionnaires

#### **3.5.3. Focus Group Discussions**

Focus group discussions were held with the active-parent members. The issue of discussion was about the status of school improvement program, practice and challenges that were existed but which the schools did not use when implementing the school improvement program. The focus group discussion made with active-parents also increased the quality and richness of the data as group members simulated by the perception and ideas of others with in the social environment in which the group discussion forums were also made with guiding questions which were prepared for the group discussion.

#### **3.5.4. Observations**

Based on the nature of issue of the study regarding of generalization of school visit the researcher observe some issue and take note during visit. The school environment, classroom, the communication of staff in school compound. The school facilities including classroom, toilet, cafe, playing ground (field), library and laboratories.

#### **3.6. Procedures of Data Collection.**

In order to collect data, first permission was sought from the University. Then, permission was also sought from the relevant educational authorities in Makuey Woreda for a voluntary, anonymous survey to be conducted among eight government primary schools educators in their administration Third, principals of each participating schools were contacted to arrange date for the administration of the survey, interviews and focused group discussions among principals, supervisors, students and active-parents respectively in their respective schools and areas. On the arranged dates, first the questionnaires were disseminated and retrieved with the assistance of school principals and their management teams at each school selected for the survey. Then, interview was conducted with school principals, woreda educational experts and supervisors. Finally, focused group discussions were done with active- parents respectively.

Before the questionnaire was administered to respondents, the purpose of the study was explained to them by the researcher. The questionnaire was administered to 86 students and 60 teachers in their respective schools during regular class periods. 82 students and 60 teachers' questionnaires were returned and used in analysis because four (4) questionnaires were discarded as the respondents gave incomplete and inappropriate information. Both structured and unstructured interviews were administered. For interview and FGD, contacts were made with school principals, woreda education office core process owner, school supervisors and active-parents. Therefore, all essential data have been collected for analysis.

#### **3.7. Methods of Data Analysis**

Descriptive statistic was employed in this study by using SPSS-version 20, to analyze close ended quantitative data collected through questionnaire. From the descriptive statistics, frequency counts and percentages were used and mean, standard deviation and t-test values were used as needed to analyze the data. The researcher had consulted documents such as Education Sector Development Program, School Improvement Program Guideline, and School

Improvement Program Implementation Manual to obtain additional data and to assess the trend schools were involved in when implementing school improvement program.

This technique was preferred because of its ability to provide supplementary information and flexibility. In a nut shell, through the study exercise the researcher had made attempts to make a review of the relevant written documents about the school improvement program and the meeting minutes for school improvement program. Data gathered from observation and document review were triangulated with quantitative data to enrich the analysis and interpretation of the study.

### **3.8. Ethical consideration**

All participants were assured that their participation in the study was voluntary, confidential and undertook to keep their names and all the information they provided strictly confidential; to use these only for research purposes. No administrative personnel had access to the study data at any point in the data collection process, and all participants participated freely and willingly.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### 4. PRESENTATION, ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data collected from respondents (Students, Teachers, Principals, Supervisor, woreda education office,) through questionnaires, interview, FGD, Observation and document review in the selected primary schools of Makuey Woreda, Nuer Zone in Gambella People National Regional State. The results of the study were presented and discussed following the methodology. The general characteristics of the respondents and the analysis of the main findings of study in line with the research question were presented in this chapter as follow.

#### 4.4. Characteristicseof the Respondents

The necessary data were obtained from eight (8) schools found in Makuey Woreda. Besides, document analysis was carried out to enrich the data obtained through questionnaire and interview. The respondents were, teachers, students, principals, Active-parents members and Woreda educational experts. Thus a sum total of 146 copies of questionnaires were distributed and 142 (97.3%) were returned in proper way and were used in the analysis. 60 (100%) were teachers, 82 (95.3 %) were students. Moreover 16 (100%) principals, 2 (100%) supervisor, 1 (100%) Woreda education Office expert were interviewed and 32 (100%) active parents participate in focused group discussion (FGD). The major characteristics of respondents were presented below as follow.

Table 4.1: Respondents Gender and Age Category

No	Variable	Teachers		Student		Total		
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
1	Gender	Male	51	85%	59	72%	110	77.5%
		Female	9	15%	23	28%	32	22.5%
		Total	60	100%	82	100%	142	100%
2	Age Category	Less than 18	-	-	76	93%		
		18 – 25	4	7%	6	7%		
		26 – 35	33	55%				
		36 – 45	21	35%				
		Above 45	2	3%				
		Total	60	100%	82	100%	142	100%

As indicated in the table 4.1, above among respondents teachers 51 (85%) were male and 9 (15%) were female, while from the student respondents 59 (72%) were male and 23 (28%) were female. The result show that from both groups the number of male respondents was greater than female respondents. The age category of respondents, the teachers age category were: 4 (7%) were in the age category of 18 – 25 years, 33 (55%) were in the age category of 26 – 35 years, 21 (35%) were in the age category of 36 – 45 years, 2 (3%) were in the age category of above 45 years. Whereas the age category of students respondents were: 76 (93%) were in the age category less than 18 years, 6 (7%) were in the age category of 18 – 25 years.

This revealed that the age distribution for the majority of teacher respondents were between 26-35, and for student respondents was in the age category of less than 18. Thus, it is possible to claim that the majority of both respondents were in the required age group to implement school improvement program.

Table 4.2: Educational Background and Year of Service of Respondents.

No	Variable		Teachers		Principals		Supervisors		Students		Total	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Educational Background	Diploma	27	45	-	0	-	0			8	10
		Degree	33	55	16	100	2	100			70	90
		Masters	-	0	-	0	-	0			-	0
		<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>			<b>78</b>	<b>100</b>
2	Years of service	1 – 5	13	22	-	0	-	0				
		6 – 10	28	47	10	62.5	-	0				
		Above 10	19	31	6	37.5	2	100				
		<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>				
3	Students grade level	Grade 7							38	46.3		
		Grade 8							44	53.7		
		<b>Total</b>							<b>82</b>	<b>100</b>		

As indicated in the table 4.2, above the educational background of respondents show that 27 (45%) were diploma holders and 33 (55%) were degree holders. This indicates that the teachers fulfill the standard of primary school to effectively accomplish the teaching and learning activities in schools. Similarly, the qualification of school principals, supervisors, and the woreda

education expert who have participated in the interview were all degree holders. On the other hand, students' grade level show that 38 (46.3%) students were from 7<sup>th</sup> grade, 44 (53.7%) were from 8<sup>th</sup> grade. We can see that all students were taken from grade 7 and 8, and it relatively indicate that more students were taken from 8. This is because they have a long duration in the school relative to other grades and so have better understanding about SIP status in their school.

With respect to teacher's years of service, 13 (22%) teachers were in service category less than 5 years, 28 (47%) teachers were in service category of 6 – 10 years and 19 (31%) teachers were in service category above 10 years. The majority of teachers 47% were in the service category of 6 – 10 this show that more teachers have average years of teaching experience. Regarding the principals and supervisors, 10 (62.5%) and 6 (37.5%) principals were categorized in 6 – 10 and above 10 years of working experience respectively, 2 (100%) supervisors were categorized in the above 10 years of service.

According to the above data 47 (78%) of teachers were in the service category of more than 6 years in the school, this show that more teachers have average years of teaching experience; which is relatively better to have deep understanding of the teaching profession and various programs carried out in schools including school improvement program. This in turn might enable them to provide genuine and correct responses to the questions presented to them. Besides, they might be in good stand to identify those major problems observed in the school improvement program.

Table 4.3: Respondents Awareness about SIP

Variable		Teachers		Students	
		No	%	No	%
Did you receive any training on SIP?	Yes	38	63.4	-	-
	No	22	36.6	82	100
	Total	60	100	82	100

From the table 4.3, above it indicate the number of students and teacher which took SIP training. According to the response of the respondents it was found that majority of teachers; that is, 38 (63.4%) took SIP training and 36.6% (22) of teachers did not attend the SIP training and all students 82 (100%) did not attend SIP training at all. According to the data obtained from interview the training was conducted in 2008 & 2009 before separation of two Woredas Makuey

and Jikow. In the other hands, there were any students which have attended SIP training. According to MoE (2010) SIP implementation guidelines it stated that teachers are the key stakeholders in the process of SIP implementations and in achieving the overall out comes. But, the above finding indicated that significant numbers of teachers did not take SIP related training, which can reflect that the process of SIP implementation is negatively influenced due to absence of training.

#### **4.5. Analysis and interpretation of findings**

Items written to investigate the current practices of school improvement program in the schools were collected on five points; likert scales, consisting items for school improvement planning, leadership domain, involvement of the community, teaching-learning domain, learning environment domain, monitoring and evaluation, successfulness of the government primary school and items for the challenges of the school improvement program. The responses were converted into a numerical scale. The numerical value assigned to each response was given as [(1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3= undecided 4= agree and 5= strongly agree) (1= very low, 2= low, 3= moderate, 4= high and 5= very high)]. For analysis purpose the mean value was interpreted as > 3.5 high, 2.5-3.5 moderate, and < 2.5 low.

Then, the frequency distribution of each variable was calculated as well as the mean score, standard deviation as required and using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) Software. Later, data were aggregated at the school level by averaging the scores for each item within each instrument. The mean scores for each variable and factor were then determined by averaging the scores for all survey items within each instrument and/or subscale. Accordingly, descriptive statistics including the mean and standard deviation were presented.

##### **4.5.1. SIP Planning**

Planning SIP seems simple but needs collaborative efforts of all stakeholders and commitment of key partners of the plan. In order to implement the program properly, conducting self- evaluation and involving stakeholders are few to list and focus on. The items were selected and presented to respondents to be rated on five point rating scale as shown in the table below.

Table 4.4: Teachers and Students Response of School Improvement Planning

No	Items	Respondents			
		Students		Teachers	
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D
1	Strategic plan was prepared based on self-evaluation.	1.50	0.689	1.34	0.633
2	Training was related to SIP planning	-	-	1.54	0.706
3	Stakeholders were involved in SIP plan	1.91	0.773	1.50	0.805
4	Teachers were enough information about national strategic plan	1.85	0.705	2.21	0.716
5	Teachers' planning skill meet the need of various students	1.73	0.771	1.56	0.771
<b>Aggregate mean and Standard Deviation</b>		<b>1.678</b>	<b>0.7412</b>	<b>1.63</b>	<b>0.7262</b>
<b>T-Value</b>		<b>0.081</b>			

From table 4.4, the respondents were asked to respond on School Improvement Program planning. The results from students and teachers response indicate low level of School Improvement Program planning in five dimensions in difference behaviors with an aggregate mean value of 1.678 and 1.63 for students and teachers respectively. Moreover, as the calculated t-value in the above table, t-value (0.081) which is less than the critical t-value (1.96) at  $\alpha=0.05$  confirms that teachers and students have similar view.

Besides, the data obtained through document analysis shows that, preparation on self-evaluation of school's strategic planning were not used to analyze the school strategic plan. In this case, low performance on the sight of school improvement planning might lead them to use school demand (class-room) results to analyze the school's strategic planning. However, knowing one's own performance on the basis of the school improvement planning provides a relatively strong base than that of a performance indicator which is derived based on school's itself standards. However, the data obtained from the document analysis reveals that, in most schools there was a gap in assessing all of school improvement program. From this respondents replied that, schools might lack of school improvement plan activities. The finding shows that teachers were made less familiar with the school improvement planning and program. Process was not straight line together with Ministry of Education (2010) School Improvement Program Guideline.

The interview was conducted through schools principals, supervisors, and woreda education office core process owner they were learned that schools made self-evaluation and based on the specific problems was identified their own strategic plan. In this regard, supervisor had to say, the school principals made us to review the performance of schools without discussing the school improvement program. This made all of us not to have a good understanding of the SIP Framework. Therefore, findings suggested that the planning process of school improvement program was not participatory, according to which school principals would implement policies which are not defined by higher educational authorities.

#### **4.5.2. School improvement program in four domains**

As indicated in review of related literature there are four domains or focus areas for school improvement program (MoE, 2006) which are supposed to enhance students' achievement and ultimately improves quality of education. This part discusses the major activities that should be performed to bring about school improvement. The four domains namely; school leadership and management, community involvement, teaching learning, learning environment.

##### **4.5.2.2.School leadership and management domain**

In this section, school improvement activities related to the leadership and management domain were addressed. School leadership capacity has vital role for the effectiveness of SIP. According to Harris and Linda Lambert (2003) school principal empowers others to lead and serve as catalysts for change. Therefore, building leadership capacity is an important duty to carry out SIP properly. In the table below the response of teachers and students for the items from their questionnaire were presented together. The first item was for both teachers and students but the second and third items are for teachers only.

Table 4.5: Response on school leadership and management domain

No	Items	Respondents		Responses					
				SA	A	UD	D	SD	Total
1	School leaders designed to improve the learning environment by beautifying the school compound	Students	No	4	10	34	22	12	82
			%	4.9	12.2	41.5	26.8	14.6	100
		Teachers	No	6	13	21	12	8	60
			%	10	21.7	35	20	13.3	100
2	School leaders communicating with the community on the program toward school improvement	Teachers	No	3	16	25	7	9	60
			%	5	26.7	41.6	11.7	15	100
3	Principals have been regularly supervising classroom instruction to give constructive feedback for teachers	Teachers	No	-	11	31	10	8	60
			%	0	18.3	51.7	16.7	13.3	100

The first item from the table 4.5, focuses on school leaders designed to improve the learning environment 14 (17.1 %) and 19 (31.7 %) students and teachers agree respectively, 34 (41.4 %) students and 20 (33.3 %) teachers disagree, the majority of the respondents replied undecided consisting of 34 (41.5 %) students and 21 (35 %) teachers. The second and the third items of the table are for teachers only the second item is concerned with communication of leaders with community. The response of the respondents show that 19 (31.7 %) of teachers agree, 16 (26.7 %) of teachers disagree and the majority of 25 (41.6 %) of teachers answer undecided. The item 3 of the table concerned with the statuses of principals regularly supervision of classroom instruction to give constructive feedback for teachers. Accordingly, 11 (18.3 %) teachers agree, 18 (30 %) teachers disagree and the majority 31 (51.7 %) respond undecided.

As it can be seen from the response of the respondents the School leaders are no designed to improve the learning environment by beautifying the school compound, the school leaders are not communicating with the community on the program toward school improvement Principals and there is no regular supervising of classroom instruction to give constructive feedback for teachers. Moreover, the data obtained from the FGD, observation and interview with Woreda education office, supervisors and principals reflects the same thing with no different from the above response. Most of the schools leaders do not exercise school leadership in the appropriate way for school improvement program. Therefore; school leaders are not properly playing their role in the implementation of SIP.

### 4.5.2.3. Community participation domain

Parents and community are the key stake holders for school improvement endeavor and this domain discussed about their involvement to implement school improvement program. Their willingness to serve the community and active involvement in the school improvement process is critical for the success of the program. School leaders in this aspect should involve community to participation for better achievement of the desired goals of the schools through collaborative effort of stake holders. Kindred in Gallagher, DR Bagin D, and More, EH (2001:13) defines school community relations as “a process of communication between the school and the community for the purpose of increasing citizen understanding educational needs, practices, interest and cooperation in the work of improving the school.” This definition showed that participation of community was determining factor for success of SIP.

Table 4.6: Response on Stakeholders Involvement

No	Items	Respondents		Responses				
				VH	H	M	L	VL
1	Community participation on SIP plan to improve standard and future interest	Teachers	No	-	9	14	21	16
			%	0	15	23.3	35	26.7
		Students	No	3	9	15	23	32
			%	3.7	11	18.3	28	39
2	Parents have information about school self evaluation process	Teachers	No	-	3	15	25	17
			%	0	5	25	41.7	28.3
		Students	No	5	11	10	51	5
			%	6	13.4	12.3	62.3	6
3	Parent are involve in decision making process	Teachers	No	-	6	24	16	14
			%	0	10	40	26.7	23.3
		Students	No	3	18	24	27	10
			%	3.7	22	29.3	33	12

From Table 4.6, item 1 focuses on Community involvement in SIP plan implementation 9 (15%) teachers and 12 (14.7%) students responded high, 14 (23%) teachers and 15 (18.3%) students’ responded moderate while the majority 37 (61.7%) teacher and 55 (67%) students responded low. This implies that the participation of community in SIP plan implementation was low. Item 2

was about parents having an information about school self evaluation process, 3 (5%) teachers and 16 (19.4%) students responded high, on the other hand 15 (25%) teachers and 10 (12.3%) students rated moderate. However, the majority of respondents 42 (70%) teachers and 56 (67.3%) students rated low. item 3 focuses on parent involvement in decision making process 6 (10%) teachers and 21 (25.7%) students choose high, 24 (40%) teachers and 24 (29.3%) students choose moderate, the majority 30 (50%) teachers and 37 (45%) students believe that the parent participation in decision making is very low.

Similarly, interview conducted with school principals, supervisors, Woreda education office core process owner. Show that, there was a weakness in getting the parents having information about school self-evaluation process. In fact there is community participation in giving positive ideas for better performance of schools and also support in labor activities to some extent. This differ from school to school, in some schools there is no any participation at all and the awareness creation done so far was not enough and not in position to achieve SIP objective. Further investigation through focused group discussion with parents showed that community involvement in designing education responses did not occur at very much point. This indicate that community participation in SIP plan implementation was low and their only participation is in the meetings when school open and closed. This is due to lack of awareness about the SIP implementation.

However, to enhance community participation on SIP implementation it is mostly school principals' responsibility to aware and motivate the community actively to participate in the issue of the school. From this we can see that insufficient involvement of school community is one factor that affect SIP implementation. However, participation through the contribution/extraction/ of money and material was low though it differs from school to school.

#### **4.5.2.4. Teaching learning domain**

It is the major determinant of students' achievement that indicates what is going in the class room. Not much powerful and sustainable change happens in teaching learning process unless it happens in class rooms (Earl, 2003). This domain focuses on the actual interaction between teachers and learners (students). The following items stated the teaching learning process, and were rated by the researching during school observation of the study as follow.

Table 4.7: Response on Teaching-Learning Domain

No	Items	Respondents	Responses				
			SA	A	UD	D	SD
1	Teaching process meet the general need of students and curriculum standard	Teachers	3	19	28	10	-
		%	5	31.7	46.7	16.6	0
		Students	-	31	32	19	-
		%	0	37.8	39	23.2	0
2	Teachers' know their students	Teachers	-	14	31	15	-
		%	0	23.3	51.7	25	0
		Students	-	18	53	11	-
		%	0	22	64.6	13.4	0
3	Appropriateness of lesson plan and students' progress is Suitable provision	Teachers	6	19	22	13	-
		%	10	31.7	36.7	21.6	0
		Students	-	9	50	23	-
		%	0	11	61	28	0
4	Quality of teaching and teachers' professional progress is very high	Teachers	-	7	17	36	-
		%	0	11.7	28.3	60	0
		Students	-	-	23	59	-
		%	0	0	28	72	0
5	Teachers are identifying individual need of students	Teachers	-	20	31	9	-
		%	0	33.3	51.7	15	0
		Students	-	23	22	37	-
		%	0	28	27	45	0
6	Students' centered method of teaching was practiced	Teachers	-	25	11	24	-
		%	0	41.7	18.3	40	0
		Students	-	9	31	42	-
		%	0	11	37.8	51.2	0
7	Teachers' are giving the tutorial support to the students	Teachers	-	21	-	39	-
		%	0	35	0	65	0
		Students	-	-	15	67	-
		%	0	0	18.3	82.7	0
8	teachers are using different techniques to motivate students	Teachers	-	21	8	31	-
		%	0	35	13.3	51.7	0
		Students	-	22	24	36	-
		%	0	26.8	29.2	44	0
9	laboratory services are provided to the students	Teachers	-	-	16	19	25
		%	0	0	26.7	31.7	41.6
		Students	-	-	-	25	57
		%	0	0	0	30.5	69.5

As shown in table 4.7, the results of the respondents on the implementation of SIP related to teaching learning domain indicates that 22 (36.7 %) teachers and 31 (37.8 %) students agree that teaching process meet the general need of students and curriculum, 28 (46.7 %) teachers and 32 (39 %) students rate undecided, 10 (16.6 %) teachers and 19 (23.2 %) students disagree. Regarding item 2 of the table 14 (23.3 %) teachers and 18 (22 %) students agree that teachers know their students, 31 (51.7 %) teachers and 53 (64.6 %) students rate undecided, 15 (25 %) teachers and 11 (13.4 %) students disagree. Regarding appropriateness of lesson plan and students' progress is suitable provision; 25 (41.7 %) teachers 9 (11 %) students agree, 22 (36.7 %) teachers and 50 (61 %) students' rate undecided, 13 (21.6 %) teachers and 23 (28 %) students disagree. About the quality of teaching and teachers' professional progress is very high 7 (11.7 %) teachers agree, 17 (28.3 %) teachers and 23 (28 %) students rate undecided, 36 (60 %) teachers and 59 (72 %) students disagree.

In the case of identifying individual need of students by their teachers 20 (33.3 %) teachers and 23 (28 %) students agree, 31 (51.7 %) teachers and 22 (27 %) students' rate undecided, 9 (15 %) teachers and 37 (45 %) students disagree. Practice of students' centered method of teaching was rate as; 25 (41.7 %) teachers and 9 (11 %) students agree, 11 (18.3 %) teachers and 31 (37.8 %) students rate undecided, 24 (40 %) teachers and 42 (51.2 %) students disagree. 21 (35 %) teachers agree that teachers' are giving tutorial support to the students, while 15 (18.3 %) students rate undecided, and the majority 39 (65 %) teachers and 67 (82.7 %) students disagree. 21 (35 %) teachers and 22 (26.8 %) students agree agree that teachers are using different techniques to motivate students', 8 (13.3 %) teachers and 24 (29.2 %) students' rate undecided, 31 (51.7 %) teachers and 36 (44 %) students disagree. About laboratory services are provided to the students' 16 (26.7 %) teachers' rate undecided, 44 (73.3 %) teachers and 82 (100 %) students disagree.

On the other hand, data collected through interview from school principals, supervisors and education office core process owner indicates that teachers give tutorial to students to catch up uncovered topics regardless of students level of attainment. They did not give tutorial support by identifying students level of understanding. However, tutorial should be given especially to low achievers to help them understand the subject matter and improve their results. This shows that attention has not been given in categorizing students by their level of achievement to support learners.

In addition, laboratory works, and inadequate reference book and teaching materials in sample schools were insufficient. Furthermore, the observation check list reveals that the level of laboratory and library services provided to students in the majority of sample schools is low. Besides, there was no laboratory in some schools and the schools which have laboratory rooms, they had no chemicals, and low number of libraries with shortage of books and poor quality of services. However, Bishop (1995) claims that the availability of facilities such as teaching material equipment's and laboratory apparatus in the school have an acceleration or deadening influence in the students learning that in turn affect students achievement.

Thus, from the given responses and observation results shown in table 7.1, it can be inferred that most of the sample schools had no laboratory works and library services which hinders the teaching learning process. This might imply the primary schools leadership's failure in considering the role of teaching and learning domain of school improvement program, Further investigation through focused group discussion with active-parents showed that teaching learning domain is totally absent in the Makuey Woreda schools. Therefore, from the above discussion, it can be deduced that the implementation of teaching learning domain in implementing SIP was at low level.

#### **4.5.2.5.The learning environment domain**

School improvement framework MoE (2007) suggested that schools should create a learning environment that could effectively meet the diverse needs of the learners. School class rooms should be neat, conducive and attractive in order to inspire students motivation and learning process. In this regard, this domain mainly focuses on making school environment safety and health relation for teaching learning process since, safety and conducive-learning environment helps school leaders, teachers and students to feel secured and contributed to their maximum potential for teaching and learning process.

Table 4.8: Response on Learning Environment Domain

No	Items	Respondents	Responses				
			SD	D	UD	A	SA
1	Students learning desire has been improved	Teachers	-	31	11	18	-
		%	0	51.7	18.3	30	0
		Students	-	42	29	11	-
		%	0	51.2	35.4	13.4	0
2	Assistance is given to the students to help them develop self-confidence and responsible	Teachers	-	31	8	21	-
		%	0	51.7	13.3	35	0
		Students	34	29	19	-	-
		%	41.5	35.4	23.1	0	0
3	School environment is safe, suitable, supportive and appealing for students	Teachers	7	32	21	-	-
		%	11.7	53.3	35	0	0
		Students	13	41	28	-	-
		%	16	50	34	0	0
4	Adequate latrine is allocated for male and female students	Teachers	3	43	14	-	-
		%	5	71.7	23.3	0	0
		Students	45	21	16	-	-
		%	55	25.5	19.5	0	0
5	Class-rooms are suitable for teaching-learning	Teachers	11	34	15	-	-
		%	18.3	56.7	25	0	0
		Students	41	18	23	-	-
		%	50	22	28	0	0
6	Student free from bullying and fear of stigma	Teachers	-	7	26	24	-
		%	0	11.7	43.3	40	0
		Students	-	41	11	30	-
		%	0	50	13.4	36.6	0

Table 4.8, indicates that the opinions of respondents on the implementation of safety and conducive learning environment in each sample schools. As seen from the data, 31 (51.7 %) teachers and 42 (51.2 %) students disagree that the students learning desire has been improved, 11 (18.3 %) teachers and 29 (35.4 %) students rate undecided, 18 (30 %) teachers and 11 (13.4 %)

students agree. Regarding the assistance given to the students to help them develop self-confidence and responsible 31 (51.7 %) teachers and 63 (76.9 %) students disagree, 8 (13.3 %) teachers and 19 (23.1 %) students' rate undecided, only 21 (35 %) teachers agree. In case of school environment is safe, suitable, supportive and appealing for students; 39 (65 %) teachers and 54 (66 %) students disagree, 21 (35 %) teachers and 28 (34 %) students rate undecided. About adequate latrine is allocated for male and female students the result show that 46 (76.7 %) teachers and 66 (80.5 %) students disagree, 14 (23.3 %) teachers and 16 (19.5 %) students rate undecided. 45 (75 %) teachers and 59 (72 %) students disagree that class-rooms are suitable for teaching-learning, 15 (25 %) teachers and 23 (28 %) students rate undecided. 7 (11.7 %) teachers and 41 (50 %) students disagree that student are free from bullying and fear of stigma, 26 (43.3 %) teachers and 11 (13.4 %) students rate undecided, 24 (40 %) teachers and 30 (36.6 %) students agree.

Table 7.1, shows the observation checklist results on learning environment domain, it generally indicates that the implementation of safety and conducive learning environment in each sample schools is low. The class rooms are not suitable for teaching and learning process, adequacy of latrine were not provided for both genders, in some cases there are schools which does not have toilets at all. However, the researcher observed that in some schools there were attempts to make school compound attractive for school community and to facilitate teaching learning process. Focus group discussion with active parents about learning environment domain, reveal that the school environment is not safe and healthy; it does not meet the standards and it is not suitable to the teaching and learning activities and there is inadequate awareness of SIP implementation from school principals and Woreda education office. This indicates that there is no safe and healthy relationship among school communities'.

#### **4.5.3. Monitoring and evaluation of SIP implementation**

Monitoring is periodical follow up of a certain program to achieve its intended objectives. It also helps to make an immediate action if there are gaps between planed and the implemented activities. This can be feasible when the concerned bodies are involved in monitoring and evaluation. For effective implementation of the program it is logical to put workable monitoring, and evaluation mechanism in to practice.

Table 4.9: Response on School Improvement Program Monitoring and Evaluation

No	Items	Respondents	Responses				
			SD	D	UD	A	SA
1	School improvement committees have fixed meeting schedules for their school visits	Teachers	22	12	20	6	-
		%	36.7	20	33.3	10	0
2	Woreda educational experts and supervisors have fixed schedules for their school visits	Teachers	18	16	16	8	2
		%	30	26.7	26.7	13.3	3.3
3	Support is given for internal supervisors	Teachers	19	14	13	10	4
		%	31.6	23.3	21.7	16.7	6.7
4	Students receive regular feedback about what they need to do to improve.	Teachers	7	27	18	8	-
		%	11.7	45	30	13.3	0
		Students	39	33	10	-	-
		%	47.6	40.2	12.2	0	0
5	Teachers receive regular feedback on how they are doing	Teachers	-	10	29	13	8
		%	0	16.7	48.3	21.7	13.3

Table 4.9, item 1 indicates if school improvement committees have a fixed meeting schedule for their school visit. Out of the total teacher respondents the majority 34 (56.7 %) teachers disagree, 20 (33.3 %) teachers undecided, and only 6 (10 %) teachers agree. Item 2 deals with the woreda educational experts and supervisors if they has fixed schedules for their school visits and give technical support for the implementation of SIP, to justify this issues the majority 34 (56.7 %) of teachers disagree, 16 (26.7 %) of teachers rated undecided and only 10 (16.6 %) of teachers agree. Under item 3, respondents rate the support given for internal supervisors. Accordingly, the results of the respondents show that the majority 33 (54.9 %) of teachers disagree, 13 (21.7 %) of teachers rated undecided, 14 (23.4 %) of teachers agree. Item 4 identify if students receive feedback about what they need to do to improve. The results show that the majority 34 (56.7 %) of teachers and 72 (87.8 %) of students disagree, 18 (30 %) of teachers and 10 (12.2 %) rated undecided, 8 (13.3 %) of teachers agree. Finally item 5 of the table show the respondents on the idea that if teachers receive regular feedback on how they are doing the response show that 10 (16.7 %) of teachers disagree, 29 (48.3 %) of teachers undecided, 21 (35 %) of teachers agree.

Moreover, the data obtained from the interview from Woreda education office core process owner, supervisors and principals revealed that supervisors were not fully familiarized in activities of schools, and there is no continuous follow-up and supervision to evaluate the performance of schools and implementation of school improvement program. The monitoring and evaluation given by Primary school supervisors and woreda educational experts to implement SIP was low. This showed that insufficient monitoring and evaluation was one of the factors which influences SIP implementation. The FGD conducted with active parents show that there is problem in Woreda education office that there is a lack of well design order to make checklist for monitoring and evaluation to check the school activities. This shows that, there is unwillingness in educational experts to run the activities and to involve the community in the approval of the SIP.

#### **4.5.4. The Success to Implement SIP**

The most successful way to stifle school improvement program is to involve members in any school activities; first to deny themselves in areas which they are equipped to function. It is the responsibilities of every government primary school principal to discover where, and how, each member can contribute to the school improvement program and strategies. All who are willing do have a place, the key is to find that place.

Table 4.10: the Successful of the Government Primary School to Implement SIP

No	Items	Respondents	Responses						
			SD	D	UD	A	SA	M	S.D
1	Progress (successful) brought to the government primary school with respect to classroom management	Teachers	13	28	19	-	-	1.28	.452
		%	21.7	46.7	31.6	0	0		
		Students	11	48	23	-	-	1.55	.772
		%	13.4	58.5	28.1	0	0		
2	Progress (successful) brought to the government primary school with respect to school environment	Teachers	14	24	12	8	2	1.63	.762
		%	23.3	40	20	13.3	3.4		
		Students	8	38	27	9	-	2.89	.315
		%	10	46	33	11	0		
3	The contribution to government primary school to brought positive relationships between teachers and students in light of SIP	Teachers	-	23	20	17	-	1.32	.468
		%	0	38.3	33.3	28.4	0		
		Students	15	33	17	15	2	1.28	.452
		%	18.3	40.3	20.7	18.3	2.4		
4	The participation of parents to follow up their children and involved in their learning to improve their achievements	Teachers	-	10	15	26	9	1.55	.772
		%	0	16.7	25	43.3	15		
		Students	10	23	12	21	16	1.63	.762
		%	12.2	28	14.6	25.6	19.6		

From table 4.10, indicates the response of the respondents about the successfulness of the government primary schools to implement SIP. About progress (successful) brought to the government primary school with respect to classroom management 41 (68.4 %) teachers and 59 (71.9 %) students disagree, 19 (31.6 %) teachers and 23 (28.1 %) students choose undecided, and no one agree. Regarding the progress (successful) brought to the government primary school with respect to school environment 38 (63.3 %) of teachers and 46 (56 %) students disagree, 12 (20 %) teachers and 27 (33 %) students choose undecided, 10 (16.7 %) teachers and 9 (11 %) students agree.

The contribution to government primary school to bring positive relationships between teachers and students in light of SIP 23 (38.3 %) teachers and 48 (58.6 %) students disagree, 20 (33.3 %) teachers and 17 (20.7 %) students choose undecided, 17 (28.4 %) teachers and 17 (20.7 %)

students agree. Regarding the participation of parents to follow up their children and involved in their learning to improve their achievements 10 (16.7 %) teachers and 33 (40.2 %) students disagree, 15 (25 %) teachers and 12 (14.6 %) students chose undecided, 35 (58.3 %) teachers and 37 (45.2 %) students agree.

Interview was conducted with principals, supervisors and Woreda education office coreproce owner. shows that, there was a weakness both side region and Woreda level, regional educational bureau do not have well record for the problem that they were investigated, no fixed checklist and schedule. In addition to Woreda level many of supervisors, active-parent, teachers and students are lament the fact that although they do not attend school improvement program training seminars, they are not encouraged to become involved in SIP activities when they return to their schools. Consequently, many primary schools are not active in school improvement program, lack of enough school demand and lack of well-trained people in their midst. Occasionally some members of stakeholders will voluntarily offer their service, but many others conclude that they are neither needed nor wanted.

Further investigation through focused group discussion with active- parents, shows the same response with the above mention, as a researcher observed, there is unwillingness from active-parents to participate in session meeting and do not come on time. Researcher observed lack of awareness, knowledge gap and ignorant are main common problem in the study area. This might imply the government fails to bring positive change to entire government primary schools in Makuey Woreda.

#### **4.5.5. Challenges on SIP Implementation**

The implementation of SIP might be challenged due to various reasons in this respect, Fullan (2001) has noted that when a new initiative is introduced undoubtedly, it will create difficult to both individuals and institutions. Thus, for success of the program it needs to consider challenging factors prior to the implementation of the program. Moreover, it was indicated in the review of related literature that, several factors are likely to affect the effective implementation of SIP. Accordingly, the respondents provided their responses in the way summarized in the following table.

Table 4.11: Teachers and Students Response on the Challenges of the School Improvement Program

No	Items	Respondents	Responses						
			SD	D	UD	A	SA	M	S.D
1	Lack of training on SIP negatively affects its implementation	Teachers	-	-	7	18	35	2.89	.315
		%	0	0	11.7	30	58.3		
		Students	-	-	12	23	47	2.85	.356
		%	0	0	14.7	28	57.3		
2	Low stakeholders involvement in SIP implementation	Teachers	-	-	9	24	27	2.88	.329
		%	0	0	15	40	45		
		Students	-	10	5	29	38	2.70	.679
		%	0	12.2	6	35.4	46.4		
3	The competency of leadership is not enough to lead SIP implementation	Teachers	-	-	8	18	34	2.90	.299
		%	0	0	13.3	30	56.7		
		Students	-	-	14	21	47	2.66	.757
		%	0	0	17	25.7	57.3		
4	Poor performance of school improvement committee	Teachers	-	-	7	24	29	2.91	.281
		%	0	0	11.7	40	48.3		
5	poor performance of follow up supervisor on SIP implementation	Teachers	-	-	8	20	32	2.90	.299
		%	0	0	13.4	33.3	53.3		
6	Insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory apparatus and pedagogy center	Teachers	-	-	9	11	40	2.89	.315
		%	0	0	15	18.3	66.7		
		Students	-	-	12	29	41	2.85	.356
		%	0	0	14.6	35.3	50		
7	Lack of financial resource to implement SIP	Teachers	-	10	5	22	23	2.88	.329
		%	0	16.7	8.3	36.7	38.3		
8	Inadequate of planning SIP	Teachers	-	14	-	38	8	2.90	.299
		%	0	23.3	0	63.3	13.4		
		Students	-	4	9	29	40	2.84	.367
		%	0	5	10	35.4	49.6		
9	Lack of teachers' commitment to implement SIP	Teachers	7	26	18	9	-	2.91	.281
		%	11.7	43.3	30	15	0		
		Students	-	-	10	14	58	2.76	.658
		%	0	0	12.2	17	70.8		

Table 4.11, present the responses of the respondents on the challenges faced in the school improvement program implementation. Considering if lack of training on SIP negatively affects its implementation 2 (11.7 %) teachers and 12 (14.7 %) students choose undecided, the majority

53 (88.3 %) teachers and 70 (85.3 %) students agree. About low stakeholders involvement in SIP implementation 10 (12.2 %) students disagree, 9 (15 %) teachers and 5 (6 %) students choose undecided, 51 (85 %) teachers and 67 (81.8 %) students agree. Regarding the leadership competency to lead SIP implementation 8 (13.3 %) teachers and 14 (17 %) students' choose undecided, while the majority 52 (86.7 %) teachers and 68 (83 %) students agree that the leadership competency is not enough to lead SIP implementation. About the poor performance of school improvement committee 7 (11.7 %) teachers' rate undecided, 53 (88.3 %) teachers agree that the performance of school improvement committee is poor.

8 (13.4 %) teachers' rate undecided, 52 (86.6 %) teachers agree that there is poor performance of follow up of supervisors on SIP implementation. 9 (15 %) teachers and 12 (14.6 %) students' rate undecided, 51 (85 %) teachers and 70 (85.3 %) students agree that school facilities are insufficient (lack of laboratory apparatus and pedagogy center). 10 (16.7 %) teachers disagree on the lack of financial resource to implement SIP, 5 (8.3 %) teachers rate undecided, 45 (75 %) agree on the lack of financial resource to implement SIP. 14 (23.3 %) teachers and 4 (5 %) students' disagree that there is inadequate of planning SIP. 9 (10 %) students rate undecided, the majority 46 (76.7 %) teachers and 69 (85 %) students agree that there is inadequate of SIP planning in the schools. 33 (45 %) teachers disagree on the lack of teachers' commitment to implement SIP, 18 (30 %) teachers and 10 (12.2 %) students rate undecided, 9 (15 %) teachers and 72 (87.8 %) students agree that there a lack of teachers' commitment to implement SIP.

Data collected through interview from Woreda education offices core process owner, supervisors, principals and focus group discussion, showed that insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory, library and pedagogical centers), inability of school committee to play their role and lack of follow-up and supervision on SIP implementation are found to be the main three top series problems to the effectiveness of SIP implementation.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered from questionnaires, interviews, focus group discussions and observation, the following summary, conclusions and recommendations were made. Chapter five is comprised of three sections the first section provides review of the study and its finding in summary form. The second section draws conclusion based on findings. The third section consists of recommendations for teachers, principals, supervisors, Woreda educational office core process owner.

#### **5.4. Summary**

To provide quality education, the capacity of school has to be developed. The school improvement program enables schools to provide quality of education by capacitating them, taking experiences of schools having good performance in country and the experiences of other countries. However, when new program is introduced, there are challenges and resistances from implementers. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to assess the status of school improvement program implementation in government primary schools of Makuey Woreda, Gambella Regional States, to identify the level of awareness teachers, principals, parents and students, the six school improvement program domains and the challenges of school improvement program dimension were measured through the perception of teachers and students using questionnaires. However, the perceptions of principals, supervisors, Woreda educational office core process owner and active-parents were measured through qualitative method, to identify basic problems encountered with the implementation of SIP and then to provide recommendations to the identified problems.

In order to achieve this purpose the study was aimed at seeking answers for the following basic questions.

1. What is the current status of school implementation program in Makuey Woreda primary schools?
2. To what extents are the stakeholders are aware about school improvement program?
3. How stakeholders are involved and contribute for the implementation of school improvement program /SIP/ activities in Makuey Woreda primary schools?

4. What are the major challenges that affect implementation of SIP in Makuey Woreda Primary school?
5. What measures need to be taken to make SIP more successful?

Thus, to conduct the study appropriate research method, sampling techniques and instruments have been developed and employed. In this research both quantitative and qualitative research approaches and survey method were implemented. As to sampling technique simple random sampling and purposive sampling method are used. Separate questionnaires were prepared and distributed to 60 teachers and 82 students. Moreover, interviews were made with 16 school principals, 2 supervisors and 1 woreda education office core process owner. In addition, FGD was conducted with 32 active parents to obtain qualitative data which are used to supplement the quantitative analysis after categorizing and developing into main themes. Again, observation check list and document review were also used to strengthen and enrich the data obtained from the questionnaire and interview. The quantitative data obtained from questionnaire were analyzed using statistical tools such as percentage and mean value and data obtained from interview, focus group discussion and document analysis was qualitatively narrated and described. Then from the analysis made, the following major findings were drawn.

- ✓ In most of the schools, the result of the study showed that the status of SIP practice was low. The schools are not receiving any training recently, the only training was conducted in 2008 & 2009 only 52 (63.4%) from the presenece teachers took SIP training and 36.6% (30) of teachers did not attend the SIP training and all students 82 (100%) did not attend SIP training at all.
- ✓ There are also low level of school improvement program planning in five dimensions in difference behaviors with an aggregate mean value of 1.678 and 1.63 for students and teachers respectively preparation on self-evaluation of school's strategic planning were not used to analyze the school strategic plan.
- ✓ Similarly as to SIP committee took to lead and coordinate to develop the strategic plan, the study revealed that all the respondent groups had at low level of agreement; only school directors were considered as responsible bodies.
- ✓ Moreover, the study showed that there was weak involvement of stake holders (teachers, students and parents) in the planning and implementation of SIP plan. The responsibility of planning was remaining in the hands of school principals.

- ✓ The most common selected factors affecting the implementation of SIP responded by entire respondent revealed the shortage of budget for implementation of SIP, insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory, library and pedagogical centers), inability of school committee to play their role, low stakeholders participation and Lack of follow-up and supervision on SIP implementation found to be the series problems to the effectiveness of SIP implementation. Over all, concerning the domains of the SIP, it is impossible to say they are implemented as expected.
- ✓ With regard to the provision of adequate orientation to stakeholder on SIP, the status of organizing and allocating the necessary resources for the implementation of SIP, and on the collecting of the necessary information in line with four school domains for the purpose of SIP implementation, the majority of respondents had set their disagreement.
- ✓ Concerning the challenges of SIP, The study indicated that there was weakness of teachers, students and community in the involvement of planning SIP. The responsibility of planning SIP remained in the hands of school leaders. It was also found out that the presence of facilities, lack of teachers' commitment to implement school improvement program, inadequacy of planning of school improvement program, lack of financial resources to implement school improvement program, poor performance of school improvement program committee and in effectiveness of leadership to lead school improvement program inhibited schools from the implementation of school improvement program.

## **5.5. Conclusions**

There is no doubt that successful school improvement is related to systematically planning, monitoring and evaluation process which enable to increase student's achievement. Hence, the key stake holders (teachers, students and parents) should also be encouraged to have active participation in SIP planning and implementation by continuously awaring them . The extent of providing monitoring and evaluation by concerned bodies and the extent of school leadership capacity determine the extent of stake holders' participation in planning and implementing SIP. Therefore, based on the findings of the study the following conclusions were drawn:-

1. Lack of awareness and capacity building of stakeholders make school improvement program implementation very difficult if not impossible. Lack of practical training on the use of SIP guidelines was the major challenges that hinder the implementation of SIP in

government primary schools of Makuey Woreda Gambella Regional State. The major activities of SIP such as provision of adequate awareness regarding SIP training to stakeholders such as teachers, principals, supervisors, students and active-parents was absence.

2. The study revealed that the planning of SIP for implementation in most schools does not involve conducting self-evaluation. Moreover, there was weak involvement of stake holders (teachers, students and parents) in the planning of SIP, the responsibility of planning remained in the hands of school leaders due to lack of commitment of leaders to invite stakeholders in planning. This implies that low involvement of key stakeholders in planning and implementing SIP was the most challenging factor affecting the success of SIP in the schools.
3. Majority of schools implement SIP at low level performance with respect to four domains; there is no safe and conducive learning environment with insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory, toilets, library and pedagogical centers), low implementation of teaching and learning process, ineffectiveness of leadership and management capacity to lead school improvement program and there is no community involvement in the process.
4. The extent of monitoring and evaluation process carried out was weak; there is no continuous follow up/supervision/to evaluates the performance of schools and providing professional /technical /support /by educational officials.
5. Shortage of budget for implementation of SIP, and Lack of follow-up and supervision on SIP implementation are series problems to the effectiveness of SIP implementation.
6. Inability of school committee to play their role and low stakeholders participation.
7. Lack of commitment to implement school improvement program and poor performance of school improvement program committee.

## **5.6. Recommendations**

The central focus of SIP was to improving student's achievements, in order to improve academic achievements of students, schools should implement school improvement program properly by making awareness creation for all stakeholders to implement and improve the four domains of SIP, perform continuous monitoring and evaluation on the implementation of SIP and identifying challenges that affect the implementation of SIP. Therefore, based on the findings and conclusions drawn the following recommendations are forwarded.

1. The finding of the study revealed that lack of training on SIP plan implementation affected the program. Woreda education officers and school personnel in collaboration with the regional education bureaus heads; have to provide capability building and awareness creation trainings to develop common understanding on the school improvement program plan implementation among the school communities before and during the academic year commenced.
2. School leaders need to make network with woreda education officers and make awareness and inspiration for the communities, parents, students and teachers on the objectives of SIP planning and the role of all stakeholders.
3. The school principals have to give attention to planning, and should initiate commitments in developing strategic plan that entirely involves conducting self-evaluation by participating key stakeholder (teachers, students and parents) and deploy by building consensus among stakeholders for effective program implementation.
4. Schools should make an effort to mobilize and involve stakeholders (teachers, students and parents) to participate for the success of SIP implementation.
5. Woreda educational bureau and schools should make great effort to strengthen their relationship with local authorities and communities by creating forum so that they could get necessary support from them and create mechanisms that enable school principals, teachers, parents, students and educational officials at every level of education sectors to work together, trust each other on SIP implementation.
6. Stakeholders could be encouraged to come-up with some school improvement program decisional areas and find possible solutions to the problems posed. This would help them to contribute their share in the school improvement program preparation and implementation without being excluded by the principals.
7. Empowering the capacity of school principals and SIP team committee in each school to work successfully and closely with stakeholders so as to make the implementation visible requires attention.
8. The government should allocate additional budget to the school grant for successful SIP implementation and moreover, in order to solve their problems of finance and material resource, the schools should design income-generating mechanisms by taking in to account the available school facilities and technical experts to make involvement of all the school stakeholders. On top of this, Woreda educational office and schools should

allocate budget to motivate school principals, teachers and other stakeholders who perform well.

9. The monitoring, evaluation and supporting to SIP implementation should be done continuously and timely to increase demand for active-learning and upgrade school principals and teachers to have high experience skills knowledge in their respected schools.
10. Promoting the involvement of stakeholders and avoided unwillingness, ignorance to participate in the implementation process of SIP to starting from the beginning.
11. The community should have the experience of supporting schools in different ways such as supervising the classroom condition, checking of school environment concerning about toilets if they were divided in to two male and female, repairing desks, constructing teacher's staff and financial support.
12. The cluster supervisors made regular supervision to support schools. They report the problems encountered to the woreda education office that could react on the problem reported.
13. Moreover, schools should evaluate the implementation process of their school; they could improve their weakness in the future to implement SIP effectively.

## 6. REFERENCE

- Abaya Gelaleta and Tamiru Jote (2009). Educational supervision school improvement (unpublished teaching material). Jimma University.
- ACT. (2009). School Improvement Framework: Better Schools... Better Futures Raising Quality and Achieving Excellence in ACT Public Schools. Canberra.
- Admas, D. (1993). Defining Educational Quality: Improving Educational Quality Project Publication. Arlington, VA: Institute for International Research.
- Desalegn Chalchisa (2010). Continuous Teachers Professional Development: The Ethiopian context. Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
- Development Activities (2nd edition). London: David Fulton publishers Ltd.
- Dimmock, C and et al (1993) School-based Management and School Effectiveness. New York: Routledge.
- EIC (2000). School Improvement Planning a Handbook for Principals, Teachers, and School Councils. Retrieved from: <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/reports/sihend.pdf>
- EQAO (2005). Guide to School and Board: A Handbook for School and Board Leaders. Toronto, Ontario M5B 2M9.
- Frew, Amsale. (2010). Practices and Challenges of Implementing School Improvement Program in Primary Schools o Jimma City Administration. Unpublished Senior Essay. Addis Ababa University.
- Fullan, M. (1991). The new Meaning of Educational Change. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Harris, A. (2001). Building the Capacity for School Improvement: School Leadership and Management, Final Report, 21(3): 261–270.
- Harris, A. (2002). School Improvement: What's in It for Schools? London: RoutledgeFalmer Press.
- Harris, A. (2005) Teacher Leadership and School Improvement. In Harris, A. et al. (Eds.), Effective Leadership for School Improvement. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

- Hopkins, D. (1994). *School Improvement in an Era of Change. Promotion Quality in School*. London: Cassell.
- Hopkins, D. (2001). *School Improvement for Real*. RoutledgeFalmer.
- Hopkins, D. (2002). *Improving the Quality of Education for All: A Handbook of Staff*
- Hopkins, D. (2004). *School Improvement for Real (Eds.)*. London: RoudgeFalmer.
- Hopkins, D. (2005). *Instructional Leadership and school Improvement*. In Harris, a. et al. (Eds.) *Effective Leadership for School Improvement* London: RoudgeFalmer.
- Hopkins, D., and Harris, A. (1997). *School improvement: Improving Education Quality for All. Supporting for Learning, Vol. 12 No 4*. Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-9604.00035/pdf>
- Hussen, T. and Postlwaite, N. (1994). *The International Encyclopedia of Education (2nd Ed)*. Oxford: Elsevier science Ltd.
- improvement. Unpublished Guideline Paper. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
- Jose, F. and Gonzales (2002) *Method of research and Thesis writing*. Paris: national book store, Acebost.
- Lemessa Abdi (2012). *The implementation of school improvement program in secondary school of east Wollega Zone*
- Little, J. W. (1994). *Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform*. London: Continuum. Jeilu Oumer. (2009). *the challenges of free primary education in Ethiopia*. Paris, UNESCO,
- Marzano, R. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating Research in to Action*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- MoE (1994). *Education and Training Policy: Federal Democratic Republic Government of Ethiopia*. (1st Edition), Addis Ababa. St. George Printing Press
- MoE (2005). *Education Sector Development Program III*. Addis Ababa: MOE.
- MoE (2006). *Decentralized Management of Education in Ethiopia: A reference manual*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

- MoE (2007).School Improvement Program Framework. Addis Ababa
- MoE (2007).The school improvement program (Blue Print). Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
- MoE (2009).Continuous professional development for primary and secondary school Teachers, leaders, and supervisors in Ethiopia: The Framework. Addis Ababa(Unpublished Training Manual).
- MoE (2010). School Improvement Program Guidelines Final Draft. Improving the quality of Education and Student Results for All Children at primary and Secondary Schools.
- MoE (2010).Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP IV).Addis Ababa Ministry of Education.
- MoE, (2007).General Education Quality Improvement Program /GEQIP/.Program Document. Addis Ababa
- MoE, (2012). School improvement program Frame work (revised edition). Addis Ababa.
- MoE.(2007). Teachers' development program in Ethiopia (Blue Print). Addis Ababa:
- Plan international Sudan (2006). End term evaluation of school improvement project. Khartoum
- Rondenelli, et al.(1990). Planning Education Reforms in Developing Countries: The Contingency Approach. Durhan and London: Duke University Press.
- Simpkins, K. (2009). Quality education and the essential need for school

## Appendix

### A Questionnaire for Students Addis Abba University

College: Education and Behavioral Studies

Department: Educational Planning and Management

Dear respondent,

This questionnaire is intended for collecting data on the implementation of School improvement program in primary schools. The required data is of vital importance for the success of this study which is a partial fulfillment for a master's degree. As such, the value of this questionnaire relies on your genuine responses because there is no right or wrong answer, what is important is that you provide your genuine response to the best of your knowledge. The information gathered through this questionnaire will be used strictly for academic purposes and will be kept confidential.

Note:

- No need of writing your name.
- Make a tick mark (✓) on the space provided to show your responses.
- If you change your response, please cancel the former one.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation

#### Part 1. General Information

1. Name of the school \_\_\_\_\_
2. Name of the Woreda \_\_\_\_\_
3. Sex: Male  Female
4. Age: less than 18  18-25  26-35  36-45  46-55  above 55
5. Grade
  - a. Grade 7
  - b. Grade 8
6. Did you receive any training on SIP as teachers?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No

## Part 2. Objective related question

The following are statements about the Four Domains of school improvement program. Please show the degree of your agreement or disagreement by putting (✓) in the space provided under the rating scales that closely represent your opinion. 5(Strongly agree) 4(Agree) 3(Undecided) 2(Disagree) 1(strongly disagree) Very high= 5 High= 4 Medium= 3 Low= 2 Very Low= 1

### 1. School Improvement Planning

S/No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Strategic plan of the school was prepared based on self-evaluation.					
2.	The training provided relates to SIP planning					
3.	The involvement of stakeholders in developing SIP plan					
4.	Provision of enough information to teaches on national strategic plan					
5.	Teachers' planning skill meet the need of various students					

### 2. Leadership and Management Domain

S/No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1.	School leaders communicating with the community on the program toward school improvement					

### 3. Community involvement domain

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Community participation on SIP plan to improve standard and future interest					
2.	Parents have information about school self evaluation process					
3.	Parent are involve in decision making process					

#### 4. Teaching and Learning Domain

S/No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1.	Teaching process meet the general need of students and curriculum standard					
2.	Teachers' know their students					
3.	Suitability and appropriateness of lesson planning and students' progress provision					
4.	Quality of teaching and teachers' professional progress is very high					
5.	Teachers are identifying individual need of students					
6.	Students' centered method of teaching was practiced					
7.	Teachers' are giving the tutorial support to the students					
8.	Laboratory services are provided to the students					
9.	Teachers are using different techniques to motivate students					

#### 5. Learning Environment Domain

S/No	Item	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Students learning desire has been improved					
2.	Assistance is given to the students to help them develop self-confidence and responsible					
3.	School environment is safe, suitable, supportive and appealing for students					
4.	Adequate latrine is allocated for male and female students					
5.	Class-rooms are suitable for teaching-learning					
6.	Student free from bullying and fear of stigma					

#### 6. School Improvement Program Monitoring and Evaluation

S/No	Item	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Students receive regular feedback about what they need to do to improve.					

**7. The successful of government primary school to implement SIP**

S/no	Item	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Progress( successful ) brought to the government primary school with respect to classroom management					
2.	Progress(successful) brought to the government primary school with respect to school environment					
3.	The contribution to government primary school to brought positive relationship between teacher and student in light of SIP					
4.	The participation of parent to follow up their children and involved in their learning to improve their achievements					

**8. Challenges of School Improvement Program**

S/No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1.	Lack of training on SIP negatively affects its implementation					
2.	Low stakeholders involvement in SIP implementation					
3.	Insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory apparatus and pedagogy center)					
4.	Inadequate of planning SIP					
5.	Lack of teachers' commitment to implement SIP					

**B Questionnaire for Teachers**  
**Addis Abba University**

**College: Education and Behavioral Studies**

**Department: Educational Planning and Management**

Dear respondent,

This questionnaire is intended for collecting data on the implementation of School improvement program in primary schools. The required data is of vital importance for the success of this study which is a partial fulfillment for a master's degree. As such, the value of this questionnaire relies on your genuine responses because there is no right or wrong answer, what is important is that you provide your genuine response to the best of your knowledge. The information gathered through this questionnaire will be used strictly for academic purposes and will be kept confidential.

Note:

- No need of writing your name.
- Make a tick mark (✓) on the space provided to show your responses.
- If you change your response, please cancel the former one.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation

**Part 1. General Information**

**Personal background Information's**

1. Name of the school \_\_\_\_\_
2. Name of the Woreda \_\_\_\_\_
3. 3. Sex: Male  Female
4. 4. Age: 18-25  26-35  36-45  46-55  above55
5. Educational Background:  
a. Diploma  b. Bachelor degree  c. Master degree   
d. Doctorate degree  e. Any other \_\_\_\_\_
6. Years of Service in the school: \_\_\_\_\_ years.
7. Did you receive any training on SIP?  
a. Yes  b. No

## Part 2. Objective related questions

The following are statements about the Four Domains of school improvement program. Please show the degree of your agreement or disagreement by putting (✓) in the space provided under the rating scales that closely represent your opinion. 5(Strongly agree) 4(Agree) 3(Undecided) 2(Disagree) 1(strongly disagree) Very high= 5 High= 4 Medium= 3 Low= 2 Very Low= 1

### 1. School Improvement Planning

S/No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Strategic plan of the school was prepared based on self-evaluation.					
2.	The training provided relates to SIP planning					
3.	The involvement of stakeholders in developing SIP plan					
4.	Provision of enough information to teaches on national strategic plan					
5.	Teachers' planning skill meet the need of various students					

### 2. Leadership and Management Domain

S/No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1.	School leaders designed to improve the learning environment by beautifying the school compound					
2.	School leaders communicating with the community on the program toward school improvement					
3.	Principals have been regularly supervising classroom instruction to give constructive feedback for teachers					

### 3. Community involvement domain

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Community participation on SIP plan to improve standard and future interest					
2.	parents have information about school self-evaluation process					
3.	Parent are involve in decision making process					

#### 4. Teaching and Learning Domain

S/No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1.	Teaching process meet the general need of students and curriculum standard					
2.	Teachers' know their students					
3.	Suitability and appropriateness of lesson planning and students' progress provision					
4.	Quality of teaching and teachers' professional progress is very high					
5.	Teachers are identifying individual need of students					
6.	Students' centered method of teaching was practiced					
7.	Teachers' are giving the tutorial support to the students					
8.	Laboratory services are provided to the students					
9.	Teachers are using different techniques to motivate students					

#### 5. Learning Environment Domain

S/No	Item	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Students learning desire has been improved					
2.	Assistance is given to the students to help them develop self-confidence and responsible					
3.	School environment is safe, suitable, supportive and appealing for students					
4.	Adequate latrine is allocated for male and female students					
5.	Class-rooms are suitable for teaching-learning					
6.	Student free from bullying and fear of stigma					

## 6. School Improvement Program Monitoring and Evaluation

S/No	Item	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	School improvement committees have fixed meeting time.					
2.	Woreda educational experts and supervisors have fixed schedules for their school visits.					
3.	Support is given for internal supervisors.					
4.	Students receive regular feedback about what they need to do to improve.					
5.	Teachers receive regular feedback on how they are doing.					

## 6. The successful of government primary school to implement SIP

S/no	Item	Scale				
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Progress (successful) brought to the government primary school with respect to classroom management					
2.	Progress (successful) brought to the government primary school with respect to school environment					
3.	The contribution to government primary school to brought positive relationship between teacher and student in light of SIP					
4.	The participation of parent to follow up their children and involved in their learning to improve their achievements					

## 7. Challenges of School Improvement Program

S/No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1.	Lack of training on SIP negatively affects its implementation					
2.	Low stakeholders involvement in SIP implementation					
3.	The competency of leadership is not enough to lead SIP implementation					
4.	Poor performance of school improvement committee					
5.	Poor performance of follow up supervisors on SIP					

	implementation					
6.	Insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory apparatus and pedagogy center)					
7.	Lack of financial resources to implement SIP					
8.	Inadequate of planning SIP					
9.	Lack of teachers' commitment to implement SIP					

## **C Interview Guide**

**Addis Abba University**

**College: Education and Behavioral Studies**

**Department: Educational Planning and Management**

**Interview Guide line with Woreda education office coreproce owner, supervisors and principals.**

Questions related to practices of principals in facilitating Teaching and Learning

1. Did you receive any training on School Improvement Program? Yes No  
If No what is the reason\_\_\_\_\_
2. How many time your school conducting training for school improvement program?
3. For what purpose of your school conducting training of school improvement program?
4. Parent, together with local community were actively involved in creating conducive school environment?
5. Do you think that woreda education offices have given professional and support to the school in order to encourage the implementation of school improvement program?
6. Do you think that the school grants were properly managed and used for the intended purpose in the primary schools? What was its contribution in improving the primary school?
7. Do you observe that primary school principals have put adequate efforts to implement the program? Have they adequate awareness on the implementation of the program?
8. How do you evaluate students 'achievement after the program has been introduced into the primary school?
9. What progress (success) has the school improvement program brought to the primary schools with respect to the school domains?
10. What are the major factors that are hampered the implementation of the program in the primary school?
11. What measures need to be taken to make SIP more successful?

**Thank you!!**

## **D FGD Guide**

**Addis Abba University**

**College: Education and Behavioral Studies**

**Department: Educational Planning and Management**

### **Focus Group Discussion Guide line**

Questions related to practices of principals, teachers and parent in facilitating Teaching and Learning

1. Is there any positive relationship between teachers and student?
2. Is your school compound is highly safe for teacher and student and they feel secure in the school?
3. Is there any teaching and learning materials are adequately available in the school?
4. Do you think that classroom are suitable place and have conducive condition for teaching and learning?
5. What participation were given to parents to follow up their children and involved in their learning to improve their achievements?
6. What are the major factors that are hampered the implementation of the program?
7. What progress (success) has the school improvement program brought to you with respect to the school domains?

**Thank you!!**

**Table 7.1: Observation Check List Results**

No	Activities	Conditions	School								Total		
			Nyini-nyang	Gier	Puokueth	Kondey	Batokdol	Tor-morok	Bildak	Adura	No	%	
<b>1</b>	<b>School Environment</b>												
<b>1.1.</b>	The extent to which school have a well kept and attractive school compound	Good										-	0
		Satisfactory										-	0
		Poor										-	0
		V. Poor/Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8	100
<b>1.2.</b>	The availability of toilet for both male and female students separately	Good										-	0
		Satisfactory										-	0
		Poor	X									1	12.5
		V. Poor/Absent		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7	87.5
<b>1.3.</b>	The availability of water supply	Good										-	0
		Satisfactory										-	0
		Poor										-	0
		V. Poor/Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8	100
<b>1.4.</b>	The availability of school fence	Good										-	0
		Satisfactory										-	0
		Poor	X									1	12.5
		V. Poor/Absent		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7	87.5
<b>2.</b>	<b>Class room learning facilities</b>												
<b>2.1.</b>	Avalibility of students furnature	Good										-	0
		Satisfactory										-	0

	such as table chair	Poor									-	0	
		V. Poor/Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8	100	
2.2.	Availability of students class rooms	Good									-	0	
		Satisfactory									-	0	
		Poor	X									1	12.5
		V. Poor/Absent		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7	87.5	
2.3.	Existence of laboratory with sufficient chemical and equipments	Good									-	0	
		Satisfactory									-	0	
		Poor									-	0	
		V. Poor/Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8	100	
2.4.	Availability of library with sufficient books	Good									-	0	
		Satisfactory									-	0	
		Poor									-	0	
		V. Poor/Absent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8	100	
2.5.	Availability of pedagogical center and teaching aids	Good									-	0	
		Satisfactory									-	0	
		Poor	X									1	12.5
		V. Poor/Absent		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	7	87.5	