



**AN ASSESSMENT PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
IMPLIMENTATION IN SELECTED SECONDARY
SCHOOLS OF KIRKOS SUB CITY**

BY: MULU ANEDARGIE

ADVISOR: DR. MEKASHA KASSAYE (PhD)

**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**

JUNE, 2018

ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by, Mulu Andargie entitled “**An Assessment of School Improvement Program Implementation: Practices and Challenges in Secondary Schools of Kirkos Sub- City**” and Submitted in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master’s of Arts in Educational Planning and Management complies with the regulation of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the Examining Committee:

Internal Examiner _____ **Signature** _____ **Date** _____

External Examiner _____ **Signature** _____ **Date** _____

Advisor _____ **Signature** _____ **Date** _____

Chair of Graduate Program Coordinator

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and for most, I deeply feel great in my advisor Mekasha Kassaye(PhD): 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 also wish to thank all my instructors and supporting staff at AAU for the best professional relationship. It is to them that I dedicated this work. To my father; Ato Andargie Belachew, thank you for your great help. And To my Mather W/ro Yelfigne Yenesew thank you for believing in me and for providing me with materials and finance to go through this study. I deeply love you all. You are all my life.

In closing, I want to thank Kirkos Sub-City Educational officers, the sampled Woreda Educational officers and secondary 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 its practices and challenges in selected Secondary Schools of Kirkos Sub-City To this end descriptive survey design was employed. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used in the study. The study was guided by questions; such as, what are the practices of SIP implementation in secondary schools of Kirkos Sub-City? What are the major challenges encountering the SIP implementation? Data were collected by means of questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, focused-group discussion, observation and document analysis. Accordingly, the data obtained through questionnaires were analyzed by using mean values and standard deviations. For the focused group discussion, semi-structured interviews, observation and document analysis the data were analyzed by using content analysis technique. Simple random sampling was used to select the woredas under the study and purposive sampling techniques were employed to the principals, school supervisors and school improvement committees. Simple random sampling techniques were used to teachers and students. Also focused group discussions were employed to parent's student teachers association and school improvement committees. The major findings of the study indicated that planning SIP implementation lacked of conducting self-assessment to identify the current status of the school and limited budget was also presented as another challenge. Teachers' attitude and the capacities of the school leaders; moreover, were revealed as the internal factor that hindered the successfulness of the program. As a result, school leaders were advised to conduct self-assessment and prioritized the problems when planning for school improvement program. It was also forwarded that after the assignment of school leaders, woreda education administrators would be better providing principals and cluster supervisors with management related or leadership training. Finally, strengthening the community involvement and collaborative planning were recommended to school principals as well as teachers of the schools.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CEE	Civics and Ethical Education
ECI	Education commission for improvement
EDPM	Educational Planning and Management
ELIP	English Language Improvement Program
ESDP	Educational Sector Development Program
FGD:	Focus Group Discussion
GEQIP	General Education Quality Improvement Program
IQEA	International Quality Education for All
MOE	Ministry of Education
PSTA	Parents student Teachers Association
SIC	School Improvement Committee
SIP	School Improvement Program
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Science
TDP	Teachers Development Program
WEOH	Woreda Education office Head

Table of Contents

<u>Content</u>	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
ABSTRACT.....	viv
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	V
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW.....	1
1.1. Introduction.....	1
1.2. Background of the study.....	2
1.3. Statement of the problem.....	5
1.4. Objectives of the study.....	7
1.4.1. General objective	7
1.4.2. Specific objective	8
1.5. Significance of the study.....	8
1.6. Delimitation of the study	9
1.7. Limitations of the study	9
1.8. Operational definitions of key terms.....	10
1.9. Organization of the study	11
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	12
2.1. The nature & essence of school improvement	12
2.2. Historical development of school improvement program	14
2.3. The rationale and principles of school improvement program.....	15

2.3.1. The rationale for school improvement program	15
2.3.2. Principles of school improvement.....	16
2.4. Components of general education quality improvement package (GEQIP)	16
2.5. The domain of school improvement program	17
2.5.1. Teaching and learning domain	17
2.5.2. Conducive learning environment domain	18
2.5.3. Community involvement domain	18
2.5.4. Leadership and management domain	20
2.6. Responsibilities of key stakeholders	22
2.7. Problems for implementation of school improvement program (SIP)	22
2.8. School grant as a factor influencing school improvement	24
2.9. School facilities as a factor of influencing school improvement program	24
2.10. Monitoring and evaluation for school improvement program	25
2.11. Countries experience in school improvement implementation.....	25
2.11.1. The case of USA.....	25
2.11.2. Arab Republic of Egypt	27
2.11.3. United Kingdom.....	27
2.11.4. Australia	28
2.11.5. Ethiopia.....	28
CHAPTER THREE: THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	31
3.1. The research design.....	31

3.2. The research methods	31
3.3. Sources of data	32
3.4. Instruments and procedures of data collection.....	32
3.4.1. Instrument of data collection	32
3.4.1.1. Questionnaire	32
3.4.1.2. Semi-structured interview	33
3.4.1.3. Focus group discussion	33
3.4.1.4. Document analysis.....	34
3.5. Procedures of data collection	34
3.6. Sample and sampling techniques.....	35
Table1: Total Population of Sample Schools and Sample Size of the Research.....	35
3.7. Data analysis	36
CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA.....	37
4.1. Demographic characterization of the respondents	37
Table 2: Gender Distribution of the Respondents	37
Table 3: Age Distribution of the Respondents	39
Table 4: Respondents by their Educational Qualification and Specialization.....	40
Table 5: Respondents by Years of Work Experience	41
Table 6: Distribution of Respondents by SIP Related training they have been given	42
4.2. Research findings	43

4.2.1. Practices of school improvement program (SIP) implementation.....	43
Table 7: Teachers’ Response on School Improvement Planning	43
Table 8: Teachers’ Response on School Leadership Domain	46
Table 9: Teachers’ Response on Community Involvement.....	49
Table 10: Teachers’ Response on the Teaching-Learning Domain.....	52
Table 11: Teachers’ Response on Learning Environment Domain	54
Table 12: Teachers’ Response on School Improvement Program Monitoring and Evaluation-----	57
Table 13: Mean and Standard Deviation on each of the Domains.....	59
4.2.2. Major challenges encountered the SIP implementation.....	61
Table 14: Teachers’ Responses on the Challenges of School Improvement Program ...	62
Table 15: Students Responses on the Awareness of Stakeholders.....	65
Table 16: Students Responses the Involvement of Stakeholders (teachers, students, and Parents) in Implementation of SIP plans.....	66
Table17: Students Responses Conducive Learning Environment.....	68
Table 18: Students Responses School Community Participation.....	70.
Table 19: Students Responses Expected Challenges of SIP Implementation.....	72
Table 20: Mean and Standard Deviation on each of the Domains.....	73
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND	
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	76
5.1. Summary Of findings.....	76

5.2. Conclusions	79
5.3. Recommendations.....	81
Reference.....	83
Appendix A: Teachers’ Questionnaire	85
Appendix B: Students’ Questionnaire.....	94
Appendix C: Principals Interview.....	99
Appendix D: Supervisors’ Interview.....	102
Appendix E: Woreda education office Head interview.....	104
Appendix F: School Improvement Committee focus group discussion Questions-----	106
Appendix G: Parents student teachers association focus group discussion Questions-	107

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

1.1 Introduction

School improvement helps to create a learning environment that welcomes all learners. It enables teachers to be responsive to the diverse learning needs of students in their teaching learning approaches. School improvement; moreover, is essential to enhance the involvement of parents and the community in school activities and to improve the effectiveness of the school management.

As it is indicated in the school improvement program guidelines, there are many importance of school improvement program implementation. First, it enables schools to improve the teaching-learning process by systematically increasing the competency, efficiency and motivation of teachers and the management through various techniques (mutual teaching, by correcting weaknesses by self-evaluation and developing strong unity by exchanging experiences and the realistic practical training etc.). Second, it increases students 'motivation for education and improving the necessary resources for education and to create suitable condition for learning. Third, it increases the participation of parents, communities and their feelings of responsibility by increasing their awareness regarding education. Finally, it provides quality of education by providing the necessary resources through the coordination of the community, non-governmental organizations, humanitarian agencies and religious organizations, in addition to assistance provided by the government (MoE, 2006). Besides, effective school improvement program minimizes wastage of educational resources by reducing class repetition, dropout and improving the learning capacity and academic achievement of students (MoE, 2006).

Ensuring the provision of quality and relevant education to its citizens is a challenging issue for any country. The provision of quality education got its strengths. Some of the problems identified by Khosa, (2009) are that; many schools are dysfunctional and are not transforming time, teaching, physical and financial resources in learning outcomes. Next, curriculum delivery is poor; teachers do not complete the curriculum, and pitch their teaching at levels than those 2 demanded by the curriculum. In addition, district support and monitoring functions are inadequate and ineffective. Last but not least, community support of schools is low. According to Incoming (1999), the major problems that challenge school

improvement initiatives include lacking of providing performance standards for pupils, teachers and staff. Ministry of Education of Ethiopia developed standard guidelines to assess the schools, established incentive systems, encouraged self and peer monitoring and evaluation, and promoted advocacy and social for quality education. All in all, the main challenges in School Improvement Program everywhere in the world that not much powerful and sustainable change happens in schooling are inability to make it happens in classrooms.

1.2. Background of the study

The functions of education in Ethiopia; as in other part of the world, are many and varied. Education promotes the development and extension of our democratic beliefs, contributes to the realization of individual potentialities, and prepares the way for future progress and change. It transmits and perpetuates the cultural achievements of each generation as well as advancing the economic well-being of the nation. According to World Bank (1995:19), education is a major instrument for economic growth and social development. Psacharopoulos (1987:423), also writes that ascertaining minimum level of educational provision is necessary to a country in order to better attain a reasonably high rate of economic growth. These are only a few of the many reasons why schools are organized.

To improve the quality of education in the country, the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia issued two policy documents entitled, Education and Training Policy and Education Sector Strategy in 1994. Though these policies stressed the need to address issues of access, equity, relevance, quality and efficiency. They initially, focused on improving education access and equity. The Government then started to emphasize the importance of school governance. For example, the Education Sector Development Programmed (ESDP I) (MOE 1998) defined the roles and responsibilities of school governance at the federal, regional and district level. Another program recently developed and currently under implementation is the General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) which has six pillars in it. These are; School Improvement program (SIP), Teachers' Development Program (TDP), Civics and Ethical Education, Curriculum Improvement

Program, Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and Management and Administration Program (MAP).

Although there are six different pillars in General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) as indicated above, there is a substantial agreement that all of the other five pillars (that is; Teachers' Development Program (TDP), Civics and Ethical Education, Curriculum Improvement Program, Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and Management and Administration Program (MAP) are there to strengthen School Improvement Program (SIP), because all of them are inputs for SIP which gives more attention to student achievement. The School Improvement Program comprises four domains, 12 elements, 26 standards and 88 indicators; all of them targeting at improving students' performance in general education sub sector. Therefore, the researcher chose to concentrate on SIP looking at the practices, challenges and opportunities existed in the implementation of School Improvement Program.

School Improvement Program in this context is described as a concept that has a major goal of improving students' performance in schools throughout the development of a school assessment system which is undertaken against the four school domains. The four domains include the teaching learning process, school leadership and management, safe and healthy school environment, and relations among parents, community and school which are expressed as community involvement domain (MOE, 1999). The elements and indicators of SIP are interdependent and complementary to each other, which are directed towards attaining the major goals of improving students' performance.

The school improvement approach starts with schools and their stakeholders undertaking a self-assessment to identify their goals followed by development and implementation of a school improvement plan. The schools are also required to maintain information or data on the effectiveness of their plans. The school improvement assessment methodology will be critical in strengthening the planning and utilization of the school grant and other resources which in turn will realize measurable gains in school performance and the quality of education (MoE, 1999). In 2006-2007, the Moe developed the school self-assessment form with assistance from regional education bureau and teachers' education institutions. The purpose of the assessment is to review where the school is currently and to identify the area's

most in need of development. It identifies four domains as the most significant areas in need of school improvement within each domain failure of school improvement efforts include several perspectives and standards (MoE, 1999).

School improvement is a systematic and planned effort to change both the learning conditions and other related internal conditions in schools, with the main aim of more effective achievement of educational goals. However, the school does not act on its own since it is a part of the education system with which it should work cooperatively to achieve the highest levels of quality (Hopkins and Lagerweij, 1997).

The success of any program depends upon the participation of stakeholders in terms of physical, financial and moral support. If the stakeholders believe that a certain plan or program addresses their needs and reflects their aspirations, then they will definitely show their concern for it. If they feel that it is necessary to implement a plan; then, they can create environment which could contribute to the success of the plan. If the plan or program involves the stakeholders from the designing stage to the implementation as well as to the evaluation, then the success of plan could be ensured. The introduction of SIP has created an environment where the stakeholders could feel that the plan is necessary for the school development where their children are learning. The effort has further been providing the stakeholders with the opportunity to participate in the designing and implementation of the plan. During the discussion, teachers and head-teachers expressed the view that the process is autonomy: it either belongs to a centralized or to a decentralized education system. So, irrespective of the system's educational policy, the school can intervene by modifying its own internal educational policy (Theophilides and Stylianides,2000; Hoy and Miskel, 2008). School improvement helps to create a learning environment that welcomes all learners. It enables teachers to be responsive to the diverse learning needs of students in their teaching learning approaches. Moreover, school improvement is essential to enhance the involvement of parents and the community in the schools management.

The importance of implementing SIP as indicated in school improvement guideline are: first it enables the school to improve the teaching-learning process by systematically increasing the competency, efficiency and motivation of teachers and the management

through various techniques (mutual teaching by correcting weakness by self-evaluation and developing strong unity by exchanges the experiences and the realistic practical training). Second, it increases students' achievement or education and improving the necessary resources for education and to create suitable condition for learning. Third, it increases the participation of parents and the community and their feeling of responsibility by increasing their awareness regarding education and lastly it provides quality of education by providing the necessary resources through the coordination of the community, nongovernmental organizations, in addition to assistance provided by the government (MoE, 2006). In light of these facts, this study intended to examine the practices of SIP implementation in secondary schools of Kirkos Sub-City. Assessment of the major challenges encountered during the implementation of SIP was also conducted. Moreover, the study had looked into the opportunities existed which the schools could have been used to enhance the implementation of SIP but they did not use in Secondary Schools of Kirkos Sub-City.

1.3. Statement of the problem

Ensuring the provision of quality and relevant education to its citizens has been the most challenging concern to developing countries. Some of the problems identified by Khosa (2009) include, many schools are lacking quality education and are not transforming time, teaching, physical and financial resources in learning outcomes. Besides that, curriculum delivery is poor; teachers do not complete the curriculum, and pitch their teaching at levels than those demanded by the curriculum. In addition, district support and monitoring functions are inadequate and ineffective. Last but not least, community support of schools is low. To incoming (1999), the major problem that challenges school improvement initiatives include, lacking of providing performance standards for pupils, teachers and staff develop a standard guide system to assess the schools, establish incentive systems encourage self and peer monitoring and evaluation, and promote advocacy and social for quality education.

Generally, the main challenge in school improvement everywhere is that not much powerful and sustainable change happens in schooling is inability to make it happens in classrooms. Although many of the SIP initiatives were related to teaching and assessment practices, we

heard little to suggest that classroom practices being transformed in ways that would lead to improve students learning (Earl et al, 2003).

According to Education Commission for Improvement (2000), schools can only make a lasting difference when they focus on specific goals and strategies for change. School improvement planning is a process through which schools set goals for improvement and make decisions about how and when these goals will be achieved. The ultimate objective of the process is to improve student achievement levels by enhancing the way curriculum is delivered, by creating a positive environment for learning, and by increasing the degree to which parents are involved in their children's learning at school and in the home. Schools have to design and invent their own solutions for specific problems and improvement in general. Creemers and Reezigt (1997) School improvement can also provide new insights and new possibilities for effective school factors.

As a result, alongside ESDPs and GEQIP, the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia has designed and implemented the School Improvement Programmed (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, and they play leading roles in implementing effective practices and decisions (MOE 2007). Various studies have been carried out on the implementation of school improvement program in government primary and secondary schools.

Among these DerejeHafosha (2013), RahelAshagre (2014), AbderaGudisa (2011), IsayasAmpune (2009), EsayasGorfe (2010), and AdemWado (2011) are some to be mentioned. The findings of many of these studies for example; DerejeHafosha (2013) and IsayasAmpune(2009) indicate that educational leaders lacked enough capacity to implement SIP. In addition it is also showed that absence of adequately trained school

leaders in the field of educational leadership and management added to the weak implementation of the program.

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 trained school leaders in the field of educational leadership and management. However, the current practices showed that educational leaders have not enough capacity to implement SIP. Thus, the absence of adequately trained school leaders in the field of educational leadership and management would add to the weak implementation of the school improvement program.

The purpose of this study; therefore, was to examine the practices of SIP implementation in secondary schools of Kirkos Sub-City. Assessment of the major challenges encountered during the implementation of SIP was also conducted. Moreover, the study had looked into the opportunities existed which the schools could have been used to enhance the implementation of SIP but they did not use in Secondary Schools of Kirkos Sub-City.

Based on these, the study was expected to give answers to the following basic questions:

1. What are the practices of SIP implementation in Secondary Schools of Kirkos Sub-City?
2. What are the major challenges encountering the SIP implementation?

1.4. Objectives of the study

1.4.1. General objective

The general objective of this study was to examine practices and challenges of SIP implementation in the government Secondary Schools of Kirkos Sub-City.

1.4.2. Specific objective

In order to fulfill the above mentioned broad aim, some specific objectives were needed to be addressed. Specifically; therefore, the research would see to:

1. To identify the current practices of SIP implementation in government secondary Schools of Kirkos Sub-City.

2. To describe the challenges encountering the implementation of SIP in government Secondary schools of Kirkos Sub-City.

1.5. Significance of the study

As it is stated in the review of Ethiopian Education Training Policy and its Implementation (2008) the assumption is that the education system should be relevant for the nation's overall development and that strategies should and can be implemented. There is also a clear assumption that an education policy should have a positive impact on beneficiaries, otherwise it should not be formulated since it leads to the wastage of human, material and financial resources. So, to 'achieve this objective schools are place where the implementation takes place.

Thus, the study was significant to the field of education in that it allowed principals and teachers to understand the main focus of SIP as it is related to school improvement in general. Besides that, the result of this study would provide principals and teachers a better understanding of the main impediment in improving school quality; that is, changing the mentality of the society. Moreover, the study would provide principals and teachers a better understanding of what behaviors the faculty must possess that would create a sense of shared purpose and a learning community in which the organizational goals are everyone's goals. This study would also allow principals and teachers to understand what is needed in order to increase the academic performance of both students and teachers within their schools. This is because; in the very beginning, principals need to be able to justify creating and sustaining school improvement program implementation

experiences in their school, which would later help teachers at the same time to take responsibility for problems and weaknesses that arise in schools. Furthermore, this study would contribute to the available body of knowledge related to practices and challenges of SIP implementation in schools.

In addition to the significance of the study to educational field in general, the study was also important to the school system where the study was conducted. The study could provide principals and teachers with the information that could bring real change in the lives of those who were involved in teaching and learning; that is, parents, teachers and students.

1.6. Delimitation of the study

Programs of school improvement are very essential in improving students' achievement. However, it would be very difficult to investigate the practices and challenges of SIP at all levels of school system and in all regional states of the country even in Kirkos Sub City. Since it was very difficult to manage successfully and come up with an optimum result in such large area, the study was delimited to the assessment of the practices and challenges of the implementation of SIP in secondary schools of Kirkos Sub-City. Here, how the schools were implementing SIP, the factors hindered the effective implementation of the program and the possible ways to implement the program effectively were assessed.

In this of sub city, there were 11 woredas and 5 secondary schools. The study delimited to cover only governmental secondary schools. Out of the total governmental secondary schools in the zone, 5 of them were selected for the study. Principals, vice principals, teachers, supervisors, students and school improvement program committee were selected as the participants in the sample study.

1.7. Limitations of the study

The limitations of this study were five in number. 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 principal's and supervisor's interviews as well as students' and 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 teacher 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. Fourth, there was a less than optimal return rate of survey questionnaires. The return rate was 95 % for teachers' surveys over all schools. The higher the return rate the more reliable the data; therefore, unless 100% of the surveys were returned, the rate was less than optimal. Finally, there was lack of quality information as to why teachers felt as they did during the study.

1.8. Operational definitions of key terms

- **Improvement:** Is the action of providing better than previous situation.
- **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.
- **Principals:** The managerial staff and professional leaders in charge of schools.
- **Program:** Is a schedule or planned serious of events related to the activities in long term aim
- **.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).
- **School improvement Committee:-**It is committee which established from the school community and parents to support implementation of SIP in the schools (MOE, 2006).
- **Secondary School:** is a schooling system offering a post elementary school program (from Grade 9 to 12). In Ethiopian context duration consists of two years of general secondary education.

1.9. Organization of the study

This study was organized in to five chapters. The first chapter dealt with the problem and its approach. The second is concerned with the review of related literature while the third chapter provided the readers with the research designs and methodology of the study. The fourth chapter contained presentation, analysis and interpretation of data while the fifth chapter covered with the summary of the major findings, conclusion and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The study mainly aimed at assessing the practices and challenges of SIP implementation in secondary high schools of Kirkos Sub-City. In order to strengthen and support the study by theoretical frameworks and practical experiences, an attempt was made to review the related literature, summarize studies of previous researches, books and internet sources.

2.1. The nature & essence of school improvement

Different people conceptualize and perceive the term school in different ways. Authorities also define the term school in different ways of expressions the prominent writer Bollen in Reynolds et al. (1996:12) elaborated school as it is a very complex entity in itself and is part of a complex educational system with local and national components. Furthermore, input, process and output system was suggested as a very fundamental to conceptualize school system. School is an open system organization that interacts with supra system and its environment. This statement supports that schools are the organization that expected to satisfy the needs of community and exists by the existence of the community. Schools need to be changed if they are not going to meet the needs of today's students and society.

The organizational nature of school and rate of the changing situation may have an effect on functions of the school system. Schools have an integral component of our ever-changing society helps to create environment where in our schools must not only survive, but also meets the difficult challenge of providing for educational needs of a highly diversified client. Schools must serve the learning needs of the rich, the poor, the aged, the gifted, the disadvantaged, and the hand capped (Spiva1978).

In this regard, the basic change of the school leads us to the school improvement and coping with the changing context of the school improvement. The phrase school improvement interpreted in various writers in to several meanings having the same or nearly the same concept. Jeilu (2010:173) states that a school improvement is an activity to improve the input and process in order to improve teaching and learning outcomes.

According to MacBeath (2006:112), school improvement program is described in government document as critical professional friend to the school, helping its leadership to evaluate its performance, identifying priorities for improvement and planning effective change. The role of school improvement program is to build the schools capacity to improve the attainment of pupils and to achieve other key outcomes for pupils that bear on attainment.

School improvement is the process to make the school a place that attracts the pupils to stay in it to learn and success in their educations. In the same manner, Vein Hulpia and Valck (2004) conceptualize the phrase school improvement as a dynamic, planned rational change process with structural and cultural aspect. School improvement is a process that is planned along three phases known as initiation, implementation and institutionalization. These writers state that the plan for school improvement is not one shot; it is the process needs the change of the structure in the school and change in the cultural aspect of the system. Moreover the plan for improvement requires the creation of awareness in the implementers and monitoring the implementation from time to time.

Mackb (2006), prepared the essence guidance and principles of school improvement program which includes: strict adherence to confidentiality, respect to the school autonomy to plan its development starting from the school's self-evaluation and needs of the community, focus on pupil's achievement and the many factors which influence it including the importance of pupil's well-being, professional challenge and support so that the head teachers feel that practice is improved by interaction with the school improvement program and there is evidence -based assessment of the school's performance and its strategies for improving and learning, intervention on inverse promotion to success, coherence so that external agencies consistently support the school's normal cycles of evaluation, planning and action.

Generally, school improvement is an approach to educational change rested on a number of assumptions, among which is a key focus on the internal condition of a school. These include not only the teaching and learning activities of the schools, but also its organizational norms, professional learning system, knowledge transform process, leadership arrangements and its receptiveness to external learning (Hopikins, 2005:86).

The range of school improvement goals includes those related to pupils, teachers and school organization. School improvements ultimate aim is to enhance pupil's progress, achievement and development Rob Halsall, (1998:8). This means that school improvement program is a systematical, sustained effort aimed at changing the learning conditions and other related internal conditions in schools with the ultimate aims of accomplishing educational goals more effectively.

2.2. Historical development of school improvement program

In the past decades, educational authorities have embarked up on an exercise that has come to be known as the restructuring of education. Recently, the issue of educational change and transformation is becoming the current and worldwide agenda.

According to Townsend (1997:16-17), school improvement approach in the past thirty years approaches have been characterized by two different sets of assumptions. In the 1960s, school improvement internationally displayed a technological view of change, in which curriculum innovations were mainly introduced top down' to schools from outside. The focus was on the schools formal organization and curriculum, outcomes were taken as given, and the innovation was targeted at the school rather than individual teachers.

In the second assumptions and approach of school improvement paradigm of the early 1980s, school improvement was characterized by a bottom-up approach to school improvement, in which improvement attempts were owned by those within schools, although outside consultants or experts could offer knowledge for possible use. By the late (1980s), the journey was also undertaken to enable schools to evaluate their processes and outcomes (Townsend, 1997:17).

The fourth phase was lasted by the year 1990s. Marzano, (2003:158) states that school improvement in this phase was characterized by systemic school reform. It does not mean that the fourth phase is the end era of school improvement, but this phase was pioneer for the current approach of school improvement.

Furthermore; Hopkins 2001:16-17, states that the fundamental approach that enables the current educational change for the development of the recent comprehensive approach

to school improvement consists of achievement oriented, enquire based, aspiration, teacher leadership, capacity building, interventionist, and strategic external support, collaborative and change oriented approach. This recent approach guaranties to satisfy the need of current society, students and the overall objective of the government.

2.3. The rationale and principles of school improvement program

2.3.1. The rationale for school improvement program

Under a topic, frames for organizational change Broman and Deal (1984) in Jones, and Mallow, (1988:124-125), have described organizations from four different perspectives:

Human resources frame-involves changing people through training, coaching and personal shifts. Structural frame restructuring goals, technology and tables of organization on the assumption that form and function are rationally related. Political terms a distribution of power among shifting coalitions of groups formed by their self-interests and past interactions. Symbolic frame,-leaders refocus meanings, values and visions to create a new organizational ethos. School reformers need all four frames to recognize the incredible complexities of human resources, strategies and structures, power struggles, and cultural meanings present in every organizational change.

As to Gallagher 2004:2:3, school excellence as a concept specialize that teachers ‘role determine student learning and their outcomes. Assuring high student outcome, as the basis for its existence, schools are targeting strategies toward classroom instruction where teachers take the unique and key responsibility. Such initiative, therefore, enable schools provide quality learning and enhance their effectiveness.

Hopkins, and Ainiscow (1993:289-291), further indicate that the logic of school improvement is developed to make their project work well-guided, on grounds of the given assumptions, that is, outcomes for students and staff; school culture the aggregate of values, norms, and beliefs that characterize the way in which a group of people behave with in a specific organizational setting; the school’s background and organization; the chosen improvement priorities some aspect of curriculum, assessment or classroom process;

the conditions necessary to support such changes—frame works, the roles and responsibilities school needs to get work done; and the school improvement strategy—are the deliberate actions or sequence of actions taken by a school staff in order to implement identified curriculum or organizational priorities.

2.3.2. Principles of school improvement

School improvement process is a systematic approach that follows its own principles. Burg and Ornstein (1991:294) have listed the following guiding principles that need to be owned in school improvement process: (i) Schools should employ a set of goals and missions which are easy to understand, (ii) Students' achievement must be continuously checked and evaluated, (iii) Schools need to help all students especially the low achievers need to be tutored and enrichment program should be opened for high talented students, (iv) Principals and staff should be actively involved in continuous capacity building to update their knowledge, information and to develop positive thinking, (v) Every teachers needs to contribute to successful implementation of school improvement program, (vi) Teachers must involve in staff development by planning implementing it, (vii) School environment has to be safe and health, (viii) School community relationship should be strengthened so that community and parents needs to involve in SIP implementation, and (ix) School leadership should be shared among staff, students and parent.

2.4. Components of general education quality improvement package

(GEQIP)

In the document of GEQIP (2007), it is indicated that the SIP components is again divided into two sub components which are the school improvement program (SIP); and the school grant program. The document further describes the main objectives of the component as improving the capacity of school to prioritize needs and to develop a school improvement program, enhance school and community participation in resource utilization decision government capacity to deliver specified amount of school grants at the Woreda level and improve learning environment by providing sufficient resource to school, and resource generation; improving the school environment.

2.5. The domain of school improvement program

School improvement domains are key areas of concern for improvement activities in its main focus is enhancing students learning outcome. It serves as coordinating activities, planning, monitoring and evaluation etc. of school tasks. Domains of SIP are varying from country to country based on their priorities. For instance, MoE (2006) and ACT (2009) divided school domains in to four categories.

According to ACT the four domains of the schools includes: learning and teaching, leading and managing, conducive environment and community involvement. The domains represent the four key areas in which school improvement takes place .They describe the essential characteristics of an effective school. The form a structure with each school can review question and analyze their systems and process (ACT, 2009).

2.5.1. Teaching and learning domain

Teaching and learning domain describes the context in which the curriculum is delivered. High quality learning occurs when teachers make appropriate decisions about what is taught, how to engage students in meaningful manner experiences and how progress will assessed to inform future action. Some educators claim good teaching cannot be attained because the criteria differ for every instructional situation and every teacher.

Harris, (2002) states that, while it cannot be denied that there are conditions at school level which can make class room improvement more possible, there teaching-learning process the main determinant of educational outcomes. Fulan (1992) in Harris, (2002) have stated the school improvement research highlights the center of teaching and learning in the pursuit of sustained school improvement. Curriculum is the issue that could be taken in to account in the processes of teaching-learning processes. In development and implementation of curriculum, teachers are the fundamental agents and direct in and institutional delivery and evaluation of the curriculum.

2.5.2. Conducive learning environment domain

Environment describes the promotion of positive and respectful relationships able, welcoming and inclusive in safe and productive learning environments strongly engaged and participate in the broad range of learning opportunities. The decision about their learning and their contributions are valued. In a safe school disciplined environment personal and school property are not subject to thief. Hence, safe conducive climate and healthy school environment plays significant role for school improvement. (MoE, 2006) states that school environment consists of focus, students empowerment and students support and decisive domain for the implementation of school improvement program.

2.5.3. Community involvement domain

According to Van and Lamer (1990:25-32), in Kruger (1996), parent involvement is the active and willing participation of parents in a wide range of school and home based activities which may be educational or non-educational. It extends from supporting and upholding the school ethos to supervising children's homework at home. Parents 'involvement implies mutual cooperation, sharing and support. “

Community involvement domain describes the development quality, ongoing community relationship and networks. Schools are responsive to community expectations, suitable for learning, school administration and community participation. Community participation in educational affairs is one of the most important. Community participation is a process through which stakeholders shared control over development initiatives.

As to Van (1990:1924) in Kruger, (1996:78), parent involvement is a matter of principle; parent involvement in formal education is legally prescribed; formal education on its own cannot fully satisfy the demands of the twenty- first century; guarantee for maintenance of community values; the high costs of education requires that funds be utilized in the best possible ways; the intellectual development of the child calls for parent-teachers cooperation. Similarly, McNergney, et.al. (2004:194), further indicates that good schools and good homes go together. Evidence suggests that connection between home and

school help students adjust and learn. Parents boost their children's academic achievement by exposing them to intellectually stimulating experiences, requesting information, and participating in school governance.

According to MoE (1996:83), has also indicated the following activities as a means for parents to get school; helping children with homework, fund raising ; maintenance building and supporting of pupil's; organization functions at school helping with extracurricular and supporting school activities. Several reports on community involvement indicate that school in general and teacher and students in particular benefits a lot from the involvement of the community in the issue of schools (MoE, 2006).

Van (1990:25-32) in Kruger, (1996:78-79), emphasize the following merits of parent involvement for the teacher, the pupil and the school: engender parent- teacher positive spirit, trust, support, lightning of teacher work load, and knowledge of circumstances of students at home; improvement of pupil's learning performance and school attendance, illumination of learning and behavioral problems, increase in pupil's sense of security and emotional stability, improvement of unity and coordination of education, valuable service in the interests of the school, improved support from the community and can lead to greater financial support.

Dodd, and Konzal, (2000:240), suggest that many people in a community have few links to schools- these include, single people, married couples without children and older parents whose children are no longer in school. Others who work in the local business, profit organizations and places of worship do not live in the community. Yet schools affect them. Their attitudes toward the schools affect the schools-especially when school budgets are debated and decided.

According to Kruger, (1996:110-111), marketing has an essentially dual character... to view the school from the point of market; changing in attitude of very one wit in the school so that they are able to share that marketing perspective. Once this fundamental change has taken place, the school management can considered the best way of communicating with the market... information to the market on what the schools offers; convincing the market to take advantage of those offers...there are four distinct phases in promotion- draw the attention of

potential clients; generate interest in the product on offer; create a desire for the advantage of the product; encourage action on the part of those who are convinced of these advantages. As Cheng, (2005:487), has also suggested the following developmental program for parental involvement in education: environmental scanning of current situation; identify the strategic needs of the school and parents; design and develop a development program including objectives, methods, implementation time frame, resource allocation, evaluation and monitoring mechanism; implementation of plan; monitoring and evaluation.

2.5.4. Leadership and management domain

The leading management domain is considered with communicating a clear vision for a school and establishing effective management structures. Leaders set directions guide the school community alignment of its purpose and practice. Effective leadership within the school is collegial student centered and teachers focus promoting a collective responsibility for improvement.

Harris and Linda (2003) describe the concept of leadership by explaining the leadership is an enacted variable depend up on interactions between leader follower and context. South (2004, p.1) also noted the leadership and context when she state that; Leadership is contingent upon environmental and contextual factors. One characteristic that marks out successful leader of school is to understand the contexts in which they operate. Leadership is a shared function and only expresses itself with and through others. But it cannot delegate. The expansions of leadership is empowering others to led and improve schools.

Empowerment as Arcaro, (1997:14) states : people are encouraged to be open, creative, and innovative in finding new ways to work within the system enable everyone achieve the system wide vision|| leadership a critical and essential variable in the process of generating capacity for school improvement. It builds capacity for individuals flourish and for school to continually improve and change.

School leadership plays a great role in implementing school improvement programs. To implement school improvement programs effectively and sustainable school leadership capacity has to be enhanced. Hopkins et al, 2001 in Harries et al. (2003:122) point out

school capacity is the collective competency of the school to bring about effective change. School principal empower other to lead and serves as catalyst for changes (Harris and Linda Lambert, (2003:38-39). Hal Linger and Heck, 1996 (in Harris et al.2003) indicate four areas in which head teacher influences the school. The first is through establishing and conveying the purpose and goal of the schools. A second through the inter play between the schools organization and its social network. A third is trough influence over people and fourth is a relation to organizational culture. Successful leaders articulate a vision for their schools so that everyone articulates a vision for their school. So that everyone understands the vision shares authority, responsibility and accountability to accomplish it (Lovis and Miles, 1990 in Harris and Daniel Muijes 2005:15).

Cheng 2005:283-285, suggested school leadership can be performed in terms of the following five critical dimensions: Human leadership-involves showing high sensibility and concern for other's needs; structural leadership- implies strong emphasis for careful planning and clear timeliness; political leadership-demands anticipating and dealing skillfully with organizational conflict; cultural and symbolic leadership- involve the use of celebrations and symbols to shape values, build moral; and educational leadership-involves encouragement of teachers to continuously develop their professional competence.

Harris, (2001), in Harris (2002:11), indicates that school improvement research has re enforced the importance of leadership in securing school- level change. It has shown that leaders with in improving schools have vision and derive change forward. It has also demonstrated with in improving schools leadership is shared and distributed. Harris, (2002:5), has also urged that the success of any school improvement effort will ultimately depend on the context in which it takes place. It will not occur by chance but requires a conscious effort to create an environment that is supportive of risk taking and mutual learning. Explicit efforts need to be made to foster trust, to develop the relationships within the schools and to create the conditions for improvement to occur. School leaders have an important role to play in creating those conditions.

2.6. Responsibilities of key stakeholders

According to MoE (2010), school improvement program guidelines states the responsibilities of governmental structure that govern the overall school improvement program. Some of them are:(i) The MoE will be responsible for the coordination of the national SIP, translate, print and distribute SIP guidelines to all Regions, sub city, Woredas and Schools based on the allocations.(ii) The regional education bureaus will be responsible for the success of the SIP in each region. Translate, print, and distribute the SIP guidelines. Organize sub city and Woreda training workshop on the SIP guidelines and monitor the SIP implementation. (iii) The Sub City Education Office (SCEO) staff will be responsible for providing supervision and advisory support to woredas by supervising the woreda SIP training workshops, monitor the SIP implementation. (iv) Woreda education office (WEO) will be responsible for the success of the school improvement program implementation in each woreda. By selecting three representatives from each school to attend the Woreda SIP training workshop, organize Woreda school improvement program workshop, provide support to schools, monitor school grants program, undertaking the school self-evaluation.

2.7. Problems for implementation of school improvement program (SIP)

The school improvement program is complex process which can be challenged by different factors during its implementation. In this respect, Fullan (2001:89-90) has noted that when a new initiative is introduced undoable it will create difficult to both individuals and institution. Thus for success of the program it need to consider challenging factors prior to the implementation of the program and in due process rendering quality and relevant education to citizen has been the most challenging concern to almost all countries. It is even more serious in developing countries like ours. A lot of attempts made in reform and improvement to change. Endeavour has been facing challenge.

Some of the problems identified by Khosa (2009), indicate that many schools are dysfunctional and are not transforming teaching schedules, physical and financial resources in learning out comes next to curriculum delivery is poor; teachers do not complete the curriculum and pitch their teaching at levels then those demanded by the

curriculum. In addition, district supports and monitoring functions are inadequate and ineffective. Last not least, community supports of schools are low. The major problems that challenge school improvement initiative include lack of performance standards provision for pupils, teachers and staff do not develop a standard guidance system to assess the schools, establish incentive system encourage self and peer monitoring and evaluation and promote advocacy and social for quality education generally, the main challenge in school improvement everywhere in the world that not match powerful and sustainable change happens in schooling is inability to make it happens in classrooms. Although many of the SIP initiatives were related to teaching and assessment practices, we heard little to suggest that classroom practices were being transformed in ways that would lead to improve students' learning (Earlet al., 2003).

Stoll and Fink (1996:55) also indicate that lack of commitment or reluctant to change at schools as the other major challenge for the successful implementation of SIP. Besides that, Anderson (1992:84) states that other reluctant to change can happen due to lack of awareness on the purpose of intended change, lack of knowledge and skills needed to make the change happen, and the belief that the changes will not make any difference to them/their students.

According to the school improvement program manual (MoE, 2007:2-3), the obstacles of SIP implementation include lack of commitment to depart from traditional practice, absence of responsible organized effort at all levels which could direct and monitor the program implementation, shortage of training, lack of initiative and good look on the part of some teachers and school leaders, absence of awareness creation among stakeholders and absence of clearly stated role about the participation level of each stakeholders. Similarly, Harris in Hopkins (2009:19) has noted difficulty to change school management arrangement and working culture as one of the challenge to SIP in developing countries. In our case; too, school improvement program seemed as it was challenged by lack of necessary inputs, lack of commitment, low level of motivation and poor leadership practices in the schools.

2.8. School grant as a factor influencing school improvement

The ministry of education has begun allocating schools with grant to support school improvement program and bring quality education in the schools. In 2009, MoE issued a manual to implement school grant which has been previously stated in the blueprint book. School grant is an initiative designed by government partners (donors) to be administered by general education quality improvement packages (GEQIP). It is designed with the intention to build a capacity to the teaching learning and improve quality of alternative basic education, primary and secondary education of government and public schools MoE (2009). School grant should be spent to inputs that improve school performance and the quality of education. School grant guidelines specified items that cannot be spent on the given grant to strictly direct the money for improvement and avoid misuse.

Accordingly, items prohibited from spending funds of school grant includes new building classrooms, teachers' salaries and per dimes, PTA members payment, Television, fuel and weapons MoE (2009). School grant funds must be used for items that would improve the quality of educations at schools. The source of fund is GEQIP from the center; that is , ministry of education and allocated it to the regions. Allocations of school grant is good start that helps schools to buy necessary inputs to support school improvement endeavors.

2.9. School facilities as a factor of influencing school improvement program

Clean, quiet, safe, comfortable and healthy environment are an important part of teaching and learning. On this account, scholars suggested that school facilities can facilitate the implementation of school improvement program. For example, Bishop (1995:111), states that the ability of school facilities such as teaching materials and equipment, laboratory apparatus, specialist work rooms, the media of communication, the design of the class room influence on the students learning. From the author view point; therefore, it is clear that school facilities can enhance or affect students' learning. This in turn, would make school facilities to affect school improvement program implementation.

2.10. Monitoring and evaluation for school improvement program

Questions arisen in school improvement program implementation such as what does it mean to be improving school? And how can it be measured? need to be answered and decision about schools and children are likely to be based on these evidences. This point stretched to the evaluation process in areas of intense activity for several decades; they are in many ways, still in their infancy (Earl et al, 2003). The work that has been done in many different countries; certainly, extended knowledge and understanding about ways in which education and the broader and community can engage in the process of improving school. Goldstein 1998 in Earl et al (2003) indicates that the academic research community is just beginning to become more effective and to develop research methodologies and analysis technique that capture the complexity of change. It is imperative that the concept of the school improvement is just beginning to establish some comprehensive models of how school can change to became more effective and to develop research methodologies and analysis techniques that capture the complexity of change. It is impressive that the concept of the school improvement is clearly defined and understood and the measurements used to represent in congruent within the definition. The implication of measuring school improvement is for reaching with regard to the trends in evaluating of school improvement initiatives.

2.11. Countries experience in school improvement implementation

This part dealt with some experience over the world which exercised SIP. Accordingly, an attempt has been made to assess of their research findings and literatures on the issue of SIP on the ground long history on the development of the program and experience.

2.11.1. The case of USA

Goodlad (1966) in Lieberman, (2005:2), discussing about the roots of school improvement in the context of the USA states that:

...sponsored by the growing infusion of federal funds through the national defense education act of 1958, the national science foundation and other private foundations educators began to look more closely at schools, classrooms and the curriculum and how to improve them, who was to take responsibilities to take change? How were they to be made? What conditions would be necessary to support serious reform? These were some questions that were gaining national attention as, for the first time, large amounts of federal funds were being appropriate to improve school.

Expanding Goodlad's idea, Smith and Giacquinta also in Liberman, (2005:3), stated that curriculum reform efforts, civil right movement pressures, commitment towards, war on poverty, and money provided for a wide variety of educational programs to support equity and the improvement of school eventually cause evaluation of how school used the money and how the program for change actually made their into school practice that led to understand school as social organizations and the enormous difficulties that were involved in trying to change them and all of which to give ground for the beginning of school improvement. As a response to Evans statement, Harris, (2002), argues as follows: within the United States; particularly, school improvement efforts are yet the success of restructuring as a means of improving schools remains questionable.

According to Jones, et al. (1988:5), the following were focus areas of school improvement strategies for Americans since world war II; new math, flexible scheduling, desegregation, educational television, management by objectives, open classrooms, competency based curricula, micro-computers, master teachers or merit pay plans, teachers preparation programs, and mainstreaming special needs students.

Passow (1989) in Cookson, et al. (1992:454-455), have also discussed the following futures of the two waves of the post 1980s: the first wave was concerned primarily with the issue of accountability and achievement with a top-down reform measure represented by increased graduation requirements; toughened curriculum mandates; and increased the use of standardized test scores to measure student achievement proven being ineffective to dealing with the schools numerous problems. The second wave was more decentralized to the local and school levels.

2.11.2. Arab Republic of Egypt

According to Cookson, et al. (1992:150-153), educational reform in Egypt goes back to 1868. And educational reform that took place in between 1868 and 1952 includes: democratization of education, with free and compulsory education; encouraging female education; coverage versus quality; and improvement of teachers' training. Especially in 1980s, efforts were also made through a series of declarations which aimed at – expanding compulsory education; improving quality of education; linking education to development and productivity; keeping up with the expansion of knowledge and advancement of science and technology to respond to information explosion; requiring flexibility in the education system; and demanding closer links between education and the work force.

Obsolete administrative and management procedures; centralization; statue based on merit but not seniority; duplication of effort; weak communication among sectors, departments, schools; teachers shortage and lack of training; problems of curriculum development; lack of physical facilities and educational materials; academic versus technical education; drop outs and repetitions; problems of improving technical education; universalization of basic education; illiteracy; and the miss-match between skills acquired and skills required in the job market.

2.11.3. United Kingdom

United Kingdom is one of the countries that have a long history by exercising school improvement program to enhance the provision of quality education. According to Hopkins (1987:8), school improvement in the UK which provided a context for more detailed discussion of the four major themes that emanated from International SIP: namely school-based review for school improvement, the role of external support, the role of the head-teacher and internal change agents in school improvement and the development and implementation of school improvement policies by education authorities. International school improvement program (ISIP) aimed in the UK improve teaching and learning of the pupils. As Hopkins et al. (1994:74) study since 1990s the model of IQEA is become the activities of the many schools across the world.

Improvement of quality education for all (IQEA) is the result of international school improvement program which focuses on the improvement of teaching-learning by improving the main agents of the school. Supporting this idea Hopkins (2002:71) has discussed that IQEA project is fundamentally based up on central premises that without an equal focus on the development of capacity, or internal conditions of the school and classroom development, innovative work quickly becomes marginalized. This implies that development focusing to improve some area or partial improvement is not guarantee the school improvement; rather, the entire system needs the emphasis to be treated well to bring quality education and to realize school improvement.

2.11.4. Australia

School improvement program in Australia has a large extent been due to state education system initiatives (Marsha, 1988:13). The emergence of a very different, decentralized system in Victoria in the 1980s warrants special mention. The incoming labor government introduced series of ministerial papers during 1982-1984 to announce the creation of school council, a state board of education (Marsha, 1998:14). Moreover, this authority described that it is evident that other states education system in Australia are likely to follow the lead given by the act school authority and the Victorian education ministry in devolving decision making to the local school level. Many different patterns many emerge during the next decade, but highly likely that parents and students will be encouraged to be more closely involved in local school decision-making.

School improvement ventures in the future are therefore likely to involve and should involve parents and community members and students, as well as teachers and related professional group.

2.11.5. Ethiopia

Education is all rounded instrument and fundamental for the production of ethical citizens and changes the behavior of the society to the desired direction of change, adopting the society with the new technology and scientific innovation initiates socio-economic cultural development of the country. In our country, to make education an instrument of

development, the new policy and training was promulgated and implemented since 1994 E.C. The implementation of the new policy played crucial role in all levels of education in terms of access and equity parallel with access and equity, to improve the quality of education several activities have been done. Among those activities developing the skill and knowledge of teachers through different training mechanisms, inspection and improvement of curriculum, educational training for the leaders of education, creation of awareness in community to develop the sense of ownership and increase participation in the issues of education, increasing the supply of educational materials, supporting the instruction in the classroom by technology and the others (MoE 1999:1).

But supplying and accessing what mentioned above couldn't bring the desired result of education (MoE 1999:1). This statement in a sense improving some parts of school safeties and narrowing the gap of equity and access doesn't guarantee the role of education supposed to play and problem of quality yet not solved. According to MoE (1999), the evidence from a research conducted shows that students within different levels were scoring average result in their education. This is because of the teaching-learning system was not systematic and scientific rather than practicing routine or traditional approach in teaching and learning did not focus on the students' achievement. In response to the low level of achievement of pupils, Ministry of Education making of collaboration with the regional educators by scaling up the good practices of the schools in the countries and comforting with the experiences obtained from other countries schools improvement program was promulgated (MoE, 1999:2).

School improvement program is designed by focusing on quality provision of education in the classroom and improving the achievement of students' /learning outcomes/by identifying the domains that have an impact on learning outcomes of the pupils (MoE 1999:1).

In the year 1999 E.C, Ministry of Education has identified four domains of school improvement program by assuming high performing schools supporting students' learning through best. Practices across a range of elements within the four domains of school improvement program. The four domains are teaching and learning; safe, conducive climate and healthy school environment; leadership and management; and community

participation. These four domains are the pillars and future can be broken-down in to elements consisting of twelve essential points.

When we generalize school improvement program in Ethiopian context, the Ministry of Education has been engaged in formulation and implementation of different policies and programs, one of the land marks to this effect is putting the 1994 Education and Training Policy along with the Education Sector Strategy and Education Sector Development Program (ESDP III) in place. Another program recently developed and currently under implementation is the general education improvement package (GEQIP) which has six important pillars. Those are the following: teachers development program (TDP), School improvement program (SIP), civic and ethical education (CEE), information and communication technology (ICT), and curriculum improvement program (CIP) and management and leader ship.

Although an attempt to provide basic education for all and the educational coverage has shown a remarkable progress, the quality of education provided in the country has a serious problem among the evidence that indicate the problem of quality in education, the result of national learning assessment MoE (2005) in ESDP III, the national primary and secondary leaving examination results researches on the implementation of curriculum, MoE (2006) are a few to mention. Due to poor quality of education students, —achievement for most subjects is below averagel. This is the main reason for the promulgation of GEQIP in Ethiopia.

CHAPTER THREE: THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter presented the appropriate research method that was suitable for the topic under this study. It also described sources of data, instruments and data collection methods, sample and sampling techniques, and method of data analysis.

3.1. The research design

Quirk (1979) stated that the design and methodology of a research is determined by the purpose of the study (Quirk, 1979). The purpose of this study was to examine the current practices and challenges of school improvement program implementation in government secondary schools of Kirkos Sub-City. 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. The research methods

The study was located between the two broad categories of quantitative and qualitative researches. Within the mixed research realm, the study adopted survey design which employed ample questionnaires to ask teachers to provide real information about the current practices of school improvement program and a series of interviews were conducted to ascertain the critical issues bothering principals, vice principals and supervisors; focus group discussions were done with students and school improvement committees and a survey of the teachers' body was conducted using these issues as variables. Both qualitative and quantitative researches analysis, specific approach to its subject matter suited the study's quest to investigate the current practices of school improvement program in government secondary schools of Kirkos Sub-City.

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

3.3. Sources of data

Both primary and secondary sources of data were used to collect relevant data for the study. The primary data were collected from teachers, students, school improvement committee members, principals and assistance principals, and supervisors. Secondary data were collected by reviewing relevant policy documents and guidelines such as Education Sector Development Program and the School Improvement Program Blue Print and Implementation Manual.

3.4. Instruments and procedures of data collection

3.4.1. Instrument 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 practices, challenges and opportunities of school improvement program implementation. In the design of these instruments, the researcher used literature review as a base. As a result, this study used a combination of the following methods as data collection tools.

3.4.1.1. Questionnaire

The questionnaire was used for data collection because it offered considerable advantages in the administration. It also presented an even stimulus potentially to large numbers of people simultaneously and provided the investigation with an easy accumulation of data. Gay 1992 claims that questionnaires give respondents freedom to express their views or opinion and also to make suggestions.

The questionnaires were constructed by the researcher to access the required information from teachers on the basis of theoretical ground about practices and challenges that schools encountered when implementing school improvement program. As a result, the questionnaire assessed the practices and the major challenges that existed for schools when implementing school improvement program.

The questionnaire comprised of both close-ended and open-ended and seventy-three items. The researcher used a 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 teachers. The second section was used to measure teachers' view about practices and challenges existed for schools when they implement school improvement program. It was this section that contained seventy-one closed-ended items and twelve open-ended items were prepared to teachers. All the questionnaires were prepared in English.

3.4.1.2. Semi-structured interview

Interviews were administered to 12 principals and 3 supervisors using an interview guide because it could help one generate a wide range of ideas. Interviews also guarantee an immediate feedback and thus could generate reliable data. Consequently, face-to-face questions were asked and comments were made to meet the objectives of the study. The interview guide for principals and vice principals consisted of twelve (12) total questions and those guides prepared for supervisors consisted of nine (9) total questions. After being drafted in English, the guides were translated into Amharic. All interviews were conducted in person, primarily at the residence of the principals and supervisors the school in order to reduce the burden on the interviewee and increase their participation rates. Each interview took approximately 25-to-35 minutes. The results of interview were employed to substantiate the results gathered through questionnaires.

3.4.1.3. Focus group discussion

Focus group discussions were held with the members of school improvement committee and parent, teacher and student associations. The issue of discussion was about the practices, problems and opportunities that were existed but which the schools did not use when implementing the school improvement program. The focus group discussion made with school improvement committees 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 situated (Daymon and Hollowoy 2002, in McMillan and Schumacher (1997,

p.453). In addition to that, two discussion forums were also made with twenty one (21) school improvement committees and twenty one (21) parent, teacher and student associations. Guiding questions were prepared for the group discussion.

3.4.1.4. Document analysis

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.

3.5. 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 the kirkos sub- city for a voluntary, anonymous survey to be conducted among thirteen government secondary schools educators in their administration .

Third, principals of each participating schools were contacted to arrange a date for the administration of the survey, interviews and focused group discussions among teachers, principals, supervisors, students and school improvement committees 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 and supervisors. Finally, focused group discussions were done with parent, teacher and student associations and school improvement committee respectively.

3.6. SAMPLING TECHNIQUES

The target population of the study were primary school principals, teachers, supervisors, Woreda education office head (WEOH), school improvement committees (SIC) and member of parent, teacher and student associations (PSTA). In this study the researcher believes that they are the right source of information in the contribution of school improvement program on students' academic achievement in Kirkos Sub-City.

In this sub-city there are 11 Woredas and 5 secondary schools. As a result the research focuses on 5 out of 3 schools which are select by using Simple random sampling techniques in order to give equal chance for each school. Purposive sampling was employed for selecting All 12 school leaders and 30% from 182 total teachers from both selected schools to consider gender, school supervisors, WEOH, SIC and PSTA.

Table 1: List of schools and sample technique

Name of woreda	secondary schools	Name of the Sample schools	Population of sample schools							Sample Size						
			principals	supervisors	teachers	student	SIC	WEOH	PSTA	principals	supervisors	teachers	student	SIC	WEOH	PSTA
02	1	Temenja Yazh	4	1	56	250	7	1	7	4	1	17	15	7	1	7
03	2	Yeteba berute	4	1	20	115	7	1	7	4	1	6	25	7	1	7
06	1	Shimeles Habte	4	1	106	500	7	1	7	4	1	32	50	7	1	7
3w ore da	4	3Sample schools	12	3	182	865	21	3	2 1	12	3	53	90	21	3	21

The research population included (12) school principals, (182) teachers, (865) students, (3) supervisors and (21) school improvement program committees. Since principals, teachers and supervisors were few in number and were the core people for school improvement program implementation, all of them were included from the selected schools. As far as students were concerned, 90 (i.e. two sections) of the students were selected from three schools by simple random sampling/lottery/technique in order to conduct questionnaires with them in the classes. In three of the schools, 21 school improvement program committees (i.e. 7 in each of the three schools) were taken by purposive sampling technique. Teachers and school improvement committee were generally included in the study. The principals and supervisors for the interview were also generally selected. Member of the school improvement program committees and member of parent, teacher and student associations in focused group discussions were invited on the recommendations of school principals as key informants based on their knowledge, experience, and involvement in school activities.

3.7. Data analysis

At the end of data collection, responses on the questionnaires were encoded and analyzed in the statistical package. Each principal received a bag with not less than 15 survey questionnaires for distribution to teachers who work with 9th and 10th grade students. On the other hand, data from interviews and focus group discussions were transcribed, classified and presented in a narrative form. The qualitative data were intertwined with the quantitative data to further enrich and enhance the information collected.

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

In this chapter, the researcher presented, analyzed and interpreted the results of her research. Moreover, the researcher gave an account of her findings and demonstrated her findings through the use of tables.

4.1. Demographic characterization of the respondents

In the following section, the researcher gave a general demographic characterization of the respondents that participated in this study. From fifty three teachers fifty three teachers were filled and returned the questioner, ninthly students, twenty one school improvement committee, twelve principals (12) and three supervisors from Government Secondary Schools of Kirkos Sub-City

Table 2, the respondents were classified based on sex

Variable	Male		Female		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Teachers	33	62.3	20	37.7	53	100.0
Principals	12	100.0	--	--	12	100.0
SIP Committee	12	57.2	9	42.8	21	100.0
Students	48	53.3	42	46.7	90	100.0
Supervisors	3	100.0	--	--	3	100.0
WEOH	3	100.0	--	--	3	100.0
PSTA	13	61.9	8	38.1	21	100.0
Total	124	61.1	79	38.9	203	100.0

As it is shown from Table 2, the respondents were classified based on sex. Among 53 teachers, 90 students, 21 school improvement committee, 12 principals and 3 sample

supervisors who participated in the study, only (20 or 37.7 percent) teacher respondents were female and (33 or 62.3) teacher respondents were males. In contrast, all supervisors, that is, (3 or 100 percent) were males and there are no female respondents. Besides that, (12 or 100 percent) principal respondents were males and there are no female respondents. Moreover, (12 or 57.2 percent) of the school improvement committee respondents were males and (9 or 42.8 percent) of the school improvement committee respondents were females. All WEOH, that is, (3 or 100 percent) WEOH respondents were male and there is no female respondents, only (8 or 38.1 percent) PSTA respondents were female and (13 or 61.9) PSTA respondents were males finally, nearly half; that is, (48 or 53.3 percent) of the students respondents were males and (42 or 46.7 percent) of the students respondents were females.

From the table; thus, it can be deduced that the managerial positions of the Secondary Schools of Kirkos Sub-City, in general, were occupied by males. Since this is so, it is clear that the participation rate of females in the School Improvement Program decision making process and their participation in managerial and leadership positions in these schools was very low. This might be probably an indicator of less educational opportunity had been given to females. This can, moreover, imply poor gender sensitivity in attracting females into the leadership positions. Furthermore, such background could be one factor that affected effective implementation of school improvement program. Because according to MoE (2010) SIP implementation guideline, it was stated that the proportion of female in the school improvement committee should be one third. Moreover, in the Millennium Development Goals document, it is indicated that the involvement of both girls and boys in education should be proportional.

Table 3: Age Distribution of the Respondents

Age	Teachers		Principals		School Improvement		Students		Supervisors		WEOH		PSTA	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	N	%	N	%	No	%
<17 years	--	--	--	--	--	--	60	66.6	-	--	-	--	3	14.3
18-20 years	--	--	--	--	--	--	30	33.4	-	--	-	--	3	14.3
21-30 years	10	18.9	--	--	3	14.3	--	--	-	--	-	--	--	--
31-40 years	35	66.0	4	33.3	10	47.7	--	--	3	100	3	100	3	14.3
41-50 years	8	15.1	8	66.7	8	38.0	--	--	-	--	-	--	12	57
50 + years	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	--	-	--	--	--
Total	53	100	12	100	21	100	90	100	3	100	3	100	21	100

In referring to the age of the respondents; majority of the school improvement committee (10 or 47.7percent), principals (4 or33.3percent), supervisors (3 or 100 percent), **SCEOH** (3 or 100 percent) and PSTA (3 or 14.3 percent) consecutively were within the age group 31-to-40 years; on the contrary, majority of the students (60 or 66.6 percent) were less than 17 years old. On the other hand, teachers (10 or 18.9 percent) were within the age group 21-to-30 years. Followed by these majority of respondents, while (30 or 33.4 percent) of the students were within the age bracket 18-to-20 years, there is no principals were within the age group 21-to-30 years old. Besides that, (35 or 66.6 percent) majority of the teachers, (3 or 100 percent) majority of the teachers (3 or 100 percent) majority of SCEOH failed between 31-to-40 years.

Moreover, (8 or38 percent) of the school improvement committee and, (12 or 57 percent) of PSTA were within the age group of 41-to-50. Still, the analysis further revealed that fewer teacher respondents amounting to (8 or 51.1 percent) and (8 principals or 66 .8 percent) were within the age group 41-to-50 years. What is more, while (3 school improvement committee or 14.3 percent) were within the age group between 21-to-30 years? From these data, it might

be concluded that the majority of the respondents; that is, (122 or 47.5 percent) were between 31-to-40 years of old. Hence, in order to lead these young staff safely and to secure the implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Kirkos Sub-City, the school principals need to be well experienced not only in the understanding of their own schools in the educational ladders but also in the understanding clearly what they, community and their staff are going to accomplish in the schools for which they are responsible.

Table 4: Respondents by their Educational Qualification and Specialization

Variable	Teachers		Principals		SIP Committee	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Grades 5-8	--	--	--	--	--	--
Grades 9-10	--	--	--	--	4	19.0
Diploma	--	--	--	--	5	23.8
First Degree	23	43.4	4	33.3	4	19.0
Second Degree	30	56.6	8	66.7	8	38.8
Total	53	100.0	12	100.0	21	100.0

In discussing the educational level of the respondents, while (4 or 19 percent) of the school improvement committee had indicated that they had Bachelor Degree, the other principals; that is, (4 or 33.3 percent) and (23 or 43.4 percent of the teachers) also added that they had Bachelor Degree. Besides that, (30 or 56.6 percent) of the teachers and (8 or 66.7 percent) majority of the principals as well as (8 or 38.8 percent) of the school improvement committee were master graduates. Furthermore, the analysis also indicated that (5 or 23.8 percent) of the school improvement committee) were diploma holders. Only (4 or 19.0 percent) of the school improvement committee were within the grades configuration of 9-to-10.

These data showed that the schools where this survey was undertaken were staffed with the graduates of Second Degree. This is really a very good finding. Because, if the present set of teachers, principals and school improvement committees at those secondary schools were Second Degree holders, it meant that they had acquired the necessary teaching qualification

and competency for those educational levels, and probably this might also mean that they could teach, manage and develop school improvement program up to the very required or expected point. Regarding to parents with in the school improvement committee, although the data showed that the majority of them were within primary school and diploma graduates, it could be said that they acquired minimum reading and writing ability and were believed to be supportive.

Table 5: Respondents by Years of Work Experience

Experience	Teachers		Principals		SI Committee		Supervisors	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Less than 5 years	10	18.9	5	41.7	18	85.7	--	--
6-10 years	12	22.6	5	41.7	3	14.3	2	66.7
11-20 years	15	28.3	1	8.3	--	--	1	33.3
21-30 years	10	18.9	1	8.3	--	--	--	--
30 + years	6	11.3	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	53	100.0	12	100.0	21	100.0	3	100.0

As far as the work experience of the respondents was concerned, (10 or 18 percent) of the teachers, (5 or 41.7 percent) of principals, (18 or 85.7 percent) of the school improvement committee and all (3 or 100 percent) of the Supervisors had work experience less than 5 years in the current secondary schools. Then, (12 or 22.6 percent) of the teachers, (5 or 41.7 percent) of the principals and (3 or 14.3 percent) of the school improvement committee and (2 or 66.7percent) of supervisors had work experience between 6-to-10 years. Next, (15 or 28.3percent) of the teachers and only (1 or 8.3 percent) of the principals and 1 or 33.3 percent of the supervisors had work experience between 11-to-20 years. Later, (10 or 18.9 percent) of the teachers and (1 or 8.3 percent) of the principals were reported as they had work experience between 21-to-30 years. Subsequently, only (6 or 11.3 percent) of the principals had work experience above 30 years.

From these data, it might be concluded that the respondents; that is, (10 or 18.9percent) of the teachers,(5 or 41.7 percent) of the teachers 18 or 85.7 percent of majority school improvement committee) had not adequate work experiences in the current secondary schools. Since this was so, they might lack necessary power to influence, develop and implement school improvement program in their schools. Researchers; moreover, have identified some benefits of frequency or experience of interaction between certain school management bodies. For instance; Relationships mature as the frequency and duration of interactions increases, and with the variety of challenges that relationship partners face together. As a result, the activities that will be performed by the group will be fruitful.

Table 6: Distribution of Respondents by SIP Related training they have been given

SIP Related Training	Teachers		Principals		S I Committee		Students	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
4 Times Per Year	--	--	12	100.0	12	57.1	26	28.9
Total No of Training Taken	--	--	--	--	9	42.9	64	71.1

The respondents were further classified according to the SIP related training they have been given or taken in their respective schools. It was found that while majority of students; that is, (64 or 71.1 percent) of students were given SIP related training, it was only (9 or 42.9 percent) of school improvement committee that had been given SIP related training. Results of the analysis also revealed that none of the teachers and principals was given SIP related training.

These data showed that school improvement program training is not common at secondary schools of kirkos sub city. This is really a surprising finding. It is negated by some earlier researchers 'thoughts. For example, MoE (2010) SIP implementation guidelines stated that teachers are the key stakeholders in the process of SIP implementations and in achieving the overall students out comes. Since the above finding indicated that significant numbers of teachers were not taken SIP related training, one can conclude then that the process of SIP implementation is negatively influenced due to absence of training.

4.2. Research findings

4.2.1. Practices of school improvement program (SIP) implementation

Teachers' responses to items written to investigate the current practices of school improvement program in the schools were collected on five (5) points; likert scales, consisting of five (5) items for school improvement planning, four (4) items for school improvement program implementation, nine (9) items for school leadership domain, nine (9) items for involvement of the community, fifteen (15) items for teaching-learning domain, twelve (12) items for learning environment domain, and nine (9) items for school improvement program monitoring and evaluation. 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). Then, the frequency distribution of each variable was calculated as well as the mean score, standard deviation and range 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 in the following tables.

Table 7: Teachers' Response on School Improvement Planning

Item	No	Mea	Stan.
The level of which strategic plan of the school was prepared based on self-evaluation.	53	2.25	.897
The extent to which the trainings provided relate to SIP planning for the whole staff.	53	3.36	.942
The involvement of stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents) in developing SIP plan.	53	2.04	1.037
The extent to which teachers have enough information on national strategies to understand their impact on their teaching method and plan preparation.	53	2.19	1.039
The extent to which school leaders plan ways that help to fulfill the requirements of special need students.	53	2.25	.897
The extent to which teachers provide necessary information to enable school improvement committee carryout evaluations.	53	3.36	.942
School improvement planning	53	2.58	.957

Level of agreement: 0.00 < 1.50 =strongly disagree; 1.50—2.50 =disagree; 2.50—3.50 =undecided; 3.50—4.50 =agree; and 4.50—5.00 =strongly agree.

Although the mean score for all six items of school improvement planning did not reach 5.0 for maximum agree response, there was some moderate agreement on the occurrence of school improvement planning in the school. For example, teachers gave moderate response on one item that to some extent teachers provide necessary information to enable school improvement committee carryout evaluations with mean score of 3.36 and standard deviation of 0.942. On close analysis; however, it appeared that more scores on this aspect of school improvement planning was somewhat minor. As an illustration, teachers expressed some disagreement with maximum occurrence of planning school improvement program based on self-evaluation with a mean score of 2.25 and standard deviation of 0.897. A similar pattern was also found for the other four practices that comprised this dimension of school improvement program planning practices. On closer examination; consequently, it appeared that teachers were moderately confirming the existence of school improvement program planning practices.

The two character dimensions with a mean score of 2.04 and standard deviation of 1.037 and another similar character with a mean score of 2.19 and standard deviation of 1.039 in teachers 'responses were the lowest mean scores of the six school improvement program planning practices items. Next to this, teachers reported that they had very little information on national strategies to understand their impacts on their teaching method and plan preparation with a mean score of 2.19 and standard deviation of 1.039. Besides that, teachers had also reported that school provided training related to SIP planning for the whole staff minimally with a mean score of 3.36 and standard deviation of 0.94.

These minimum mean scores of (2.25, 3.36, and 2.19) respectively on the behaviors, School prepared strategic plan based on self-evaluation, School provided training related to SIP planning for the whole staff', and Teachers have enough information on national strategies to understand their impact on their teaching method and plan preparation 'would indicate that teachers minimally know about the practices of school improvement planning process in their schools. This coupled with the lowest mean scores of 2.25 and standard deviation of 0.89 and

mean score of 2.04 and standard deviation of 0.94 respectively on the behavior or practice, Stakeholders (teachers, students and parents) are involved in developing SIP plan, and School leaders plan ways that help to fulfill the requirements of special need students|| could lead to a situation where teachers do not know the practices of school improvement program planning and implementation in the schools. This finding that teachers were made less familiar with the school improvement program planning process was not in line with Ministry of Education (2010) School Improvement Program Guideline. This guideline pointed out that School Improvement Committee members are required to undertake classroom observations for a number of classes across different subjects and grades. For this fact, it is important for the person conducting the classroom observation to be experienced, ideally in teaching. Drawing on the above analysis, one can understand that school improvement program planning was not practiced according to the standard set in the schools where this study had been taken.

Through the interview conducted with schools principal's and students, it was learned that schools made self-evaluation and based on the specific problems they identified then they prepared their strategic plan. In addition to this, school supervisors and school improvement committees were asked in groups about school improvement program practices in their schools and their responses were that schools prepared their strategic plan based on self-evaluation results. However, school improvement committee, and supervisors confirmed that schools 'self-evaluations were not made in accordance with the guideline and standards. In this regard, supervisor p1 had this to say:

The school principals made us to review the performance of schools without discussing the school improvement program frameworks. This made all of us not to have a good understanding of the SIP Framework. They have to correct it.

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.

Table 8: Teachers' Response on School Leadership Domain

Item	No	Mean	Stan. Dev
School leadership communicates with the community and encourages higher participation of community in the school activities and plan.	53	2.17	.826
School leaders designed to improve the learning environment by beautifying the school compound.	53	2.00	.981
School leaders make conducive learning environment.	53	1.51	.505
School leadership encourages teachers to participate in the preparation, implementation and assessment process of the school plan.	53	1.57	.500
School leadership encourages community to have positive attitude towards students 'educational achievements.	53	1.51	.505
School leaders direct and manage the activity of school improvement committee.	53	1.55	.503
The school leadership is ensuring and managing the school budget to attain SIP goals.	53	1.47	.504
School leaders are ensuring whether all teachers and staff members have received assistance through training.	53	1.55	.503
School leaders are organizing professional competency programs for teachers continuously.	53	1.53	.504
The School Leadership Domain	53	1.48	0.59

Level of agreement: 0.00 < 1.50 =strongly disagree; 1.50—2.50 =disagree; 2.50—3.50 =undecided; 3.50—4.50 =agree; and 4.50—5.00 =strongly agree.

Though the mean score for all nine items of school leadership domain did not reach 5.0 for very maximum agree response, there was some moderate agreement on the occurrence of effective school leadership in the schools. Take the cases of, School leaders make conducive learning environment and School leaders are organizing professional competency programs for teachers 'continuously. In these behaviors; first, teachers showed with mean score of 1.51 and standard deviation of 0.50 that principals moderately make conducive learning

environment. Next to this, teachers also confirmed with mean score of 1.47 and standard deviation of 0.50 that school principals were moderately organizing professional competency programs for teachers ‘continuously.

Teachers; on the other hand, expressed minimum perception with mean scores of below 2.50 on almost seven (9) of the nine (9) behaviors. The behavior with the lowest mean score of (1.47) and the lowest standard deviation of (0.50) was, —School leaders are ensuring whether all teachers and staff members have received assistance through training. Next to this, teachers also reported with a minimum mean score of 1.51 and a minor standard deviation of 0.50 that school principals were ensuring and managing the school budget to attain SIP goals. Another example of a behavior with a minimum mean score of (2.17) and a minor standard deviation of 0.82 was, School leaders designed to improve the learning environment by beautifying the school compound. Similar minimum mean scores of 2.17, 2.00, 1.57 and 1.55 and minor standard deviations of (0.82, 0.98, 0.50, and 0.50) respectively, indicating a minimum school leadership for behaviors, School leaders direct and manage the activity of school improvement committee, School leadership communicates with the community and encourages higher participation in the school activities and plan, School leadership encourages teachers to participate in the preparation, implementation, and assessment process of the school plan and School leadership encourages community to have positive attitudes towards students educational achievements.

The minimum mean scores of (2.17, 2.00, 1.57, 1.55 and 1.51) and minimum standard deviations of (0.82, 0.98, 0.50, 0.50 and 0.50) respectively on school leadership domain of, School leadership encourages community to have positive attitude towards students‘ educational achievements, School leadership encourages teachers to participate in the preparation, implementation and assessment process of the school plan, School leadership communicates with the community and encourages higher participation of community in the school activities and plan, School leaders direct and manage the activity of school improvement committee, School leaders designed to improve the learning environment by beautifying the school compound, and The school leadership is ensuring and managing the

school budget to attain SIP goals would indicate that school leadership did not create more effective school to leading higher levels of students achievement.

The above analysis coupled with the lowest mean score of 1.47 and the lowest standard deviation of 0.50 on the behavior, School leaders are ensuring whether all teachers and staff members have received assistance through training could automatically lead to a situation where leaders failed to bring staff up to high standards of achievement as expected and demanded by most educators and communities. This finding is inconsistent with earlier study by Luck (2011: 1—2) who also found that school management could be improved if it involved students, teachers and communities in school decision making.

The interview response from students about the principals ‘behavior of managing people, data and processes to create school improvement was not far from the teachers‘ response mentioned above; meaning, the school principals lacked the potential to unleash latent capacities in the schools. In this connection, one student from a group responded. Our parents were communicated by the school management bodies for financial contribution and were not participating in different activities of the school.

From the school improvement committee and supervisors ‘perspective, the school leaders were not actually significantly communicating the community to encourage their participation in school improvement program implementation. One school supervisor in focused group discussion reported.

Though the school managements are expected to foster communication with the community to help them participate in the school improvement program management, in this regard, achievements of the schools leaders were not satisfactory.

Responses of the school improvement committee in focused group discussion similarly indicated that while students ‘examination results were needed to be improved, both school improvement committee and students did not perceive the school principals as adequately equipped to play a significant role in leadership. The role of the school principals in

improving instruction to enable teachers to teach at their best and students to learn to their utmost, as well as principal behavior of cultivating leadership in others so that teachers and other adults will assume their parts in realizing the school vision was therefore minimal.

Table 9: Teachers’ Response on Community Involvement

Item	No	Mean	Stan. Dev
Parents involve in decision making process about their children’s education.	53	1.77	.724
Parents involve in school programs and students’ progress.	53	1.62	.686
Community participated on SIP plan outlining goals those help to improve standards and future interests.	53	1.85	.886
Parents have information about school self-Evaluation process.	53	1.74	.880
The school leaders conduct meetings with the community leaders.	53	1.53	.541
School leaders provide information to the community members about the curriculum activities and the school academic calendar	53	1.23	.423
Community Involvement	53	1.63	0.69

Level of agreement: 0.00 < 1.50 =strongly disagree; 1.50—2.50 =disagree; 2.50—3.50 =undecided; 3.50—4.50 =agree; and 4.50—5.00 =strongly agree.

As it was indicated in the table, the average score for all six dimensions of perceived community involvement did not reach 5.0 for maximum response. The existed data; therefore, needed to be examined. In fact, it appeared that the average score on this aspect of school improvement program practices was confined to one level of agreement; that is, minimum agreement. As an illustration, teachers reported that school leaders provide information to the community members about the curriculum activities and the school academic calendar for a mean score of 1.23 and standard deviation of 0.42. When teachers reported their perception on this school improvement program practice with this mean score of 1.85, by observing all the other mean scores, it would be easy to say that this was a maximum mean score of all. A similar pattern was also found for the other five behaviors that comprised this dimension of school improvement program practices. On closer

examination; consequently, it appeared that teachers were minimally accepting the existence of community involvement in the current practices of school improvement program.

The character dimension with a mean score of 1.23 and standard deviation of 0.423 in teachers' report was the lowest of the six involvement of the community in current practice of school improvement program. These minimum mean scores; that is, 1.85 in teachers' response as the maximum mean and 1.23 in teachers' response respectively on the behavior, School leaders conduct meetings with the community leaders as the minimum mean would indicate that principals very minimally involved community members in school improvement program. This coupled with the other low mean scores on the behaviors, Parents are involved in decision making process about their children's education, Parents are involved in school programs and students' progress, Community participates on SIP plan outlining goals those help to improve standards and future interests, and Parents have information about school self-evaluation process could lead to a situation where teachers are in the dark regarding what principals really think about what is happening in their school setting. Not only that; from these respondents' responses, one can also conclude that principals were not focusing more on removing obstacles that prevent community from involvement.

The perceived community involvement with mean scores of 1.77 and standard deviation of 0.724 in teachers' response on the behavior, Parents are involved in decision-making process about their children's education as well as the perceived community involvement dimension with mean score of 1.62 and standard deviation of 0.686 in teachers' response on the behavior, Parents are involved in school programs and students' progress also do not offer such hope that schools could be effective in their performance. Such minimum mean scores indicate that a number of teachers had minimally agreed with the minimum participation of community in school improvement program planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. Thus, it could be said that a number of teachers have minimal faith in their principals' abilities to work very closely with parents and communities to improve participatory decision-making at school level. Thus, education might not be more relevant and suitable for children in such schools because parents have not a say in what teachers are teaching and how they are doing.

In addition to the information gathered through the questionnaire from teachers, interview and focused group discussion were also conducted with school principals, supervisors, and students; their response was not far from the information gathered through the questionnaires.

The result was that although it was stated that community should be involved in the development and management of the school improvement program system that provide their children with quality education, parents' involvement in the school decision making process and their participation in the school improvement program development, management and monitoring and evaluation was very minimal. Moreover, principals added that there is a very low level of parents 'participation rate in all other school improvement programs. Further investigation through focused group discussion with supervisors showed that community involvement in designing education responses did not occur at very much point. In this regard, one supervisor said.

Mostly, it is in the days that schools are opening and closing that parents come and participate in the school activities .It is only written on the paper that parents are participating in their children's school matters.

The preceding paragraph confirmed what was reported earlier in this paper regarding the involvement of community in school management improvement program. In other words, most of the respondents said that community involvement in the school management improvement was absent.

Table 10: Teachers' Response on the Teaching-Learning Domain

Item	No	Mean	Stan. Dev
The teaching process meets the general needs of students and curriculum standards.	53	3.81	1.226
Teachers know their student.	53	3.83	.995
There is a suitability and appropriateness of lesson planning and students' progress supervision.	53	4.08	1.053
There is quality of teaching and teachers professional progress.	53	1.53	.846
Teachers are identifying individual learning needs and providing the lesson accordingly.	53	4.08	1.158
Teachers 'planning skills meet the needs of various student groups.	53	4.15	1.133
Student-centered method of teaching was practiced.	53	4.13	1.020
Teachers are giving tutorial support to the student.	53	1.68	.894
Laboratory services are provided to the student.	53	1.55	.503
Teachers are using different techniques to motivate students.	53	1.57	.500
Library service is available to the school community.	53	1.79	.863
Teachers are checking students 'achievement.	53	4.49	.505
Students 'learning desire has been improved.	53	1.62	.686
Teaching-Learning Domain	53	2.95	.879

Level of agreement: 0.00 < 1.50 =strongly disagree; 1.50—2.50 =disagree; 2.50—3.50 =undecided; 3.50—4.50 =agree; and 4.50—5.00 =strongly agree.

The researcher now briefly analyzing the respondents 'responses regarding to the teaching-learning domain. Consequently, while the average score for all thirteen dimensions of teaching-learning did not reach 5.00 for very maximum agree response, there was some moderate agreement on its practices. On close analysis; thus, it appeared that the average score on this aspect of teaching-learning domain practices is somewhat distorted by the minimum perception teachers themselves have on this aspect of teaching-learning domain.

For example, teachers reported moderately not equally on two behaviors that they know their students and they give tutorial support to the students for mean scores of 3.83&1.68 and standard deviations of 0.995&0.894 respectively. Again on two more different behaviors; that is, the teaching process meets the general needs of students and curriculum standards and Teachers were checking students 'achievement teachers reported moderately not equally with mean scores of 3.81&4.49 and standard deviations of 1.226 &0.505 respectively. When teachers reported their perception on this teaching-learning domain; however, they expressed some minimum agreement with frequency occurrence of this behavior with a mean score of 1.53 and standard deviation of 0. 846 on the behavior, Students 'learning desire has been improved; mean score of 4.15 and standard deviation of 1.133 on the behavior, Teachers 'planning skills meet the needs of various students groups; mean score of 4.08 and standard deviation of 1.158 on the behavior, Teachers are identifying individual learning needs and providing the lesson accordingly; and mean score of 1.53 and standard deviation of 0. 846 on the behavior, There is no quality of teaching and teachers professional progress. On closer examination; consequently, it appeared that teachers moderately believed that teaching-learning process was not carried out in their schools.

The character dimension with a mean score of 4.13 and standard deviation of 1.020 in teachers 'report on the behavior, Student-centered method of teaching was practiced as higher than the character dimension with a mean score of 1.62 and standard deviation of 0. 686 in teachers 'response on the behavior, Students 'learning desire has been improved. This mean score; that is, 4.13 in teachers 'response on the behavior, Student-centered method of teaching was practiced indicates that teaching-learning process was moderately practiced in the schools where this study has been conducted. This coupled with the moderate mean scores on the behaviors, Teachers use different techniques to motivate students with a mean score of 1.57 and standard deviation of 0.500; The school provides laboratory service to the students with a mean score of 1.55 and standard deviation of 0.503; There is a suitability and appropriateness of lesson planning and students' progress supervision with a mean score of 4.08 and standard deviation of 1.053; and Library service is available to the school community with a mean score of 1.79 and standard deviation of 0.863 could lead to a

situation where both teachers and principals moderately make their knowledge, practices and professional engagement clear.

Interview with school principals revealed that teaching-learning domain was improved. They all shared the perception that principals, as the schools ‘main source of everything, were involved in checking the appropriateness of the evaluation in respect to planning the lesson and supervising students ‘progress. On the other hands, the school improvement committee said that there existed no proper practices of following up to check the appropriateness of the lesson planning evaluation. In addition to the above descriptions, PSTAs in focused group discussion reported that there were no activities that could motivate students to learn.

Table 11: Teachers’ Response on Learning Environment Domain

Item	No	Mean	Stan. Dev
Assistance is given to the students to help them develop self-confidence and sense of responsibility.	53	4.53	.504
School environment is safe, suitable, supportive and appealing for students.	53	1.70	.911
Students are free from bullying and fear of stigma.	53	1.55	.503
The school outlined standards for educational achievements and qualities.	53	1.57	.500
Adequate latrine is allocated for girls students.	53	3.98	1.168
There is health relationship among school community	53	1.43	.500
Class-rooms are suitable for teaching learning	53	4.42	.497
School compound becomes attractive	53	1.66	.517
Adequate latrine is allocated for boys students	53	4.08	1.053
Learning Environment Domain	53	2.77	0.683

Level of agreement: 0.00 < 1.50 =strongly disagree; 1.50—2.50 =disagree; 2.50—3.50 =undecided; 3.50—4.50 =agree; and 4.50—5.00 =strongly agree.

In considering the learning environment domain as one component of the current practices of school improvement program, while the average score for all nine items of learning environment did not reach 5.00 for very maximum agreement with a safe, orderly school climate described, there was moderate agreement on its presence. On close analysis; therefore, it appeared that the average score on this aspect of school improvement program practices is somewhat distorted by the minimal perception teachers have on this aspect of school improvement program practice. One example of this is that teachers reported that there is health relationship among school community for a mean score of 1.43 and standard deviation of 0.500. When teachers reported their perception on this school improvement program practice; however, they expressed some disagreement with minimum distribution of results for this behavior with a mean score of 1.43 and standard deviation of .500. A similar pattern was also found for the other seven behaviors that comprised this dimension of school improvement program practice. On closer examination; thus, it appeared that teachers were moderately agreed with no presence of positive school environment where all students feel comfortable, wanted, valued, accepted, and secured in the environment.

The perceived learning environment dimension with mean score of 1.55 and standard deviation of 0.503 in teachers' response on the behavior, The students are not free from bullying and fear of stigma ; mean scores of 3.98 & 4.08 and standard deviations of 1.168 & 1.053 on the behaviors, Adequate latrine is allocated for girl students and Adequate latrine is allocated for boy students respectively as well as the perceived learning environment with mean score of 1.66 and standard deviation of .517 on the behavior, School compound becomes not attractive do offer moderate hope that the school and classroom provide opportunities for a high degree of students involvement. Thus, teachers are not moderately committed to work as a team to ensure a safe and respectful, nurturing, and invigorating environment where learning is moderately a shared responsibility.

On the other hand, minimum mean score of 1.70 and standard deviation of 0.911 on the behavior, School environment is safe, suitable, supportive, and appealing for students as well as mean scores of 4.42 & 4.53 and standard deviations of 0.497 & 0.504 respectively on the behaviors, The classrooms are suitable for teaching-learning and Assistance is given to the

students to help them develop self-confidence and responsible as teachers rated their learning environment indicate that a number of teachers had minimally agreed with no the presence of positive school environment where all students feel comfortable, wanted, valued, accepted, and secured in the environment. As a result, it could be said that a number of teachers have indicated that respect, safety, security and positive learning environment is minimally not prioritized in their schools.

But an excellent learning environment is usually of great interest to students, parents, supervisors, teachers and principals especially in schools where school improvement program is implemented as those of Ethiopians. School improvement committees were asked to comment on the learning environments of the schools. In a focused group discussion, one committee reported.

There is high drop-out and high number of repeating students in grade 9. The teaching-learning process is not run very well. There is no assistance given to the students to help them develop self-confidence and responsible. Responses of the other interviewees similarly indicated that learning-environment needed to be not improved. The overall role principals, teachers, supervisors, school improvement committees and other school stakeholders played in improving this domain was therefore minimal. Learning-environment, in terms of school facilities and materials resources, was ascribed to the school principals.

Past study by (Brendtro, Brokenleg& Van Bockern, 1990) shows that a positive school and classroom climate can have a major effect on the achievement and behavior of students. Moreover, these authors stressed that it is not always an easy task to create a school or classroom that focuses on a positive learning environment conducive to learning. So, making it happen will always require the community, school teachers, parents, and students working together, a commitment from all stakeholders, and a major shift in thinking.

Table 12: Teachers’ Response on School Improvement Program Monitoring and Evaluation

Item	No	Mean	Stan.
School improvement committees have fixed meeting time.	53	1.55	.503
Sub city educational experts and supervisors have fixed schedules for their school visits.	53	1.55	.503
Support is given for internal supervisors.	53	4.26	.944
Students receive regular feedback about what they need to do to improve.	53	4.62	.489
Teachers receive regular feedback on how they are doing.	53	1.51	.912
School Improvement Program Monitoring and Evaluation	53	2.69	.280

Level of agreement: 0.00 < 1.50 =strongly disagree; 1.50—2.50 =disagree; 2.50—3.50 =undecided; 3.50—4.50 =agree; and 4.50—5.00 =strongly agree.

Regarding to the school improvement program monitoring and evaluation as one component of the current practices of school improvement program, while the average score for all five items of school improvement program monitoring and evaluation did not reach 5.00 for very maximum agreement with learning and feeding-back of the schools, there was moderate agreement on its presence. On close analysis; therefore, it appeared that the average score on this aspect of school improvement program practices is somewhat distorted by the minimal perception teachers have on this aspect of school improvement program practice. One example of this is that teachers reported that school improvement committees have fixed meeting time to judge if their work has been going in the right direction for a mean score of 1.55 and standard deviation of 0.503. Besides that, teachers claimed that Sub city educational experts and supervisors have fixed schedules for their school visits for a mean score of 1.55 and standard deviation of 0.503. When teachers reported their perception on this school improvement program practice; however, they expressed some disagreement with minimum distribution of results for this behavior with a mean score of 1.51 and standard deviation of 0.912. A similar pattern was also found for the other three behaviors that comprised this dimension of school improvement program practice. On closer examination; however, it

appeared that teachers were minimally agreed with the presence of monitoring and evaluation system which establishes clear links between past, present and future initiatives and development results.

The perceived monitoring and evaluation dimension with mean score of 4.26 and standard deviation of 0.944 in teachers' response on the behavior, There is support given for internal supervisors as well as the perceived monitoring and evaluation with mean scores of 4.62 and standard deviations of 0.489 on the behaviors, Students receive regular feedback about what they need to do to improve do offer very minimum hope that the schools place attention on monitoring and evaluation of the school improvement program. Thus, teachers are tended to very minimally stay on their tracks. Moreover, problems were not often detected earlier. As a result, there is a likelihood of having major cost overruns or time delays in the schools. Questionnaire responses showed that minor (1.55 mean score) of the surveyed teachers perceived minimum school improvement program monitoring and evaluation at the schools. In the same manner, the majority of school improvement committees in focused group discussion reported that there was no more school improvement program monitoring and evaluation. One member of the school improvement committee elaborated: Government leaves this to the school and it is the responsibility of the school principals, teachers, supervisors, school improvement committees and students to monitor and evaluate the school improvement program implementation. But, we are not even aware of the ways how the schools are conducting the follow up. In each school, principals served as leaders of the school improvement committees. However, most of them felt that they were adequately monitoring and evaluating school improvement programs together with other members of the committees.

One of them commented: Throughout the school year, each of us is expected to monitor the operation of school improvement program. Accordingly, all of the school improvement committees are monitoring and evaluating the performance of the school and with the assistance of other stakeholders, we could revise the school improvement program as necessary. On the other hands, interview with supervisors showed that to them, constant

review on the implementation of school improvement program constituted the very minimal of their business as stakeholder of the schools.

One Supervisor reported: Our major roles as the internal school assessors are to give advice or to provide support in planning and self-reviewing at school level. But, I do not think that we are producing better results. Because, working together with these teachers and principals in preparing and implementing school projects that serve as the basis for continuous self-assessment and school improvement is very difficult. Teachers and principals see it in a negative way.

Table 13: Mean and Standard Deviation on each of the Domains

Variable	No	Mean	Std. Deviation
School Improvement Program Planning	53	2.58	.957
School Leadership	53	1.48	0.59
Community Involvement	53	1.63	0.69
Teaching-Learning	53	2.95	.879
Learning Environment	53	2.77	.683
Monitoring and Evaluation	53	2.69	.280
Current Practices of School Improvement Program	53	2.35	.681

Table 13 shows the means and standard deviations of the survey on each of the six broad school improvement program domains. Accordingly, mean and standard deviation for school improvement planning practice in the schools is 2.58 and 0.957 respectively, the mean and standard deviation for school leadership domain practice is 1.48 and 0.59 respectively, the mean and standard deviation for community involvement domain practice is 1.63 and 0.69 respectively, the mean and standard deviation for teaching-learning domain practice is 2.95 and 0.879 respectively, the mean and standard deviation for learning environment domain practice is 2.77 and 0.683 respectively and monitoring and evaluation domain practice has the mean score of 2.69 and standard deviation of 0.280. On the other hand, the

overall mean score for current practices of school improvement program in the schools where this study has been conducted was 2.35 and standard deviation of 0.68.

The result of this calculation has shown that the moderate mean score of 2.95 and standard deviation of 0.879 for teaching-learning domain of the school improvement program indicates that a number of teachers moderately agree that there is no high-quality teaching and research-based instruction in their schools. Following this, the moderate mean score of 2.77 and standard deviation of 0.683 for learning environment domain of the school improvement program also indicates that no teachers know what to do and are also willing to do better. Yet, the minimum mean score of 2.69 and standard deviation of 0.280 for school improvement program shows that there are some more teachers who minimally agree with the presence of monitoring and evaluation. These large categories of teachers not might have focused on the overall performance of a school improvement program. On top of that, it appeared that the average score of 1.48 and standard deviation of 0.59 for school leadership was somewhat minimal. As a result, this may give birth to the realization of unsuccessful schools. When principals are reported as they are not good leader of the schools, it implies that principals show very minimal commitment to the work of the schools. Community involvement in school activities is much worse than school improvement program planning practices. This is evidenced with the result that while the mean score for school improvement program planning is 2.58; it is only 1.63 for community involvement domain. An example of community involvement in the school decision-making is, the school leaders conduct meetings with the community leaders has a mean score of 1.53 and standard deviation of 0.541 which means that school principals do not engage community in education delivery and management.

The low mean scores of 2.69, 2.58, 1.63, and 1.48 and standard deviations of 0.280, 0.957, 0.69, and 0.59 respectively on domains, Monitoring and Evaluation, School Improvement Program Planning, Community Involvement, and School Leadership could contribute to the overall low mean score of 2.35 and standard deviation of 0.681 for The Current Practices of School Improvement Program. This is because, when the process of school improvement program planning, implementation and monitoring practices tends to lack proper planning,

the participation of others, effective leadership and lack of monitoring and evaluation feedback mechanisms, then, it would not more likely to improve students' achievements. In addition, teachers, principals, parents, students and larger community would not more likely to take their work seriously.

Besides that, they would not demonstrate a very high level of commitment, and perform below average to meet the needs of students. In such schools, stakeholders would not respect each other's 'competence and expertise. Furthermore, teachers would not really engage in the real teaching-learning process. In conclusion, what seems clear about such schools is that, looking for ways of improving students' achievement is of little interest to teachers and school principals.

4.2.2. Major challenges the SIP implementation encountered

Teachers' responses to items written to investigate the key challenges schools encountered in implementing of SIP were collected on five (5) points; likert scales, consisting of nine (9) items for challenges of SIP. 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). Then, the frequency distribution of each item was calculated as well as the mean score, standard deviation and range using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) Software.

Later, the overall data were aggregated at the school level by averaging the scores for each item within this instrument. The mean scores for each item and factor were then determined by averaging the scores for all survey items within this instrument and / or subscale. Accordingly, descriptive statistics including the mean and standard deviation were presented in the following single table.

Table 14: Teachers’ Responses on the Challenges of School Improvement Program

Variable	No	Mean	Stan. Dev
Lack of training on SIP negatively affects its implementation	53	4.02	.909
Low stakeholders involvement in SIP implementation	53	4.38	.765
The competency of leadership is not enough to lead SIP implementation	53	4.25	.875
Poor performance of school improvement committee	53	4.47	.696
Poor performance of follow up supervisors on SIP implementation	53	4.55	.503
Insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory apparatus and pedagogy Centre)	53	4.55	.503
Lack of financial resources to implement SIP	53	4.58	.497
Inadequate of planning SIP	53	4.51	.505
Lack of teachers’ commitment to implement SIP	53	4.49	.608
The Challenges of SIP	53	4.42	.595

Although the mean score for all nine items of key challenges of school improvement program did not reach 5.00 for very maximum agree response, there was some considerable high agreement on the presence of school improvement program challenges on some items. For example, teachers gave considerable high response on the item that there were insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory apparatus and lack of pedagogy Centre equipment) with mean score of 4.55 and standard deviation of 0.503. A similar pattern was also found for the other three behaviors that comprised this dimension of school improvement program challenge. On close analysis; however, it appeared that the average score on the challenges of school improvement program implementation was somewhat distorted by the moderate and minor mean scores teachers have given on this challenge of school improvement program implementation practices. As an illustration, teachers expressed minor agreement with the

presence of lack of teachers 'commitment to implement SIP with a mean score of 4.49 and standard deviation of 0.608. On closer examination; consequently, it appeared that teachers were willing to say that moderate challenges were existed as there were inadequate in planning of SIP, lack of financial resources to implement SIP, poor performance of school improvement program committee, and the competency of leadership was not enough to lead SIP implementation.

The character dimension with a mean score of 4.02 and standard deviation of 0.909 in teachers 'response was the lowest mean score of the nine challenges of SIP implement SIP, Poor performance of SIP committee, and The competency of leadership was not enough to lead SIP implementation. Next to this, teachers reported that there were inadequacies in planning of SIP with a mean score of 4.51 and standard deviation of 0.505. Besides that, teachers had also reported that lack of financial resources to implement SIP as existed with a mean score of 4.58 and standard deviation of 0.497. Teachers also reported with a mean score of 4.47 and standard deviation of 0.696 that school improvement program committees were not performing to the expected standards of performance. Another example of a challenge with a moderate mean score of 4.25 and standard deviation of 0.875 was, the competency of leadership was not enough to lead SIP implementation.

These major and agree & strongly agree mean scores of (4.02, 4.25, 4.49, 4.51 and 4.58) respectively on the challenges, Lack of teacher's commitment to implement SIP, Inadequacies in planning of SIP, Lack of financial resources to implementation would indicate that SIP development, implementation and revision had encountered with moderate challenges. This coupled with the considerable high mean score of 4.58 and standard deviation of 0.497 on the challenge, There are Lack of financial resources to implement SIP, considerable high mean score of 4.55 and 4.55 and standard deviation of 0.503 and 0.503 in teachers' response on challenge There are insufficient school facilities (lack of laboratory apparatus and pedagogy centre equipment) & There are Poor performance of follow up supervisors on SIP implementation in teachers' response on challenge, Low stakeholders involvement in SIP implementation as well as considerable high mean score of 4.38 and standard deviation of 0.765 in teachers' response on challenge, Poor performance of follow

up supervisors on SIP implementation could lead to a situation where teachers do not believe that SIP is implementing in their schools. This finding that SIP encountered with the challenges of insufficient school facilities, lack of training on SIP implementation strategies, low level of stakeholders participation and low level of supervisors monitoring and evaluation mechanisms was related with what the researcher has got from the other participants such as principals, parents and supervisors themselves in interview and FGD. These respondents added that teachers' and parents' attitude was also affecting the implementation of SIP. Supervisors on their own strengthened the points raised by the school principals and said that lack of commitment was the major challenge. The SIC members; moreover, focused on the school leaders incapability to motivate and mobilize the school community as the major problem they observed. Drawing on the above analysis, one can understand that SIP has been encountered with many problems in the schools where this study has been conducted.

Students' responses to items written to investigate the current practices of school improvement program in the schools were collected on five (5) points; likert scales, consisting of three (3) items for Awareness of stakeholders, five (5) items for Involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of sip plan, eight (8) items for conducive learning environment, four (4) items for school community participation, and five (5) items for Expected challenges of SIP implementation. 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). Then, the frequency distribution of each variable was calculated as well as the mean score, standard deviation and range used 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 averaging the scores for all survey items within each instrument and / or subscale. Accordingly, descriptive statistics including the mean and standard deviation were presented in the following tables.

Table 15: Students responses on the awareness of stakeholders

Item	No	Mean	Stan. Dev
Students get enough awareness about sip.	90	1.58	.519
Students know there responsibility about sip .	90	1.60	.632
Students have enough awareness about sip implementation and goals.	90	1.52	.565
Awareness of stakeholders	90	1.57	.572

Level of agreement: 0.00 < 1.50 =strongly disagree; 1.50—2.50 =disagree; 2.50—3.50 =undecided; 3.50—4.50 =agree; and 4.50—5.00 =strongly agree.

In considering the awareness of stakeholders as one part of the current practices of school improvement program, while the average score for all three items of learning environment did not reach 5.00 for very maximum agreement with a safe, orderly school climate described, there was moderate agreement on its presence. On close analysis; therefore, it appeared that the average score on this aspect of awareness of stakeholders is somewhat distorted by the minimal perception Students have on this aspect of school improvement program practice. One example of this is that Students reported that there is no enough awareness about sip for Students for a mean score of 1.58 and standard deviation of 0.519. The students are not know there responsibility about sip; mean scores of 1.60 and standard deviations of 0.632 on the behaviors, there is no enough awareness about sip implementation and goals for students respectively. Moreover, students reported there is no enough awareness about sip, Students do not know there responsibility about sip implementation and goals.

Table 16: Students responses the involvement of stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents) in implementation of sip plans.

Item	No	Mea n	Stan. Dev
Students discuss about the effectiveness of sip implementation with together school leaders	90	1.79	.918
Students accomplish their responsibility effectively regarding to coordinate , attendance,& assessment of sip	90	1.74	.829
The school leaders conduct meetings continuously with the community about student result & teaching and learning.	90	1.48	.502
School leaders lead by cooperate student result & sip implementation	90	1.58	.580
There is good r/ship with stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents about sip implementation and student result.	90	1.66	.621
Involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of sip plan	90	1.65	0.69

Level of agreement: 0.00 < 1.50 =strongly disagree; 1.50—2.50 =disagree; 2.50—3.50 =undecided; 3.50—4.50 =agree; and 4.50—5.00 =strongly agree.

The researcher now briefly analyzing the respondents ‘responses regarding to the involvement of stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents) in implementation of sip plan. Consequently, while the average score for all five dimensions of teaching-learning did not reach 5.00 for very maximum agree response, there was some moderate agreement on its practices. On close analysis; thus, it appeared that the average score on this aspect of involvement of stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents) in implementation of sip plan practices is somewhat distorted by the minimum perception students themselves have on this aspect of involvement of stakeholders. For example, students reported moderately there is no good r/ship with stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents about sip implementation and student result for mean scores of 1.66 & standard deviations of 0.621 respectively. Again on

two more different behaviors; that is, Students discuss about the effectiveness of sip implementation with together school leaders and The school leaders conduct meetings continuously with the community about student result & teaching and learning Students reported moderately not equally with mean scores of 1.79&1.48 and standard deviations of 0.918 & 0.502respectively.

When Students reported their perception on this involvement of stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents); however, they expressed some minimum agreement with frequency occurrence of this behavior with a mean score of 1.74 and standard deviation of 0.829 on the behavior, Students accomplish their responsibility effectively regarding to coordinate , attendance,& assessment of sip; mean score of 1.58 and standard deviation of 0.580 on the behavior, School leaders lead by cooperate student result & sip implementation. On closer examination; consequently, it appeared that Students moderately believed that Involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of sip plan was not carried out in their schools.

Interview with school principals revealed that Involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of sip plan was improved. They all shared the perception that principals, as the schools 'main source of everything, were involved in The school leaders conduct meetings continuously with the community about student result & teaching and learning and School leaders lead by cooperate student result & sip implementation. On the other hands, the school improvement committee said that there existed no proper Involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of sip plan. In addition to the above descriptions, PSTAs in focused group discussion reported that school leaders not conduct meetings continuously with the community about student result & teaching and learning.

Table 17: Students responses conducive learning environment

Item	No	Mean	Stan. Dev
There are visible ,participatory and student govern rule	90	1.88	1.130
There is health relationship between teacher & students	90	1.54	.656
School compound has become attractive for students and teachers	90	1.73	.832
There are visible & easily understandable policies for stakeholders in the school	90	1.69	.774
There are Adequate latrine ,water supply ,library, pedagogy center allocated for students	90	1.48	.565
Class-rooms are suitable for teaching-learning & it include special need students	90	1.51	.623
Adequate books is allocated for students	90	1.77	.765
There is similarity between using of language by student text books	90	1.71	.838
conducive learning environment	90	1.66	.773

Level of agreement: 0.00 < 1.50 =strongly disagree; 1.50—2.50 =disagree; 2.50—3.50 =undecided; 3.50—4.50 =agree; and 4.50—5.00 =strongly agree.

In considering the conducive learning environment domain as one component of the current practices of school improvement program, while the average score for all eight items of learning environment did not reach 5.00 for very maximum agreement with a safe, orderly school climate described, there was moderate agreement on its presence. On close analysis; therefore, it appeared that the average score on this aspect of school improvement program practices is somewhat distorted by the minimal perception students have on this aspect of school improvement program practice. One example of this is that students reported that there are visible, participatory and student govern rule for a mean score of 1.88and standard deviation of 1.130. When students reported their perception on this school improvement

program practice; however, they expressed some disagreement with minimum distribution of results for this behavior with a mean score of 1.48 and standard deviation of 0.565.

A similar pattern was also found for the other seven behaviors that comprised this dimension of school improvement program practice. On closer examination; thus, it appeared that teachers were moderately agreed with no presence of positive school environment where all students feel comfortable, wanted, valued, accepted, and secured in the environment. The perceived learning environment dimension with mean score of 1.51 and standard deviation of 0.623 in students' response on the behavior, The Class-rooms are not suitable for teaching-learning & it include special need students; mean scores of 1.69 & 1.48 and standard deviations of 0.774 & 0.565 on the behaviors, There are visible & easily understandable policies for stakeholders in the school and There are not Adequate latrine, water supply, library, pedagogy center allocated for students respectively as well as the perceived learning environment with mean score of 1.73 and standard deviation of 0.832 on the behavior, School compound becomes not attractive do offer moderate hope that the school and classroom provide opportunities for a high degree of students involvement.

Thus, there is no health relationship between teacher & students. The teaching-learning process is not run very well. The overall role principals, teachers, supervisors, school improvement committees and other school stakeholders played in improving this domain was therefore minimal. Learning-environment, in terms of school facilities and materials resources, was ascribed to the school principals. Past study by (Brendtro, Brokenleg & Van Bockern, 1990) shows that a positive school and classroom climate can have a major effect on the achievement and behavior of students. Moreover, these authors stressed that it is not always an easy task to create a school or classroom that focuses on a positive learning environment conducive to learning. So, making it happen will always require the community, school teachers, parents, and students working together, a commitment from all stakeholders, and a major shift in thinking

Table 18: Students responses school community participation

Item	No	Mea	Stan. Dev
There is enough Parents involvement in school programs and students' progress.	90	1.51	.723
Parents assist students to learn at home.	90	1.50	.503
School leaders discuss about the relationship b/n school & student result with together Parents	90	1.46	.564
Your Parents support you by answering questions	90	1.53	.640
school community participation	90	1.50	.607

Level of agreement: 0.00 < 1.50 =strongly disagree; 1.50—2.50 =disagree; 2.50—3.50 =undecided; 3.50—4.50 =agree; and 4.50—5.00 =strongly agree.

As it was indicated in the table, the average score for all four dimensions of perceived community involvement did not reach 5.0 for maximum response. The existed data; therefore, needed to be examined. In fact, it appeared that the average score on this aspect of school improvement program practices was confined to one level of agreement; that is, minimum agreement. As an illustration, students reported that there is enough Parents involvement in school programs and students' progress for a mean score of 1.51 and standard deviation of 0.723. When students reported their perception on this school improvement program practice with this mean score of 1.53, by observing all the other mean scores, it would be easy to say that this was a maximum mean score of all. A similar pattern was also found for the other three behaviors that comprised this dimension of school improvement program practices. On closer examination; consequently, it appeared that students were minimally accepting the existence of community involvement in the current practices of school improvement program.

The character dimension with a mean score of 1.46 and standard deviation of 0.564 in teachers 'report was the lowest of the four involvement of the community in current practice

of school improvement program. The perceived community involvement with mean scores of 1.51 and standard deviation of 0.723 in students' response on the behavior, There is enough Parents involvement in school programs and students' progress as well as the perceived community involvement dimension with mean score of 1.50 and standard deviation of 0.503 in teachers' response on the behavior, Parents assist students to learn at home. Such minimum mean scores indicate that a number of students had minimally agreed with the minimum participation of community in school improvement program planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.

Thus, it could be said that a number of teachers have minimal faith in their principals' abilities to work very closely with parents and communities to improve participatory decision-making at school level. Thus, education might not be more relevant and suitable for children in such schools because parents have not a say in what teachers are teaching and how they are doing. In addition to the information gathered through the questionnaire from teachers, interview and focused group discussion were also conducted with school principals, supervisors, and students; their response was not far from the information gathered through the questionnaires.

The result was that although it was stated that community should be involved in the development and management of the school improvement program system that provide their children with quality education, parents' involvement in the school decision making process and their participation in the school improvement program development, management and monitoring and evaluation was very minimal. Moreover, principals added that there is a very low level of parents' participation rate in all other school improvement programs. Further investigation through focused group discussion with supervisors showed that community involvement in designing education responses did not occur at very much point. In this regard, one supervisor said. Mostly, it is in the days that schools are opening and closing that parents come and participate in the school activities. It is only written on the paper that parents are participating in their children's school matters. The preceding paragraph confirmed what was reported earlier in this paper regarding the involvement of community in

school management improvement program. In other words, most of the respondents said that community involvement in the school management improvement was absent.

Table 19: Students responses Expected challenges of SIP implementation

Item	No	Mean	Stan. Dev
Lack of leaders commitment to implement sip	90	4.06	.625
Low stakeholders support in SIP implementation	90	4.06	.625
Lack of finance & materials	90	4.22	.884
Lack of Sip annual evaluation for now the effectiveness of sip	90	4.16	.898
Lack of understanding the leadership b/n sip & student result	90	4.17	.939
Expected challenges of SIP implementation	90	4.13	.868

Level of agreement: 0.00 < 1.50 =strongly disagree; 1.50—2.50 =disagree; 2.50—3.50 =undecided; 3.50—4.50 =agree; and 4.50—5.00 =strongly agree.

Although the mean score for all five items of expected challenges of school improvement program did not reach 5.00 for very maximum agree response, there was some considerable high agreement on the presence of school improvement program challenges on some items. For example, Students gave considerable high response on the item that there was lack of leader’s commitment to implement sip with mean score of 4.06and standard deviation of0.625. A similar pattern was also found for the other three behaviors that comprised this dimension of school improvement program challenge. On close analysis; however, it appeared that the average score on the challenges of school improvement program implementation was somewhat distorted by the moderate and minor mean scores Students have given on this challenge of school improvement program implementation practices. On closer examination; consequently, it appeared that Students were willing to say that moderate challenges were existed as there were lack of leaders commitment to implement sip, low stakeholders support in SIP implementation, lack of finance & materials, lack of Sip annual evaluation for now the effectiveness of sip and lack of understanding the leadership b/n sip & student result.

The character dimensions with a mean score of 4.06 and standard deviation of 0.625 in Students' response was the lowest mean score of the five challenges of implement SIP. Next to this, Students reported that there was low stakeholders support in SIP implementation with a mean score of 4.06 and standard deviation of 0.625. Besides that, Students had also reported that lack of financial & materials resources to implement SIP as existed with a mean score of 4.22 and standard deviation of 0.884. Students also reported with a mean score of 4.16 and standard deviation of 0.898 that lack of Sip annual evaluation for knows the effectiveness of sip. Another example of a challenge with a moderate mean score of 4.17 and standard deviation of 0.939 was lack of understanding the leadership b/n sip & student result. This finding that SIP encountered with the challenges of lack of leaders commitment to implement sip, Low stakeholders support in SIP implementation, lack of finance & materials, lack of Sip annual evaluation for now the effectiveness of sip and lack of understanding the leadership b/n sip & student result was related with what the researcher has got from the other participants such as principals, parents and supervisors themselves in interview and FGD.

These respondents added that Students' and parents' attitude was also affecting the implementation of SIP. Supervisors on their own strengthened the points rose by the school principals and said that lack of commitment was the major challenge. The SIC members; moreover, focused on the school leaders incapability to motivate and mobilize the school community as the major problem they observed. Drawing on the above analysis, one can understand that SIP has been encountered with many problems in the schools where this study has been conducive.

Table 20: Mean and Standard Deviation on each of the Domains

Variable	No	Mean	Std. Dev
Awareness of stakeholders	90	1.57	.572
Involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of sip plan	90	1.65	0.69
conducive learning environment	90	1.66	.773
school community participation	90	1.50	.607
Expected challenges of SIP implementation	90	4.13	.868
Current Practices of School Improvement Program	90	2.10	.702

Level of agreement: 0.00 < 1.50 =strongly disagree; 1.50—2.50 =disagree; 2.50—3.50 =undecided; 3.50—4.50 =agree; and 4.50—5.00 =strongly agree.

Table 20 shows the means and standard deviations of the survey on each of the five broad school improvement program domains. Accordingly, mean and standard deviation for Awareness of stakeholders in the schools is 1.57 and 0.572 respectively, the mean and standard deviation for Involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of sip plan is 1.65 and 0.69 respectively, the mean and standard deviation for conducive learning environment domain practice is 1.66 and 0.773 respectively, the mean and standard deviation for school community participation is 1.50 and 0.607 respectively, the mean and standard deviation for expected challenges of SIP implementation is 1.70 and 0.911 respectively and school community participation has the mean score of 4.13 and standard deviation of 0.868. On the other hand, the overall mean score for current practices of school improvement program in the schools where this study has been conducted was 2.10 and standard deviation of 0.702. The result of this calculation has shown that the moderate mean score of 1.57 and standard deviation of 0.572 for Awareness of stakeholders of the school improvement program indicates that a number of student moderately agree that there is no Involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of sip plan in their schools. Following this, the moderate mean score of 1.66 and standard deviation of 0.773 for learning environment domain of the school improvement program also indicates that no teachers know what to do and are also willing to do better.

These large categories of students not might have focused on the overall performance of a school improvement program. As a result, this may give birth to the realization of unsuccessful schools. When principals are reported as they are not good leader of the schools, it implies that principals show very minimal commitment to the work of the schools. Community involvement in school activities is much worse than school improvement program planning practices. This is because, when the process of school improvement program planning, implementation and monitoring practices tends to lack proper planning, the participation of others, effective leadership and lack of monitoring and evaluation feedback mechanisms, then, it would not more likely to improve students' achievements. In

addition, teachers, principals, parents, students and larger community would not more likely to take their work seriously. Besides that, they would not demonstrate a very high level of commitment, and perform below average to meet the needs of students. In such schools, stakeholders would not respect each other's 'competence and expertise. Furthermore, teachers would not really engage in the real teaching-learning process. In conclusion, what seems clear about such schools is that, looking for ways of improving students' achievement is of little interest to teachers, school principals and other stakeholders.

CHAPTER FIVE

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presented the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study. It clearly represented the major findings, generalization about the major findings and relevant suggestions forwarded to the major problems in the research findings.

5.1. Summary

This research was designed to examine the current practices and challenges of school improvement program in selected government secondary schools of Kirkos Sub-City. The practices of school improvement program were measured as the practices perceived by the school principals, teachers, students, school improvement committee and supervisors. The six school improvement program domains and the challenges of school improvement program dimension were measured through the perception of teachers using questionnaires. However, the perceptions of principals, students, school improvement committee and supervisors were measured through qualitative method. The following research questions were asked:

1. What are the current practices of school improvement program implementation in some selected schools of Kirkos Sub-City?
2. What are the major challenges encountering when the school improvement program is Implemented?

Surveys were used to collect the perception of teachers; semi-structured interviews were used to collect the perception of principals, vice principals and supervisors; focused group discussion was done to measure the perception of school improvement program committee and students, check list and document analysis were also used to confirm the reality of data from a simple random sample of three (3) government secondary schools in Kirkos Sub-City. At these schools, thirty (30 %) of the population; that is, at Temenja Yazh secondary school seventy (17) teachers, four (4) principals, one (1) supervisor and seven (7) school improvement committee and 15 students; Yetebaberute secondary school six (6) teachers, four (4) principals, one (1) supervisor and twenty five (25) students and seven school improvement committee. at Shimeles Habte secondary school thirty two (32) teachers, four

(4) principals, one (1) supervisor and seven (7) school improvement program committee and 50 students. Accordingly, surveys were distributed among teachers and students. Interviews were done with the principals, vice principals and supervisors. Moreover, focus group discussion was done with PSTA and school improvement program committee. Furthermore, observation was also done. Finally, it was observed that a total of fifty three (53 or 30 percent of teachers) and 90 students returned usable surveys, twelve (12 or 100 percent of principals) three (3 or 100 percent of supervisors) interviewed, twenty one (21 or 100 percent of school improvement program committee) and twenty one (21 or 100 percent of PSTA) were put into sex groups and discussion was done with them. All survey data were aggregated to the school level using the means from completed survey items and qualitative data were analyzed. The current practices of school improvement program and challenges of school improvement program survey data were then statistically analyzed using SPSS and tables to see the results.

The data analysis leads to the following major findings;

1. The study indicated that there was weak involvement of teachers, students and community in the planning of SIP. The responsibility of planning SIP was remained in the hands of school leaders.

2. It was also found out that the presence of insufficient school 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.

3. Results indicated that none of the schools in the study had a good culture of implementing school improvement program.

4. Since the present practices of these factors were at minor, moderate and considerable points, there appeared to be difficult to implement school improvement program in these schools.

5.2 .Conclusion

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 aware 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:

- However, the nature of school improvement program implementation required excellent planning which could be achieved through collective efforts of all school stakeholders; it is found out that the school improvement program planning process lacks good self-assessment, and the participation of those who have a stake in schools. From this it can be safely concluded that the school improvement committee were not contributing significantly in the planning and implementation of school improvement program.
- It is also found out that the over-all process of school improvement program practices tends to lack proper planning, participation of others, effective leadership and lack of monitoring and evaluation / feedback mechanisms. On the other hands, in the school improvement program guidelines, it is stated that school improvement program requires a broad-based effort by the entire community; including educators, students, parents, law enforcement agencies, business organizations, and faith-based organizations, among the others during the planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of school improvement program.
- The schools in the sub city were not properly utilizing the different potentials and experiences of their stakeholders during the preparation and implementation of school improvement program. Consequently, if stakeholders were not made to participate in the process of school improvement program, it might have caused a number of problems. That is, it might reduce greater readiness to do what is required to assist the school to achieve its goals, affect sense of ownership from the stakeholders, affect morals, and professional

commitment from the teachers and supervisors sides. Moreover, it might also impede effective implementation of the school improvement program, disassociate the stakeholders from the school, discourage stakeholders 'creativity and increase dissatisfaction and affect students 'achievement.

- On the other hand, insufficient school facilities, lack of training on school improvement program implementation strategies, low level of stakeholders 'participation, and low level of supervisors 'monitoring and evaluation mechanisms were challenging the school improvement program in the sub city. This seemed resulted from the low consideration given to the importance of School Improvement Program.
- Generally the study revealed that the planning of SIP for implementation in most schools doesn't involve conducting self-evaluation, and identifying and prioritizing the problems. 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 stake holders in planning. This implies that low involvement of key stake holders in planning and implementing SIP was the most challenge affecting the success of SIP in the secondary schools found in the sub city. Majority of schools implement SIP at moderate level performance with respect to four domains making safety and conducive learning environment domain, teaching learning process, leadership and management domain whereas the community involvement showed weak level of performance. In most schools 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 that are found at different level in the implementation of SIP.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made believing that they would be helpful for realizing and putting in effect in schools where one has to be effective in planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the school improvement program.

1. It was identified that schools were developing school improvement program plan with the less participation of stakeholders. In order to develop accountability and responsibility in all stakeholders to implement and improve the four main domains of school improvement program, the school leaders need to prepare the school improvement program plan collaboratively with other stakeholders.

2. 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; therefore, are advised to provide the training to develop common understanding on the school improvement program plan implementation among the school communities before and during the academic year commenced. Moreover, 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, key parents of SIP planning and the role of all stakeholders.

3. To use stakeholders' inputs to shape the learning environment of the school, the principals need to identify avenues for active participation. As an illustration, 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.

4. School facilities play great role in promoting safe and secure learning environment. In other words, schools need material and financial support to organize discussion groups, teachers study groups, baseline action research groups, seminars, forums, conference and extra that could play great role to enhance quality of learning-teaching in the schools. Thus, school principals need to consult teachers and other stakeholders in order to use school facilities more wisely and effectively for school improvement program.

REFERENCES

Abdurahman Burka (2011). **The Practices of School Improvement Program Planning and Implementation in Selected Government Schools of West Arsi Zone—**

Oromia Regional State.

AberaGudisa (2011). **Assessment of the Practices and Problems of Implementing SIP in Secondary Schools of South West Shoa Zone of Oromia region.**

ACT (2009).**School Improvement Framework: Better School...Better Futures Raising Quality and Achievement Excellence in ACT Public School,**

Retrieved on Nov.11, 2010 from www.det.act.gov.et.

DerejeHafosha (2012). The Implementation and Challenges of SIP in Government Secondary Schools of Oromia Special Zone Surrounding Finfinne.

Earl. et. al (2003). **Manitoba School Improvement.** Retrieved on Oct.29, 2010, <http://www.pacework.org>.

EIC (2000).**School Improvement Planning: A Hand Book for principals Teachers and School Council's Extracted** from [http // eie.edu.gov.on.ca](http://eie.edu.gov.on.ca). On 21 August 2009.

EssayasAmpune (2009). **An Assessment of the Progress of SIP in Gullelie Sub-city Government Primary Schools.**

EssayasGorfe (2010). **Survey of the Practices and Challenges of SIP Implementation in Selected Government Secondary Schools of Tigray Region.**

FDRGE (2008).**Ethiopian Education and Training Policy.** Addis Ababa: St. George Printing Press.

Fulan (1991).**The New Meaning of Educational Change.** New York: Teachers College Press.

Gallagher, D. R., Bagin, D. and Moore, E. H. (2001).**The School and Community Relation, (8th ed).** Printed in the United States of America.

Hopkins, D., Aniscow, M. and West, M. (1994).**School Improvement in an Era of Change.**

Harris,A and Linda L (2003). **Building Leadership Capacity for Improvement**.

Harris,A. and Linda Lambert (2003). **Building Leadership Capacity for Improvement**. Philadelphia : Open University Press.

Harris, A (2002). “**Successful School Improvement in United Kingdom and Canada**”. **Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Issue. V. 15**; University of Nottingham Press.

Harris, A (2002). **Successful School Improvement in United States of America**.

Hopkins, D et al. (1994). **School Improvement in the Area of change**. London: Cassell.

Hopkins, D. (1987). **Improving the Quality of Education For All**. London: Routledge-flamer.

Hopkins, D (2001). **School Improvement for Real**. London: Rutledge falmer.

Jeilu (2010).“**Strategic and School Development planning**”.Addis Ababa University.

Lieberman, A (2005). **The Root of Educational Change: International Hand Book of Educational Change (Volume 1)**.Netherlands: Published by Springer. Retrieved on retrieved on Friday 13/1/2010.

Lunen, B. and Ornstein, (1991).**Educational Administration Concept and Practices**. New York: Wads Worths, Inc.

Marsha, C (1988). **Spotlight on School Improvement**. Singapore: Kim Hup Lee Printing Plc. Ltd.

Marzano, R (2003). **Translating Research in to Action**. Alexandria, VA: ASCW.

MoE (2007).**YetmhrtMashashaya Program Masetega Manual [School Improvement Training Manual]**.Addis Abeba: MoE.

MoE (2006).**School Improvement Program Implementation Guidelines**.MoE Blue Print

MoE (2007).**TimhrtTiratMaregagechaPackej [Educational Quality Assurance Package]**.Addis Ababa: MoE. .

MoE (2007). **YetmhirtbetMashashaya Program Metsehafe id [School Improvement Program Hand Book]**. Addis Ababa: MoE.

MoE (2007). **YetmhrtMashashaya Program Maeqef [School Improvement Program Framework]**. Addis Ababa: MoE.

MoE (2007). **YetmhrtbetMashashaya Program GegiMemeria [School Improvement Program Blue Print]**. Addis Ababa: MoE.

Reynolds, et al. (1996). **Making Good Schools: Linking School Effectiveness and School Improvement**. London: Routledge.

Robtalsall (1998). **Teachers' Research and School Improvement: Opening Door from the Inside**. England Biristol and USA: Open University Press.

SouthW.G (2004). **Primary School Leadership Context: Leading Small, Medium and Large Sized Schools**. London: Rutleding Small, Medium and Large Sized Schools. London: Rutledge Farmer.

Stoll, L and Fink, D (1996). **Changing our Schools: Linking School Effectiveness and School Improvement**. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Stoll, L and Fink, D (1996). **Changing Our Schools: Linking School Effectiveness and School Improvement**. Buckingham: Open University Press

Van Schalkwyk, C. P. (1990) In Kruger, A. G. (1996). **Schools for the Twenty First Century: Leadership Imperatives for Educational Reform**. San Francisco: Jossy-Bass Publishers.

Walter, E. K (2004). **Making Good Choices: Sustainable School Improvement**.

World Bank (2004). **Improving Primary Education in Ghana: An Impact Evaluation**. Washington: The World Bank.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Teachers' Questionnaire

Addis Ababa University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire for Kirkos sub city secondary school teachers

Dear Teachers / Respondents, I am a graduate student of Educational Leadership and Management in education at Addis Ababa University. The **main objective of this questionnaire** is to collect data for the study on School Improvement Program Implementation practices, challenges and opportunities in for kirkos sub city secondary school. You are; therefore, kindly requested to fill the questionnaire that provides necessary information on different issues related to the study. It is very important that you provide honest responses as frankly as possible. In the questionnaire, two types of items are included. For items that require written answer give your response in the provided spaces corresponding to the questions. For the items which provide alternatives or scale values, please use (√) mark to show your level of agreement under one of the five scales of measurements for each item. The values for the scales of measurements are: Strongly Agree = 5; Agree = 4; Undecided = 3; Disagree = 2; and Strongly Disagree = 1.

Instruction

- ❖ Please do not write your name.
- ❖ Erase unwanted marks correctly.
- ❖ Make no stray marks.
- ❖ Please mark only one response to a question, unless other directions are given.

PART ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Sub city-----worda-----school-----
2. Sex: Male Female
3. Educational qualification: Diploma BED BS D MA
4. Educational specialization -----
5. years of service in teaching-----
 [1-5] years [6-10] years [11-15] years above 16 year

PART TWO: SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION RELATED INFORMATION

2.1 Please, tick (√) one box for each statement below to show how much you agree or disagree with it. Please tick one box only on each line

R/No	Items	Scales					
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
	School Improvement Program Planning	5	4	3	2	1	
1	Strategic plan of the school was prepared based on self-evaluation.						
2	The involvement of stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents) in developing sip plan.						
3	The involvement of stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents) in developing sip plan.						
4	Teachers have enough information on national strategies to understand their impact on their teaching method and plan preparation.						
5	School leaders plan ways that help to fulfill the requirements of special need students.						
6	School Improvement Program Implementation						
7	Teachers provide necessary information to enable school improvement program committee carryout evaluation						
8	The utilization of school grant for school improvement program activities are planned						
9	Stakeholders participate in school						

	improvement program implementation very highly					
	School leadership Domain					
10	School leadership communicates with the community and encourages higher participation in the school activities and plan.					
11	School leaders designed to improve the learning environment by beautifying the school compound.					
12	School leaders make conducive learning environment					
13	School leadership encourages teachers to participate in the preparation, implementation and assessment process of the school plan.					
14	School leadership encourages community to have positive attitude towards students 'educational achievements.					
15	School leaders direct and manage the acti of school improvement committee.					
6	School leadership ensures and manages school budget to attain SIP goals.					
17	School leaders ensure whether all teachers and staff members have received assistance through training.					
18	School leaders organize professional competency programs of teacher's continuously.					
19	Community Involvement Domain.					
20	Parents involve in decision making process about their children's education.					
21	Parents assist students to learn at home.					

22	Parents involve in school programs and students' progress.					
23	The community participation on SIP plan is outlining goals that help to improve standards and future interests.					
24	Parents have information about school self-evaluation process					
25	The school leaders conduct meetings with the community leaders					

26. What are the major challenges in your school that hinder community participation in the implementation of SIP?

.....

.....

27. What solutions do you suggest for the challenges you face in question No 26? -----

.....

.....

	Teaching Learning Domain					
28	The teaching process meets the general needs of students and curriculum standards					
29	Teachers know their student.					
30	The suitability and appropriateness of the evaluation in respect to planning the lesson and supervising students progress is very					
31	The quality of teaching and teachers 'professional progress is very high.					
32	Identifying individual learning needs and providing the lesson accordingly is usual in the school					
33	The planning skill of teachers in meeting the needs of various student groups is very					

	high					
34	Student-centered method of teaching is practiced in the school					
35	Tutorial support is given to the students by the teachers					
36	Laboratory service is provided to the students					
37	Teachers use different techniques to motivate students					
38	Library service is available to the school community					
39	Students' achievement is usually checked					

40. What other major challenges do you think hinder the implementation of SIP?

.....

41. What solutions do you suggest to improve the implementation problems raised under question No 40?

.....

42. What prospects are there to improve SIP implementation?

.....

	School Learning Environment Domain					
43	Students learning desire has been improved.					
44	Assistance is given to the students to help them develop self-confidence and responsible					
45	School environment is safe, suitable, supportive and appealing for students.					
46	students are free from bullying and fear of stigma					
47	The school has outlined standards for educational achievements and qualities					
48	Adequate latrine is allocated for girls students.					
49	There is health relationship among school community					
50	Class-rooms are suitable for teaching-learning					
51	School compound has become attractive					
52	Adequate latrine is allocated for boy students					

53. What are the major factors that hinder the conducive learning environment?

.....
.....
.....
.....

54. What solution do you suggest for problem raised under question no 53?

.....
.....
.....

	Monitoring and Evaluation of the Practices of SIP					
55	The school improvement committee has fixed meeting time.					
56	Woreda educational experts and supervisors have fixed schedules for their school visits.					
57	The school gives support for internal supervisors					
58	The students always receive regular feedback about what they need to do and to improve.					
59	Teachers usually receive regular feedback on how they are doing things.					
60	All staffs work towards SIP goals.					

61. What is your evaluation on the overall students' achievement after SIP has been launched? (Please use the scale below)

Very high High Moderate Low Very low

62. What kinds of problems were observed concerning the improvements of students' achievement after SIP has been applied?

.....

.....

63. What solution do you suggest for question No 62?

.....

.....

	Expected challenges of SIP					
64	Lack of training on SIP negatively affects its implementation					
65	Low stakeholders involvement in SIP implementation					
66	The competency of leadership not enough to lead sip implementation					
67	Poor performance of school improvement committee					
68	Poor performance of follow up supervisors on sip implementation.					
69	Insufficient school facilities (lack of Laboratory apparatus and pedagogy center).					
70	Lack of financial resource to implement SIP					
71	Inadequate planning of sip					
72	Lack of teachers commitment to implement sip					

73. Write down any other factor that negatively affects the effective implementation of SIP.

.....
.....
.....

74. What solution/s do you suggest for problems mentioned above?

.....
.....
.....

Thank you for your kind cooperation!

APPENDIX B

Addis Ababa University
School of graduate studies
Students' Questionnaire

By Collage of Education and Behavioral Studies department on the concern of sip data collection questionnaire. This Questionnaire will be filed by government secondary school students.

Dear students' /respondent:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data for preparing a thesis under the title on School Improvement Program Implementation practices, challenges and opportunities in for kirkos sub city secondary school Addis Ababa. This questionnaire is prepared to collect valid and reliable information for the partial fulfillment of M.A degree in school leadership.. Thus I kindly request you to fill this questionnaire as frank as you could be where by your ideas and comments are highly honored and kept confidential lastly, the researcher appreciates in advance for your willingness in sharing your valuable ideas.

Instruction

1. Please do not write your name.
2. please use (√) mark to show your level of agreement under one of the five scales of measurements for each item
3. Please mark only one response to a question, if you want change your first response Please cancels the first one.

1: Demographic information of the respondent

1. School name -----
2. Sex: Male male
3. Age -----
4. grade -----

PART ONE

The following items concern on awareness of sip committee about school improvement program planning and implementation. Please, tick (√) one box for each statement below to show how much you agree or disagree with it. Please tick one box only on each line.

1.1 There is training for stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents) about sip plan.

Yes **no**

1.2 List down non participated stakeholders on sip plan

training.....

Awareness of stakeholders

Strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, partially agree = 3, disagree =2, strongly disagree = 1

No	Items	scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Students get enough awareness about sip .					
2	Students know there responsibility about sip.					
3	Students have enough awareness about sip implementation and goals.					

PART TWO

2 .The involvement of stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents) in implementation of sip plan . Please, tick (√) one box for each statement below to show how much you agree or disagree with it. Please tick one box only on each line

Strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, partially agree = 3, disagree =2, strongly disagree = 1

No	Items	scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Students discuss about the effectiveness of sip implementation with together school leaders					
2	Students accomplish their responsibility effectively regarding to coordinate , attendance,& assessment of sip					
3	The school leaders conduct meetings continuously with the community about student result & teaching and learning.					
4	School leaders lead by cooperate student result & sip implementation					
5	There is good r/ship with stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents about sip implementation and student result.					

PART THREE

3. Conducive learning environment

Please, tick (√) one box for each statement below to show how much you agree or disagree with it. Please tick one box only on each line

Strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, partially agree = 3, disagree =2, strongly disagree = 1

No	Items	scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	There are visible ,participatory and student govern rule					
2	There is health relationship between teacher & students					
3	School compound has become attractive for students and teachers					
4	There are visible & easily understandable policies for stakeholders in the school					
5	There are Adequate latrine ,water supply ,library, pedagogy center allocated for students					
6	Class-rooms are suitable for teaching-learning & it include special need students					
7	Adequate books is allocated for students					
8	There is similarity between using of language by student text books					

3.1 students number above 40 in each class room.

Yes no

PART FOUR

School community participation

Please, tick (√) one box for each statement below to show how much you agree or disagree with it. Please tick one box only on each line

Strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, partially agree = 3, disagree =2, strongly disagree = 1

No	Items	scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	There is enough Parents involvement in school programs and students' progress.					
2	Parents assist students to learn at home.					
3	School leaders discuss about the relationship b/n sip & student result with together Parents					
4	Your Parents support you by answering questions					

PART FIVE

Expected challenges of SIP implementation

Strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, partially agree = 3, disagree =2, strongly disagree = 1

No	Items	scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Lack of leaders commitment to implement sip					
2	Low stakeholders support in SIP implementation					
3	Lack of finance & materials					
4	Lack of Sip annual evaluation for know the effectiveness of sip					
5	Lack of understanding the leadership b/n sip & student result					

PART SIX

Give short answer for the following question

1. . What other major challenges do you think hinder the implementation of SIP?

.....
.....
.....

2. What solutions do you suggest to improve the implementation problems raised give short answer?

.....
.....
.....

3. What prospects are there to improve SIP implementation?

.....
.....
.....

Thank you for your kind cooperation!

APPENDIX C

Principals Interview

Addis Ababa University

Graduate School of Education

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interview Guide Questions for Kirkos sub city Secondary Schools Principals

Dear Principals / Respondents, I am a graduate student of Educational Leadership and Management in education at Addis Ababa University. **The main objective of this interview is to collect data for the study on the assessment of School Improvement program implementation practices, challenges and opportunities in kirkos sub city secondary school. You are; therefore, kindly requested to provide necessary information on different issues related to the study. It is very important that you provide honest responses as frankly as possible.**

PART ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Sex: Male Female

1.2 Age:

1.3 Level of Education.....

1.4 Experience: As a Teacher Other

1.5 Current Position.....

PART TWO: SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION RELATED INFORMATION

2.1 **How do you communicate with school improvement committee?** How did you conduct self-evaluation during the preparation of the strategic plan?

.....
.....

2.2 Could you mention the stake holders who involved in the preparation of three years of strategic plan?.....

.....

2.3 How do SCEO and supervisors take monitoring and evaluation, provide technical support for SIP planning and implementation in your school?

.....
.....
.....

2.4 What major successes are there in the implementation of SIP?

2.4.1 In creating conducive learning environment:

.....
.....
.....

2.4.2 In forming conducive learning-teaching environment:

.....
.....
.....

2.4.3 In supporting school leadership and management:

.....
.....
.....

2.4.4 By promoting community participation:

.....
.....
.....

2.6 What about community participation in supporting your school?

.....
.....
.....

2.7 Have you ever been providing training on SIP for school community?

.....
.....

2.8 Is your school well furnished?

.....
.....
.....
.....

2.9 How do you see the overall students' achievement after SIP had been implemented in your school?

.....
.....
.....

2.10 Would you mind mentioning the contribution of school grant to SIP implementation?.....

.....
.....

2.11 Could you mention major challenges encountered when SIP was implemented?

.....
.....
.....

2.12 What solutions do you suggest for the problems raised above?

.....
.....
.....

APPENDIX D

Supervisors' Interview

Addis Ababa University

Graduate School of Education

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interview Guide Questions for Secondary School Supervisors

Dear Supervisors / Respondents, I am a graduate student of Educational Leadership and Management in education at Addis Ababa University. The main objective of this interview is to collect data for the study on the assessment of School Improvement program implementation KirkosSub City secondary school practices, challenges and opportunities in kirkos sub city secondary School. You are; therefore, kindly requested to provide necessary information on different issues related to the study. It is very important that you provide honest responses as frankly as possible.

Thank you in advance

PART ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Sex: Male Female

1.2 Age:

1.3 Level of Education.....

1.4 Experience: As a Teacher Other

1.5 Current Position.....

PART TWO: SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION RELATED INFORMATION

2.1 Is school principal competent enough to lead and coordinate SIP implementation?

.....
.....
.....

2.2 Did you provide training for school communities and parents on SIP implementation?.....
.....

2.3 How does Woreda education office take monitoring and evaluation, technical support for SIP planning and implementation in schools?
.....
.....

2.4 How do you evaluate stakeholder participation in implementing SIP?
.....
.....
.....

2.5 What about the fulfillments of necessary material like text book, computer and other school facilities?
.....
.....

2.6 Is there any incentive for principals who achieve SIP successfully?
.....
.....

2.7 How do you evaluate the overall students achievement after SIP launched?
.....
.....

2.8 Could you mention challenges that affect the effectiveness of SIP?
.....
.....

2.9 What solution do you suggest for problems raised above?
.....
.....

Thank you for your kind cooperation!

APPENDIX E

Werda education office Head interview

Addis Ababa University

Graduate School of Education

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interview Guide Questions for Secondary School Werda education office Head interview

Dear Werda education office Head / Respondents, I am a graduate student of Educational Leadership and Management in education at Addis Ababa University. The main objective of this interview is to collect data for the study on the assessment of School Improvement program implementation practices, challenges and prospects in kirkos sub city secondary school. You are; therefore, kindly requested to provide necessary information on different issues related to the study. It is very important that you provide honest responses as frankly as possible.

Thank you in advance

PART ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Sex: Male Female

1.2 Age:

1.3 Level of Education.....

1.4 Experience: As a Teacher Other

1.5 Current Position.....

PART TWO: SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION RELATED INFORMATION

2.1 Is school principal and supervisors competent enough to lead and coordinate SIP implementation?

.....
.....
2.2 Did you provide training for school communities and parents on SIP implementation?

.....
.....
2.3 How does Woreda education office take monitoring and evaluation, technical support for SIP planning and implementation in schools?

.....
.....
2.4 How do you evaluate stakeholder participation in implementing SIP?

.....
.....
2.5 What about the fulfillments of necessary material like text book, computer and other school facilities?

.....
.....
2.6 Is there any incentive for principals who achieve SIP successfully?

.....
.....
2.7 is there good relationship among principals, teacher, student and all staff in the school ?

.....
.....
2.8 Could you mention challenges that affect the effectiveness of SIP?

.....
.....
2.9 What solution do you suggest for problems raised above?

.....
Thank you for your kind cooperation!

APPENDIX F
School Improvement Committee FGD Questions
Addis Ababa University
Graduate School of Education
Department of Educational Planning and Management
Focused Group Discussion Questions for kirkos sub city School Improvement
Program Committees

Dear Committees / Respondents, I am a graduate student of Educational Leadership and Management in education at Addis Ababa University. The main objective of this discussion is to collect data for the study on the assessment of School Improvement program implementation practices, challenges and prospects in kirkos sub city secondary school. You are; therefore, kindly requested to provide necessary information on different issues related to the study. It is very important that you provide honest responses as frankly as possible. Thank you in Advance.

FGD Questions for School Improvement Program Committee.

1.1 Do you have functional school improvement committee?

.....
.....

1.2 Have you ever participated on school improvement program planning and check the appropriateness of the lesson planning evaluation?

.....
.....

1.3 Have you ever participated on school improvement program implementation?

.....
.....

1.4 Have you ever participated on formulating school strategic plan?

.....
.....

1.5 What do you suggest for the problems mention above?.....

Thank you for your kind cooperation !

APPENDIX G

**PSTA FGD Questions
Addis Ababa University
Graduate School of Education**

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Focused Group Discussion Questions for kirkos sub city secondary School PSTA

Dear Parent Student Teacher Association / Respondents, I am a graduate student of Educational Leadership and Management in education at Addis Ababa University. The main objective of this discussion is to collect data for the study on the assessment of School Improvement program implementation practices, challenges and opportunities in kirkos sub city secondary school. You are; therefore, kindly requested to provide necessary information on different issues related to the study. It is very important that you provide honest responses as frankly as possible. Thank you in advance

FGD Questions for PSTA

1.1 Do you know about the school improvement program?

.....
.....

1.2 Have you ever been participated on school self-evaluation?

.....
.....

1.3 Have you ever been given training on SIP?

.....
.....

1.4 What is stakeholders (teachers, students and parents) participation in developing SIP plan, implementation and evaluation?

.....
.....

1.5 Did you participate in decision making process in your schools and students are motivated to learn?.....

Thank you for your kind cooperation!

አዲስአበባዩኒቨርሲቲ

የድህረምረቃትምህርትቤት

በሥነትምህርትኮሌጅየስነባህርይጥናትክፍልየትምህርትቤትማሻሻያማዕቀፍንየሚመለከት መረጃ ማሰባሰቢያ መጠይቅ በተማሪዎች የሚሞላ

ውድተማሪዎች

ይህ መጠይቅ የተዘጋጀው በሁለተኛ ደረጃ ትምህርት/ቤቶች ያለው የትምህርት ቤት ማሻሻያ ማዕቀፍ መርሃግብር አተገባበር፣ ተግዳሮቶችን እና ለተማሪዎች ውጤት መሻሻል ያለው አስተዋፅኦ መረጃን ለማስባሰብ ነው። በመሆኑም ይህ መጠይቅ የሚኖረው መጠይቁት ክክለኛ መረጃ ለማሰባሰብ ያስቻልኩ ሆኑ ብቻ ነው። በመሆኑም መጠይቁን በጥንቃቄ እንድትሞሉ ልኛበታ ላቅ አክብሮት እጠይቃለሁ።

የሚሰበሰበው መረጃ ለትምህርት ዓላማ ብቻ የሚውል ስሜት ጥርነት የሚጠበቅ መሆኑን ከወዲሁ እገልጻለሁ። ማስታወሻ፡-

1. ስም መጻፍ አይጠበቅባችሁም
2. መልሱን በተሰጠው ስፍራ ላይ ይህን መልክት (√) ተጠቀሙ
3. መልሱን መቀየር ከተፈለገ የመጀመሪያውን መልስ ሰርዙት

1. ግልፅ መረጃ

1.1. የትምህርት ቤቱ ስም-----

1.2. የታወቀ ደረጃ

1.3. እድሜ-----

1.4. ክፍል-----

ክፍል አንድ የሚከተሉት ዓ/ነገሮች የትምህርት ቤት ማሻሻያ ማዕቀፍ ኮሚቴ አባላት ስለጥራት ምደባቸውን ግንዛቤ የሚመለከቱ ናቸው። መልሳችሁን ከዚህ በታች በተገለፀው መለኪያዎች በመመልከት ይህን ሂሳብ መጠቀም አይጠበቅብዎትም።

1.1. የትምህርት-ቤት-ማሻሻያ ማእከላዊ ፕሮግራም ለባለድርሻ አካላት ማለትም ለመምህራን፣ ለተማሪዎች፣ ለወላጅ ስልጠናተኛ ጥቷል።

አዎ

አይደለም

1.2. በስልጠናው ለመሳተፍ ያልቻሉ ባለድርሻ አካላት ካሉ ጥቀሱ

የባለድርሻ አካላት ግንዛቤ

በጣም እስማማለሁ (5) ፣ አስማማለሁ (4) ፣ አልወሰንኩም (3) ፣ አልስማማም (2) ፣ በጣም አልስማማም (1)

ተ. ተ.	ዐ/ዓ/ነገሮች	ደረጃ				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	ለተማሪዎች የትምህርት-ማሻሻያ ፕሮግራም-ን እስመልክቶ የተሰጠው ግንዛቤ በቂ ነው					
2	ተማሪዎች ፕሮግራም-ን እስመልክቶ ያላቸውን ሃላፊነት ያውቃሉ					
3	ተማሪዎች ስለ ፕሮግራም-አተገባበር ሂደት እና ግቦች በቂ ግንዛቤ አላቸው					

ክፍል ሁለት

2. ባለድርሻ አካላት በእቅድ አተገባበር ላይ የነበራቸው ተሳትፎ።
 መልሳችሁ ከዚህ በታች በተገለጸው መለኪያ ይህን “√” ምልክት በመጠቀም አስቀምጡ።
 በጣም እስማማለሁ (5) ፣ እስማማለሁ (4) ፣ አልወሰንኩም (3) ፣ አልስማማም (2) ፣ በጣም አልስማማም (1)

ተ.ቁ	ዓ/ነገሮች	ደረጃ				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	ተማሪዎች ስለ ፕሮግራሙ ውጤታማነት ከት/ቤቱ አመራሮች ጋር በተደጋ ጋሚው ይይዙ አድርገዋል።					
2	ተማሪዎች የማስተባበር፣ የመቆጣጠር እና የመገምገም ሃላፊነቱን በብቃት ተወጥተዋል።					
3	ባለድርሻ አካላት ስለተማሪዎች ውጤትና ስለመማር ማስተማር ሂደቱ በተደጋ ጋሚ ተወያይተዋል					
4	ርዕሰ መምህራን የት/ቤት መሻሻል መርሃ ግብር ከተማሪዎች ውጤት ጋር እስተሳስረው በንቃት ተንቀሳቅሰዋል።					
5	በፕሮግራሙ አፈፃፀም እና በተማሪዎች ውጤት ከባለድርሻ አካላት መካከል ጠንካራ የሆነ ትስስር አለ።					

ክፍል ሶስት

3. የመማሪያ አካባቢ

መልሳችሁ ንክኪህ በታች በተገለፀው መለኪያ ይህን “√” ምልክት በመጠቀም አስቀምጡ።

በጣም እስማማለሁ (5)፣ እስማማለሁ (4)፣ አልወሰንኩም (3)፣ አልስማማም (2)፣

በጣም አልስማማም (1)

ተ.	ዓ/ነገሮች	ደረጃ				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	ተማሪዎች ንጥረ ነገሮችን በጥሩ ሁኔታ ለማሳወቅ ይችላሉ					
2	ጠንካራ የመምህር ተማሪ ግንኙነት አለ					
3	የት/ቤቱ ቅጥር ግቢ ለተማሪዎችና መምህራን የተመቻነው					
4	የት/ቤቱ ፖሊሲዎችና የት/ቤቱ ከባለድርሻዎች የሚጠበቅባቸው ነገሮች በግለፅ የተቀመጡና ባለድርሻዎች በቅጥር የተረዱባቸው ናቸው።					
5	የተማሪዎች (የውሃ አቅርቦት፣ የመጠጫ ጭነት፣ ቤተ መጻሕፍት፣ ላብራቶሪ፣ ቅንጫፍ ማስከፈል) የተሟሉ ናቸው					
6	የመማሪያ ክፍሎች ለመማር ማስተማር ሂደት ምቹ እና የልዩ ፍላጎት ተማሪዎችን ያካተተ ነው።					
7	ለሁሉም ተማሪዎች መጠቀሚያ አለ					
8	መጠጫ ጭነት በታች አጠቃቀም ሰዓት ለመሙላት ሲያስፈልግ አላቸው					

4.1 የእያንዳንዱ የመግሪያ ክፍል የሚይዘው የተማሪ ቁጥር ከ40 የበለጠነው

አዎ አይደለም

ክፍል አራት

የትምህርት ቤቱ ማህረሰብ ተሳትፎን በመለከተ

መልሳችሁ ንክዚህ በታች በተገለፀው መለኪያ ይህን “√” ምልክት በመጠቀም አስቀምጡ

ተ.ቁ	ዓ/ነገሮች	ደረጃ				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	ትምህርት ነገገ-ዳዮችን ለመደገፍ ወላጆች ያደረጉት አስተዋፅኦ ተቀባይነት					
2	ወላጆች የልጆቻቸው የትምህርት ውጤት እንዲሻሻል ያደረጉት ክትትል ልናድጋቸው					
3	ወላጆች ከትምህርት ቤቱ አመራር ጋር የት/ቤት መሻሻል መርሃ ግብር ከተማሪው ጤት ጋር በማስተሳሰር ያደረጉት ወይይት ተቀባይነት					
4	ወላጆች የቤት ስራ ስትሰራ/ሪ/ ጥያቄዎችን በመስራት ያግዙ ሃል/ሻል/					

ክፍል አምስት

ለትምህርት ማሻሻያ ፕሮግራም ሂደት አተገባበር እንቅፋት የሆኑ ምክንያቶች

በጣም አስማማላሁ (5) ፣ አስማማላሁ (4) ፣ አልወሰንኩም (3) ፣ አልሰማማም (2) ፣

በጣም አልሰማማም (1)

ተ.ቁ	ዓ/ነገሮች	ደረጃ				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	የአመራሩ ቁርጠኝነት አናሳ መሆን					
2	በብቁ ሁኔታ የባለድርሻ አካላት ድጋፍ አለመኖር					
3	የ የገንዘብ የቁሳ ቁስ እጥረት መኖር					
4	የፕሮግራሙ ንስኤ ታማኝነት ለማወቅ አመታዊ ግምገማ አለመካሄድ					
5	የት/ቤት መሻሻል መርሃ ግብር ፕሮግራም ከተማሪው ጤት ጋር ጥያቄዎችን አለመገንዘብ					

ክፍል ስድስት

ለሚከተሉት ጥያቄዎች በአጭሩ መልሳችሁን ግልፁ።

(1) የት/ቤት መሻሻል መርሃ ግብር ፕሮግራም ለመተግበር ያጋጠሙ ዋና ዋና ችግሮች ምን ድንገቶች ናቸው

(2) ከላይ የተገለፁትን ችግሮች የመፍትሄ ሀሳቦች ይሆናሉ የምትሉትን በአጭሩ ግለፁ

(3) የት/ቤት መሻሻል መርሃ ግብር ፕሮግራምን በመተግበር የሚጠበቅ ተስፋ ምን ድንገቶች ሁታስባላችሁ -

ስላደረጋችሁት ብብር አመሰግናለሁ!

አፔንዴክስ

የትምህርት-ቤት-መሻሻል-ኮሚቴ-አባላት-የቡድን-ተኮር-ውይይት-መጠይቅ

የድህረ-ምረቃ-ትምህርት-ቤት

በቂርቆስ ክ/ከተማ-የትምህርት-ቤት-መሻሻል-ኮሚቴ-አባላት-የቡድን-ተኮር-ውይይት-የተዘጋጀ

የተከበራች-ሁ-የኮሚቴ-አባላት-በአዲስ-አበባ-ደብረ-ሲ.ቲ-የድህረ-ምረቃ-ትምህርት-ቤት-ተመራ-ቂ-ተማሪነት

ኝ :: የዚህ-ውይይት-አላማ-በቂርቆስ ክ/ከተማ-በሁለተኛ-ደረጃ

ት/ቤቶች-ያለው-ንጥ-ትምህርት-ቤት-ማሻሻያ-ማዕቀፍ-መርሃ-ግብር-አተገባበር-እና-ተግዳሮቶች-ንመረጃ-ንለ

ማስባሰብ-እና-ጥናት-ነው::

በመሆኑም-ይህ-መጠይቅ-ጋ-የሚኖረው-መጠይቅ-ት-ክክለኛ-መረጃ-ለማሰባሰብ-ያስቻለ-ከሆነ-ብቻ-ነው::

በመሆኑም-መጠይቅ-ንበጥ-ንቃቂ-እንድት-ሞሉ-ልኝ-በታላቅ-አክብሮት-እጠይቃለሁ::

የሚሰበሰበው-መረጃ-ለትምህርት-ዓላማ-ብቻ-የሚውል-ና-በሚስጥርነት-የሚጠበቅ-መሆኑ-ንከወዳሁ-እገል

ገለሁ:: የቡድን-ተኮር-ውይይት-ለሚያደርጉ-የትምህርት-ቤት-መሻሻል-ኮሚቴ-አባላት-የተዘጋጀ-መጠይቅ

1. ተግባር-ላይ-ያለ-የትምህርት-ቤት-መሻሻል-ኮሚቴ-አለ ?-----

2. የትምህርት-ቤት-መሻሻል-እቅድ-እና-ተከታታይነት-ያለው-ትምህርት-እቅድ-ግምገማ-ላይ-ተሳትፎ-ታደርጋ-ላችሁ ?-----

3. የትምህርት-ቤት-መሻሻል-ፕሮግራም-አተገባበር-ላይ-ተሳትፎ-ታደርጋ-ላችሁ? -----

4. የትምህርት-ቤቱ የ3 አመት-ስትራቴጂ-እቅድ-በማዘጋጀት-ላይ-ተሳትፎ-ታደርጋ-ላችሁ ?-----

5. ከላይ-በተዘረዘሩት-ላይ-ችግር-ካለበት-ዝርዝር-ይግለፁ ? -----

ስላደረጋችሁ-ትትብብር-አመሰግናለሁ!!

አፔንዴክስ

የወላጅ-ተማሪ መምህር ህብረት ኮሚቴ አባላት የቡድን ተኮር ወይይት መጠይቅ

የድህረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት

በቂርቆስ

ክ/ከተማ የወላጅ-ተማሪ መምህር ህብረት ኮሚቴ አባላት የቡድን ተኮር ወይይት የተዘጋጀ የተከበራችሁ የ ኮሚቴ አባላት በአዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ የድህረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ቤት/ቤት ተመራ ቁተማሪ ነኝ። የዚህ ወይይት አላማ በቂርቆስ ክ/ከተማ በሁለተኛ ደረጃ ት/ቤቶች ያለውን የትምህርት ቤት ማሻሻያ ማዕቀፍ መርሃ ግብር አተገባበር እና ተግዳሮቶችን መረጃን ለማስባሰብ እና ጥናት ነው።

በመሆኑም ይህ መጠይቅ ጋራ ሚና ለው መጠይቁት ክክለኛ መረጃ ለማሰባሰብ ያስቻለክሆኑብቻ ነው።

በመሆኑም መጠይቁን በጥንቃቄ እንድትሞሉ ልኛበታ ላቅ አክብሮት እጠይቃለሁ። የሚሰበሰበው መረጃ ለትምህርት ዓላማ ብቻ የሚውል ስለሆነ ጥርነት የሚጠበቅ መሆኑን ከወዲሁ እገልጻለሁ።

1.1 የትምህርት ቤት መሻሻል ፕሮግራም ላይ ምን ያህል ታውቃላችሁ? -----

1.2 በትምህርት ቤት ግለግም ገማላይ ተሳትፎ ታደርጋላችሁ እና ተማሪዎች ለትምህርት የተነቃቁናቸው?
?-----

1.3 የትምህርት ቤት መሻሻል ፕሮግራም በተመለከተ ስልጠና አለወይ? -----

1.4 የትምህርት ቤት መሻሻል ፕሮግራም አቅድ ፣
አተገባበር እና ግምገማላይ ባለድርሻ አካላት ማለትም የወላጅ-ተማሪ እና መምህራን ተሳትፎ ታደርጋላችሁ ወይ?
?-----

1.5 በትምህርት ቤቱ የውሳኔ አሰጣጥ ሂደት ላይ ተሳትፎ ታደርጋላችሁ ወይ? -----

ስላደረጋችሁት ትብብር አመሰግናለሁ !