

**PRACTICES AND CHALLENGES OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION IN GOVERNMENT SECONDARY
SCHOOLS OF WEST HARARGHE ZONE, OROMIA REGIONAL
STATE, ETHIOPIA**

MA THESIS

BORU TEREFE MISGENU

JUNE, 2019

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA

**Practices and Challenges of School Improvement Program
Implementation in Government General Secondary Schools of West
Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State Ethiopia**

**A Thesis submitted to the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences,
Department of Educational Planning and Management, Postgraduate
Program Directorate, Haramaya University**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of MASTER
OF ART IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP**

Boru Terefe Misgenu

June, 2019

Haramaya University, Haramaya

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE (PGPD)

We hereby certify that we have read and evaluated this Thesis entitled” Practices and Challenges Of School Improvement Program Implementation in Government Secondary Schools of West Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State Ethiopia” prepared under our guidance, by Boru Terefe. We recommended that it can be submitted as fulfilling the thesis requirement.

Gemechu Abera (AssociateProf.) _____

Major Advisor

Signature

_____ Date

Justin Sudhakar(PhD) _____

Co-Advisor

Signature

_____ Date

As a members of the Board of Examiners of the MA Thesis Open Defense Examination, We certify that we have read and evaluated the Thesis prepared by Boru Terefe Misgenu and examined the candidate. We recommend that the thesis be accepted as fulfilling the thesis requirement for the degree of Master of Art in School Leadership.

Solomon Tekalign (PhD) _____

Chairperson

Signature

_____ Date

Adare Faye (PhD) _____

Internal Examiner

Signature

_____ Date

Dejene (PhD) _____

External Examiner

Signature

_____ Date

Final approval and acceptance of the Thesis is contingent upon the submission of its final copy to the council of Graduate studies (CGS) through the candidate’s department or school graduate committee (DGC or SGC).

DEDICATION

This thesis manuscript is dedicated to my beloved child Kanke Boru.

STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR

By my signature below, I declare and affirm that this Thesis is my own work. I have followed all ethical and technical principles of scholarship in the preparation, data collection, data analysis and compilation of Thesis. Any scholarly matter that is included in the Thesis has been given recognition through citation.

This Thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the MA degree at the Haramaya University. The Thesis is deposited in the Haramaya University Library and is made available to borrowers under the rules of the Library. I solemnly declare that this Thesis has not been submitted to any other institution anywhere for the awarded of any academic degree, diploma, or certificate.

Brief quotations from this Thesis may be made without special permission provided that accurate and complete acknowledgement of source is made .Requests for permission for extended quotations from or reproduction of this Thesis in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the school or department when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interest of scholarship .In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author of the Thesis.

Name: _____

Signature _____

Date: _____

School/Department: _____

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CSA	Central Statistical Agency
CRESST	Center for Research on Evaluation, Standard and Student Testing
EDPM	Educational Planning and Management
EIC	Education Improvement Commission
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
ETP	Education and Training Police
GEQIP	General Education Quality Improvement Package
KETB	Kebele Education Training Board
MoE	Ministry of Education
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
REB	Regional Education Bureau
SIC	School Improvement Committee
SIP	School Improvement Program
WEO	Woreda Education Officer
ZEO	Zonal Education Office

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

The author was born in February 1986 in Dano Woreda West Shoa Zone Oromia Regional State. He attended his Primary school grade 1-4 from the year 1994-1997 and junior school grade 5-8 from the year 1998-2001 at Ayeru primary and junior school, secondary school grade 9-10 from the year 2002-2003 and preparatory school grade 11-12 from the year 2004-2005 at Gedo senior secondary school in West Shoa Zone. He then joined Jimma University in 2006 and continued his education from the year 2006- 2008 and received BED in English in 2008. Then he employed as an English teacher in 2008 in West Hararghe Zone at Anchar secondary school. He had 2 years of teaching experience in secondary school of Anchar in West Hararghe Zone from the year 2009-2010, from the year 2011-2014 he was worked as primary school cluster supervisor in the Zone.

Then, he joined Haramaya University in 2014 and he got his Post graduate diploma in school leadership in 2015 and after graduation again he has worked as primary school cluster supervisor for 2 years from 2015-2016 in Anchar woreda primary schools and then had also worked as secondary school supervisor from the year 2016 for Six months and he joined the MA in School Leadership in summer program at Haramaya University in 2016 academic year to pursue a graduate degree. He is currently working as secondary school supervisor in Anchar woreda secondary schools in West Hararghe Zone.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all I would like to thank my thesis advisors from the bottom of my heart, my thesis Major Advisor dear Gemechu Aberea (Associate professor) and Co-Advisor Justin Sudhakar (PhD) for their unreserved guidance they provided me from the beginning to the completion of the study. I have a sincere appreciation for their constructive comments and democratic approaches of advising. Without their help, this research work could not have been accomplished successfully. My thanks are also goes to the Ministry of education and Oromia Regional State Education Bureau for giving me education opportunity to realize my pursuit of wisdom. Moreover, I am very grateful for Haramaya University College of Education and Behavioral Sciences' Staff members for their cooperation during my stay in the campus. I deeply indebted to my wife, Mache Nagash for her strongly encouragement and financial and moral support to pursue my education to complete my study.

Moreover, I extend my thanks to all of my friends and colleagues those who provide support for the successful completion of the study's multidirectional like Kefelo Gemechu, Abdulahi Badesso, Abiyot Worku, Mitiku Yigazu and Tamasgen Abdeta. Moreover, I would like to thank Anchar secondary school and Chelelaka preparatory school and Anchar woreda education office for their material and moral support they provide me throughout the course of study. Besides, my thanks extended to West Haraghe Zone all sampled Woreda/district Education officers, secondary school teachers, principals, supervisors, Vice principals, school improvement committee members and students representatives for their affection, contribution and encouragement they showed me during data collection for the accomplishment of the study.

Table of Contents

DEDICATION	iv
STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR	v
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xii
ABSTRACT	xiii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Research Questions	5
1.4. Objectives of the Study	5
1.4.1. General objective	5
1.4.2. Specific objectives	5
1.5. Significance of the Study	6
1.6. Delimitation of the Study	6
1.7. Limitations of the Study	7
1.8. Operational Definition of Key Terms	7
1.9. Organizations of the Study	8
2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITIRUTURE	9
2.1. Concept, the needs and Strategies of School Improvement Program and Characteristics of good schools	9
2.1.1. Concepts of school improvement program	9
2.1.2. The Need for School Improvement program	10
2.1.3. Characteristics of a good school	11
2.1.4. School Improvement program Strategy	11
2.2. School Improvement Domains and Its Elements	12
2.2.1. Learning and teaching domain	13
2.2.2. Student environment domain	13
2.2.3. Leading and managing domain	13
2.2.4. Community involvement domain	14
2.3. Principles of School Improvement Program	14
2.4. The Practices of School Improvement Program	15

2.5. The Roles of School leadership in the practices of School Improvement Program	17
2.6. Stages of School Improvement Program	18
2.6.1. Self-Assessment/Enquiry	18
2.6.2. Planning	19
2.6.3. Implementing	19
2.6.4. Monitoring	19
2.7. The Challenges of School Improvement Program Implementation	19
2.7.1. Resistance to change	21
2.7.2. The capacity of the school leader	21
2.7.3. Lack of commitment on the side of both leaders and teachers	22
2.7.4. Lack of stakeholders participation	22
2.7.6. Lack of educational input	23
2.8. Summary of the Review of Related Literature	23
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	25
3.1. Description of the Study Area	25
3.2. Research Design	26
3.3. Sources of Data	26
3.3.1. Primary sources	26
3.3.2. Secondary sources	27
3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	27
3.5. Data collection Instruments	29
3.5.1. Questionnaire	29
3.5.2. Interview guide	31
3.5.3. Document review	32
3.6. Procedures of the Study	32
3.7. Methods of Data Analysis	33
3.8. Ethical Considerations	33
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	34
4.2. The Practice of School Improvement Program implementation	39
4.2.1. Analysis of the respondents' response on the phases of school improvement Program	40
4.2.2. Analysis of the respondents response on the domains of School Improvement Program	47
4.3. Analysis of Respondents' Responses on the Roles and Responsibility of School Leaders in Implementing School Improvement Program	59

4.4. Analysis of the Respondents' Response on the Strategies Used to Implement School Improvement Program	65
4.5. Analysis of Respondents' Response on the Challenges of School Improvement Program Implementation	69
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	76
5.1. Summary	76
5.2. Conclusions	79
5.3. Recommendations	82
6. REFERENCES	85
APPENDICES	90

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1: Population,SampleSizeandsamplingTechniques	28
3.2: Reliability Statistics	31
4.1: Sex and Age of the Respondents	35
4.2: Level of Education and field of qualification of the	36
4.3: Having Training on SIP and Work Experience of the Respondents	37
4.4: Respondents' Response on the Phases of SIP Implementations	40
4.5. Analysis on the teaching learning domain of SIP	48
4.6. Analysis leadership and management domains	54
4.7: Analysis on Roles and Responsibility of School Leadership in Implementing SIP	59
4. 8: Analysis of Respondents Response on the strategies used to implement SIP	65
4.9: Analysis of Respondents Response on the Challenges of SIP Implementations	69

Practices and Challenges of School Improvement Program Implementation in Government General Secondary Schools of West Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the Practice and Challenges of School Improvement Program Implementation in secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone. In this study descriptive survey research design was used with both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis. In this Zone there are 17 districts; among these 9 of them were selected by using stratified random sampling techniques. For this study total populations size and total sample size were 474 and 356 respondents respectively. The total sample size included 167 teachers, 126 school leaders, 9 supervisors and 9 Student representatives and 9 district education officers as sources of information from the 9 selected secondary schools. The sampling techniques employed were stratified random sampling for teachers; purposive sampling techniques for school leaders, supervisors, district Education officer and student representatives. The collected data through close ended questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive statistical tools such as frequency, percentages; mean, weighted mean and standard deviation were used to analyze the data found. The data collected through open- ended questions, semi structured interview and document review were analyzed qualitatively by narration. Findings of the revealed that the phases and teaching learning domain of school improvement program were moderately implemented with a weighted mean value 2.65 and 2.71 respectively however leadership and management domain of the program was implemented at low level in the study area. Generally, it was found that the sampled schools were not performed well in the phases of School improvement program implementation and most of activities across the two domains were not fully implemented. This negatively affected the implementation of the program. Besides, the finding of the study indicated as there was gab on the side of school leaders in discharging their roles and responsibilities and using different strategies on the implementation of school improvement program with the weighted mean 2.38 and 2.42 respectively. Moreover, the study clearly showed the challenges of School Improvement Program implementation were lack of budget, learning facilities, lack of financial and material resources, lack of commitment on the side of teachers and school leaders, low capacity of teachers, inadequate block grant budget allocation by district education offices, lack of awareness, lack of community participation on SIP implementation, lack of technical skills of leaders which affect the implementation of school improvement program and in turn the teaching learning process and students' academic achievement with weighted mean 3.7 which indicates the seriousness of the problems. Hence it is suggested that School leaders needs discharge their responsibilities in implementing school improvement program and they have to use the strategy designed by Ministry of Education. School, district education offices, Zone Education offices Regional Education Bureau and Ministry of Education needs to provide continuous technical assistance for stakeholders and allocate budget and fulfilling school facilities and materials as to implement school improvement program.

Key words: school leaders, challenges, implementation, school improvement and practice.

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitations of the study, limitation of the study and definition of key terms.

1.1. Background of the Study

The rapid growth and change of the needs of the society, enforces schools to update their system in accordance with the growth and varying necessity of the society. Such increasing competitive environment in which schools operate forced them to raise standards and improve the quality of their service (Harris, 2005). In doing so, the management of change in education has become a topical issue of perennial interest in the field mainly, because of the key drivers like: developments in science, technology, politics, economies and educational practices (Morrison, 1998 and Stacey, 1993). As a result of this, schools should carry out the teaching and learning activity in a systematic and a well-designed manner, so as to improve student's learning ability and results. However, in our schools the focus areas that can enhance students' result were not identified and there was no systematic design to carry out these activities.

The Ministry of Education in collaboration with the regional states' experts collected the best practices of schools in the country and studying the experiences of other countries and started to implement SIP since 2007 (MoE ,2007). Moreover, traditional educational settings need to be changed in order to incorporate advanced technology in education (Harris, 2006). This shows us in the current world leading and managing change in educational institution setting requires a lot of innovations and inventions. This is because the current world is changing at a very high rate and without innovation and inventions as well as without its effective managements of educational institutions like secondary schools will lag behind. As a result, school improvement becomes one of the major educational initiatives that many countries have developed and implemented to realize the provision of quality education (Plan international, 2004).

From the educational reforms, the researcher focuses on practices and challenges of School Improvement Program (SIP) in West Hararghe Zone's government general secondary schools by focusing on its main domains teaching and learning and school leadership and management. The reason behind is that SIP is vital for us to cope up with the dynamic changing world and it helps us to satisfy the current needs of the generation, if it is practiced as per needed in our schools. In line with this idea, Harris and Daniel (2005) stated that school improvement is defined as a distinct approach to educational change that enhances student's outcomes as well as strengthens the school's capacity for managing improvement initiatives. Hopkins (2004) described school improvement as an appropriate response to the current pressures for educational reform that focuses both on the learning needs of students and on establishing the appropriate organizational conditions within the school.

According to MoE (2010), school improvement program is aimed to support schools in addressing the following four school domains: - Teaching and learning, School leadership and Management, Parents-community school relationship, and safe and healthy school environment. Assessing practices and challenges of school improvement program implementation in the schools with different school domains and self-assessment helps to improve the inputs and process of schools. This facilitates the teaching learning process of the school to promote academic performance of the students. However, Harries in Hopkins (2002) has noted the difficulty to change school management, arrangement and working culture as a challenge to implement school improvement program in developing countries. Thus, for the success of school improvement, it needs to identify the challenges so as to take corrective measures on time.

Moreover, various studies have been carried out on the implementation of school improvement program in government primary and secondary schools. Among these Dereje (2013), Isayas (2009), Teshale (2011), and Wudneh (2012) are some to be mentioned. The findings of many of these studies for example; Dereje (2013) and Isayas (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.

Moreover, according to Teshale(2011), the engagement of principals in teaching and learning and school leadership and management is in- adequate. In relation to the above, the researcher himself has also observed some of the problems explained above regarding the practices and challenges of SIP implementation in the secondary schools of West Haraghe Zone, while he was practicing his teaching and leadership roles and working in the selected area for around 10 years. In addition, as far as the researcher's knowledge is concerned, he has not got research conducted in the same title in the study area. These and other similar problems motivated the researcher to conduct a study on the specified title in the study area.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

School improvement is commonly recognized as an important process and has become the dominant approach to educational change which helps us to enhance quality of students' learning and strengthens schools' capacity for change (Hopkins, 2002). There is a problem of quality education in the world in general and in our country Ethiopia, in particular. As a result of this, to bring efficient access to quality education in the country Ethiopia introduced General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) in 2007.

This package consists of six pillars; namely, curriculum improvement program, teacher's development program, educational leadership performance and school improvement program (SIP), civic and ethical education program and information and communication technology expansion program. The school improvement program directive categorizes all school activities in to four major domains namely teaching and learning, school environment, School leadership and management and school community participation. These school entails of SIP are complex and interwoven. Proper implementation of the activity in each domain results positive impact on student learning and outcome. This requires collective efforts of all school stake holders including school leadership, teachers,

students, parents, communities, government and nongovernmental organizations (MoE, 2007).

It seems that there is a considerable gap between the role and responsibilities of school leadership stated in SIP directive and what they practice in the research setting. Moreover, various studies have been carried out on the implementation of school improvement program in government primary and secondary schools. Among these Mesele (2011) conclude that, lack of awareness on the program, poor level of participation of stakeholders from planning to evaluation of the program and also inadequate of educational finance, lack of furniture and other facilities and inadequate competency of leadership were influencing factors of SIP implementation. In supporting this Frew (2010) also stated that, the major problems that affected the implementation of SIP are: insufficient budget, lack of school facilities, limited support of community, and lack of the necessary awareness of stakeholders.

The studies by Mesele (2011) and Frew (2010) were conducted in the primary schools in Wolyita zone sodo zura and Jimma administrative town in primary schools respectively to assess the practices and challenges of SIP. However this study was conducted in secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone to assess the practices and challenges of SIP. Therefore, this study is different from the studies of Mesele, Frew and others explained above. First, the level of school the study conducted and the area of the study conducted make the research different the two studies. Secondly, this study was mainly focuses on the two main domains of SIP and its implementation strategies. Thirdly, this study was deal with the practice of SIP and also examines the challenges of SIP implementation. The researcher have not seen any research input that directly touch the phases of SIP, roles and responsibilities of school leaders in implementing the program and the strategies used to implement SIP were the new trend in this study.

In line with the above, the researcher himself has observed some of the problems regarding the practices and challenges of SIP implementation in the secondary schools of West Haraghe Zone when he was practicing his teaching and leadership roles and working in the selected area for 10 years.

Some of these were inadequate participation of stakeholders, lack of experience and skills among school principals, low coordination of school community to implement the program, lack of adequate budget and other. In addition, as far as the researcher's knowledge is concerned, he has not known about research conducted in the same title in the study area. These and other similar problems motivated the researcher to conduct a study on the specified title.

1.3. Research Questions

This study attempted to answer the following basic questions

1. What are the practices of SIP implementation in Government secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone administrations?
2. What are the challenges of SIP implementation in Government secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone?
3. To what extent different strategies of implementing SIP is employed in secondary schools West Hararghe Zone?
4. Do school leaders discharge their roles and responsibilities in implementing SIP in secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone?

1.4. Objectives of the Study

The study has the following general and specific objective to achieve at the end of the Study.

1.4.1. General objective

The general objective of this study was to assess the practices and challenges of SIP implementation in West Hararghe Zone's Government General secondary schools.

1.4.2. Specific objectives

Specifically, the study was to:

1. Asses the practices of SIP implementation in secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone.

2. Identify the challenges of SIP practices in West Hararghe Zone's Government secondary schools.
3. Asses the strategies used to implement SIP in West Hararghe Zone's secondary schools.
4. Examine the roles and responsibilities of principals in implementing SIP in West Hararghe Zone's secondary schools.

1.5. Significance of the Study

The study was believed to contribute to the improvement of the skills, knowledge and experience of the school leaders in implementing SIP and brings quality education to play great role in our country's development and it enables ones to keep up with the dynamic world and satisfy the demands of the current generation as per needed. It is significant for policy makers as it gives them the current position of the problem under the study in comparison to the policy set.

The study provides schools, Woreda Education Office (WEO) , Zonal Education Offices (ZEO), Oromia Education Bureau (OEB), Ministry of education(MoE), other stakeholders and researchers with information about the practices and challenges of SIP implementation as the researcher will put the study on line. As a result everybody can get its soft copy and its hard copy can be available in Haramaya University. Moreover, the study also helps researchers in provision of information as secondary data for future use that means the study will be made on line internationally and its hard copy is published and submitted to Haramaya University.

1.6. Delimitation of the Study

The study was conducted in Oromia regional state, in West Hararghe Zone. It was confined to seven woredas and one Administrative town by stratified sampling technique and delimited to nine government general secondary schools out of 34 secondary schools in West Hararghe Zone. By using the stratified random sampling techniques among the total 285 teachers, 167 teachers were selected and based on purposive sampling techniques, 9 principals, 9 school supervisors, 9 vice principals, 45 Department heads, 63

SIP Committees, nine students' representatives and 9 Woreda Education Officers were selected. The study was delimited to practices and challenges of SIP implementation. There are a number of issues to be raised in studying the practices of SIP in its broader sense in school. In addition, the study would not incorporate all aspects of four SIP domains.

Due to financial and time constraints this study is delimited to the practices of the two SIP domains such as teaching-learning, leadership and management domains, the four phases of SIP, roles and responsibilities of school leaders and strategies used in implementing SIP. The methods used to conduct the study were descriptive survey research design. The statistical tools used were frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation. Questionnaire, interview guide and document review were used as data collecting tools.

1.7. Limitations of the Study

The study was focused on only the two domains of SIP from the four domains because of time, resources and financial constraints. The other limitation of the study was that, some of the WEO and supervisors were busy in engaging in various meetings and works; it was not easy to get them for an interview. However, the researcher tolerated the problems and repeatedly communicated with them going to WEO and schools and conducted the interviews and attempted to make the study as complete as possible. Besides, there was reluctance of some teachers, School Improvement Committee (SIC) members, principals and department heads to fill and return the questionnaire by the time table set at the beginning. Latest books and written documents which deal with the practices and challenges of SIP in the secondary schools were not adequately available in the libraries of the University to which the researcher had easy access. Therefore, the result of the study should be considered with this limitation.

1.8. Operational Definition of Key Terms

Challenges are difficulties to implement SIP in the secondary schools of west Hararghe zones.

Government General Secondary schools is two years duration of general education ranges from grade 9 to 10 (MoE, 1994).

Implementation can be conceptualized as an intended change. It is the process of putting ideas and materials into practices.

Practice is the act of implementing an activity for the purpose of improving, mastering it. It is schools performance in implementing SIP.

School improvement program is a program which was launched by MoE from 2007 and being implemented in secondary schools that have four different school domains (MoE, 2007).

School leaders refer to only principals, vice principals, School improvement committees and department heads as they are the most responsible in administrative activities in the school in the context of this study.

1.9. Organizations of the Study

This thesis was organized in five chapters. The first chapter deals with the introduction which comprises of the background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation , limitation of the study, definition of key terms and organization of the study. Chapter two is the review of related literature. It consists of the basic concepts, explanations and research findings on school improvement contributed by various authors and researchers. Chapter three presents highlights of the research design and methodology used, source of data, sampling method and sampling size, instruments and methods of data collection as well as methods of data analysis. Chapter four is about presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data. Chapter five provides the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study. Finally, a list of references used in this study and relevant appendices are attached.

2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITIRUTURE

This chapter deals about the review of literatures that are closely related to the problem under study. As result, the chapter briefly discusses the understanding of scholars, local related studies and the voice of the researcher in the field about the concept of SIP, the need of SIP, characteristics of good school, domains and elements of SIP, principles of school improvement program, the practices of the SIP implementation, the roles of school leaders in SIP implementation, Stages of SIP, challenges of the SIP implementation, and finally the review related literature is summarized briefly.

2.1. Concept, the needs and Strategies of School Improvement Program and Characteristics of good schools

2.1.1. Concepts of school improvement program

The school improvement program is one of the major pillars of GEQIP that has been defined in different ways by different scholars. According to MacBeath (2006), 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 making schools better places for learning which relies on changes at both level and with class rooms, which in turn dependent on school being committed to fulfilling the expectation of children and their parents. It is a systematic approach that improves the quality of education (Plan international, 2004).

Moreover, according to (EIC, 2000), a school improvement plan is a road map that sets out the changes a schools needs to make to improve the level of students achievement and show how and when these changes will be made. The ultimate objective of the process is to improve student's 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. In general, as it was mentioned above, school improvement is a combination of planned, continual and coordinated efforts made both within and out of classroom and school levels to change factors that are related to students learning with the ultimate goal of maximizing the level of learners' achievement and school capacity to manage change.

According to Harris (2005), school improvement is defined as a distinct approach to educational change that enhances student's outcomes as well as strengthens the school's capacity for managing improvement initiatives. Hopkins (2004) further elaborated that school improvement is about raising student's achievement through focusing on the teaching and learning process and those conditions which support it. In supporting this idea, Jeilu (2010) states school improvement is an activity to improve the input and process in order to improve teaching learning and students result. In this context school improvement is not only about the outcome, but also the importance of input. school improvement is commonly defined as the general efforts to make schools better places for pupils to learn in and the distinct approach for educational change that enhance students outcome as well as managing change (Hopkins, 1994).

2.1.2. The Need for School Improvement program

School Improvement program is important to enhance the students' motivation to learn, reduce wastage and improve students' learning with the ultimate purpose of creating entrepreneur and researcher who can alleviate poverty (Temesgen, 2008). To make as such rationalities, the education system is in need of effective leadership at stake holders' commitment at all level in the ladder of education system. School improvement is an important aspect of the school system. It contributes a lot to the efficiency and the quality of the educational provision. As suggested in MoE (2007) school improvement helps to create a learning environment to all learners. In the area of globalization studies confirm that school improvement is the major concern of many countries including countries at better education quality and development.

Moreover, school improvement is essential to enhance the involvement of the parents and the community in the school activities and to improve the effectiveness of the school's

managements. School improvement is becoming an increasingly important future on educational land scope. It enables teachers to be responsive to the diverse learning needs of students in their teaching learning approaches. The importance of school improvement program is thus worldwide movement (MoE, 2007).

2.1.3. Characteristics of a good school

There are various characteristics of improved schools. According to CRESST (1994) a good school has strong and professional administrators and teachers, a broad curriculum available to all students a philosophy that says all children can learn if taught, coupled with high expectations for all students and school climate that is conducive to learning. A good school is safe, clean, caring and well organized. It has an organizing assessment system that supports good interaction, a high level of parent and community involvement and support.

Moreover according to EIC (2000), good schools are characterized by clear and focused vision of learning, safe and orderly school environment, climate of high expectations for students success, high level of students achievement through an emphasis on learning activities, have an instructional leadership, frequent monitoring of student progress and strong home school relations. Providing a quality of teaching and learning. Teachers are intended to provide rich, dynamic and motivated learning environments and various teaching styles. Moreover, they provide a balanced individual, group and whole class activities. Classroom practice should be developmental, open ended and incorporate real life experiences and students and teachers should be encouraged to self assess their individual and collective progress (MoE, 2007).

2.1.4. School Improvement program Strategy

Approaches to school Improvement can be varying across different schools. MoE (2002) affirmed that successful school Improvement can occur only when schools apply those strategies that best fit their own context and particular development needs. The basic assumption which can be obtained from the author explanation is that school improvement strategies will lead to cultural change through modifications of the school condition based on the school context. According to Hopkins (2005) the strategies of

school improvement implementation are: conducting systematical review and evaluation process; base focus of information. The SIP implementation cycle prepared by MoE is as indicated once the plan has been developed, implemented, monitored, and evaluated to make real change, the process needs to focus Specific priorities.

All area can be addressed in only planners considered basic strategies to identify the priorities. Points that effective planners of school improvement should include: The necessary information is available, clear, Precise channel of communication exist in all directions, Staff at all levels are committed to the program and its goals, the level of planning activity is clear for those who organize it, the various sections of the school function as effective teams with clear objectives so that they know what is required of them and the evaluation process is built in during the planning stages. School improvement is the process whereby schools undertaken a continuous cycle of self assessment. School improvement plan of one cycle should be designed for three years. In each of these years, school have to establish a goal statement, performance targets, areas of focus implementation strategies, indicators of success time line, responsibility for implementing strategies, check points for status updates, and opportunities for revision (Adelman's, et al, 2007).

2.2. School Improvement Domains and Its Elements

Schools as organization are established to educate citizens of nations. To achieve this concern, one should understand the characteristics of an effective school. The characteristics of effective school include: strong structural leadership; clear school mission and accompanying instructional program; high expectations for students; an orderly school learning climate; opportunity to learn and an emphasis on academic learning time; frequent monitoring of pupil progress, high degree of community involvement (MoE, 2007).

School improvement domains are key areas of concern for improvement activities. They describe the essential characteristics of an effective school in which its main focus is enhancing students learning outcome. To accomplish all these, school is in need of domains based on which they can operate effectively (Organization for Economic

Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2001a). School improvement domains are key areas of concern for improvement activities. They describe the essential characteristics of an effective school in which its main focus is enhancing students learning outcome. MoE (2011) classified school domains into four categories as follows.

2.2.1. Learning and teaching domain

The learning and teaching 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 experiences and how progress will be assessed to inform future actions. These elements describe how: teachers apply their contemporary and professional knowledge to establish highly effective learning environments teachers set expectations, plan for success and assess learning outcomes school curriculum design and delivery establishes explicit and high standards for learning (MoE, 2011).

2.2.2. Student environment domain

The student environment domain describes the promotion of positive and respectful relationships which are stable, welcoming and inclusive. In safe and productive learning environments students willingly engage and participate in the broad range of learning opportunities. They contribute to decisions about their learning and their contributions are valued. These elements describe how: quality learning environments are created to focus on student needs and foster potential skills and interest's schools create opportunities for students to develop into self-regulating learners within and beyond the classroom schools value participation, and encourage student expression of new knowledge and understanding (MoE, 2011).

2.2.3. Leading and managing domain

The leading and managing domain is concerned with communicating a clear vision for a school and establishing effective management structures. Leaders set directions and guide the school community in alignment of its purpose and practice. Effective leadership within the school is collegial, student centered and teacher focused, promoting a collective

responsibility for improvement. These elements describe how: school vision is collaboratively developed to be realistic, challenging and futures oriented leaders use reflective practices to appropriately manage people to achieve improvements to teaching and learning the school's leadership team demonstrates effective resources management to achieve results (MoE, 2011).

2.2.4. Community involvement domain

The community involvement domain describes the development of quality ongoing community partnerships and networks. Schools are responsive to community expectations, value diversity and encourage contribution. Positive futures and cultures of success are promoted as educational outcomes.

2.3. Principles of School Improvement Program

School improvement process is a systematic approach that follows its own principles. According to Abeya and Tamiru (2009), researches in the area developed a number of important principles that result in school effectiveness and excellence. Based on recent effort to improve schools and the school reform, basic principles that school leaders can adopt for improving their own schools are listed below the school has clearly stated mission or set off goals school achievement is closely monitored. Provisions are made for all students, including tutoring for low achievers and enrichment programs for the gifted. Teacher and administrators agree on what is good teaching and learning a general philosophy and psychology of learning prevail, emphasis on cognition is balanced with concern of students' personal, social and moral growth. Students are taught to be responsible for their own behavior.

Besides, teachers and administration expect students to learn and convey these expectations to students and parents, teachers are expected to makes significant contribution to school improvement, administrators give ample support, information and time for teacher enrichment, sense of teamwork prevails, there is inter disciplinary and inter departmental communication, incentives ,recognition and rewards are conveyed to teachers and administrators for their efforts on the behalf of the team and school mission

and the interest and needs of individual staff members are matched with the expectation of the institution (Abeya and Temiru,2009).

Moreover, the staff has the opportunity to be challenged and creative, there is a sense of professional enrichment and renewal, staff development is planned by teachers and administrators to provide opportunities for continuous professional growth, the school environment is safe and healthy, there is a sense of order in classrooms, parents and community members are supportive of the school and are involved in school activities. The school is a learning center for the large community. It reflects the norms and values of the community and the community sees the school as an extension of the community (Abeya and Temiru, 2009).

2.4. The Practices of School Improvement Program

School leaders are the main actor in practicing the management of educational change, those initiated internally by the school and introduced by the external bodies like ministry of education in order to keep up with the rapidly changing local and global environment. In further MoE (2002), the principal has to be knowledgeable and understand the of local, national and global trends; ways to build ,communicate and implement a shared vision strategic planning process; ways to communicate within and beyond the school, new technologies, their use and impact; leading change, creativity and innovation. As it is stated on (MoE, 2013), there are various types of educational changes that are particularly affect schools in Ethiopia and these change initiatives or programs have to be managed practically as per planned.

From these educational changes SIP is one of the major pillars of GEQIP that practiced in the secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone from 2007 even if it faced some challenges. So as to implement this program, in Ethiopia with the intension of improving the quality of education, much effort has been exerted. For instance, during supervision of the program many efforts were made to assess the experience of the best promoting school with in the country and experiences of other countries. Different guidelines and frame works were developed and awareness raising training was conducted at different level (MoE, 2007). Thus the secondary schools are expected to successfully implement the

school improvement program. However, SIP is a very wide spread phenomenon and a wide variety of improvement efforts can be found.

To be any importance for school effectiveness school improvement should use the school effectiveness, knowledge base and be directed to the application of this knowledge as focused intervention, emphasizing implementation, emphasis outcomes and evaluation techniques to practice school improvement program. Implementation in the first year: preparation the school improvement unit decides how to implement and guide the framework. The school improvement committees and all stakeholders of the school will help for implementation of the framework and school preparation; collect evidences regarding the school domains making system survey: regarding current school work efficiency assess the views of stakeholders (students, parents and teachers). The key stakeholders (teachers, students and parents) should participate in the annual school evaluation (MoE, 2007).

In this respect, the school improvement framework implementation will relate with teaching & learning activities; and prepare plan of the school, the improvement unit, using the result of evaluation will prepare plan for three years and annual plans. The plan incorporates goals of objectives and priorities of the activities and implementation of the school plan will start when the school improvement committee is believed that the plan prepared is ready for implementation. This means that using feedback transfer from the previous plan and new improved plan, follow-up and control the committee itself and other stakeholders will make followed up and control system, report of the implementation, the school improvement committee will present the annual report for the school community and for the responsible bodies (MoE, 2007).

Implementation in the second year: schools will evaluate their improvement regarding the goal sets and priorities differentiate where there are new priorities, select where there are standards which are not evaluated, lastly the committee will report the progress of the SIP. In the implementation of the third year, schools will control then improvement through evaluation; implementation of strategic plan will continue; making follow up and evaluation; schools activities and results will be evaluated and provided feedback by out of school unit using the concrete evidences of the schools by identifying their strengths

and weakness recommendation will be provided and feedback will be reported to the school (MoE, 2007).

2.5. The Roles of School leadership in the practices of School Improvement Program

There are different players in the management of effective implementation of school improvement process. The role that can be played by the school principal, school improvement committees and the school boards seeks much attention. School principal plays the great role in school improvement leadership. This is because with respect to school improvement, school principal is mandated to lead the committee as a chair person. Besides, school principals establish school target and vision statement for school improvement strategic planned approval forms of school reporting retained and made Available for external validation (MoE, 2006).

In turn, reporting regularly the progress of school improvement in the school to the district education office: Australian school improvement frame work farther out lines school improvement committee. According to, the frame work school improvement plan and implementation to the principal. The school board has also some roles to play in relation to school improvement. The major ones are establishing Strategic duration and priority for school on one hand and monitoring and review of school performance on the other. The school leadership and management have a key role in the implementation of school improvement program. Without the meaning full practices and activities of the leadership and management of the school, the implementation of the program is unthinkable (MoE, 2006).

Besides, principals are the key players in the improvement process. It is their role to ensure that all stake holders are given a voice and that they are listened to and their views respected. In order to facilitate active participation of the school community and ensure that contributions are managed effectively, the roles of leadership and management classified in to three main categories: communication, staff involvement and head teacher leadership (Galesburg, 2007).

School leadership should facilitate effective communication with all stake holders. It is the responsibility of the principals to clearly explain to all staff and students the process of school self assessment and the improvement process. In supporting this ideas Marlow and Minehira (2003) stated that principals must have an understanding of not only what is occurring in individual classrooms but also the relationship between teachers, students and content through the school. In effective schools where there is a strong emphasis on learning and positive student outcomes, principals play an important role.

2.6. Stages of School Improvement Program

To achieve high student achievement level, schools set goals for improvement and make decision on how and when this goal may be attained, construct positive situation for learning and increase the degree to which parents are involved in their children's learning at school and in home (EIC, 2000). School improvement by its nature is continuous process that can systematically put in to the reality. Earlier, the ministry of education SIP training manual (2006) set different steps that the school should pass through to understand the improvement effort. This encompasses initial stages such as formation of school improvement team, understanding the context and setting issue of concern and other phases like, preparation of school improvement plan implementation, follow up and monitoring the implementation as well as Evaluation (MoE, 2007). Besides, Ministry of education from 2010 has recognized four stages of the SIP cycle.

2.6.1. Self-Assessment/Enquiry

According to MoE (2010), self-Assessment is considered to assist as a valuable tool that will support schools in reflecting upon their effectiveness. Self-Assessment has been formulated to involve the school community in an in-depth evaluation of each of the fifteen Standards of the SIP framework for quality by forming a set of questions and rules that allow a school to most accurately describe its continuous improvement progress. In completing the report, a school identifies the evidence, data, information and documented results that validate that it is meeting each standard, and this can be used in 2nd stage to develop a three-year School Improvement Strategic Plan and one-year School Improvement action plan. Self-Assessment consists of six different information gathering

activities; which are teacher interview self-assessment, teaching observation self-Assessment, student tests self assessment, parent's self-assessment, the student's self-assessment and school records self assessment.

2.6.2. Planning

The second stage is concerned with analyzing the information gathered during the first stage. It also focuses on identifying the priority areas for improvement in the school each year for the next three years and then to list this information in a three-year school improvement strategic plan and the one-year annual action plan and these two activities are undertaken by the School Improvement Committee (MoE, 2010).

2.6.3. Implementing

The overall aim of the third stage of the SIP cycle is to successfully implement the Strategic Plan and Annual Action Plans. The School Improvement Committee will be responsible for ensuring that the Annual Action Plan is implemented successfully (MoE, 2010).

2.6.4. Monitoring

The overall aim of the fourth stage of the SIP cycle is to monitor the implementation of the Annual Action Plan. Woreda staff, as well as School Cluster Supervisors and School Improvement Committee members will be expected to monitor the implementation of the annual action plan (MoE, 2010).

2.7. The Challenges of School Improvement Program Implementation

There are various challenges of the management of educational change like school improvement program implementation in the school. According to Chinsamy (2002), challenges such as lack of common understanding among the practitioners on the program, complexity and instability or change in school factors like staff turnover, change in practices from education authority and public enrolment can affect sustainability of school improvement program. As Kotler (2003) noted that many of unsuccessful change efforts occur due to many shortcomings that include: failure to generate a sense of

urgency; failure to establish a powerful guiding coalition; no clear vision or strategy to direct the change effort; ineffective communication of the change vision to all stakeholders; failure to identify and eliminate obstacles to change; failure to create and recognize short-term achievements; celebrating success prematurely.

Furthermore, MoE (2007) states about the obstacles of SIP implementation Includes lack of commitment to depart from traditional practices, 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 creations among stake holders and absence of clearly stated role about the participation level of each stake holders .Similarly, Harris in Hopkins (2002) has noted difficult to change school management arrangement and working culture as challenge to SIP in developing countries. In our case too, school improvement was challenged by lack of necessary input, lack of commitment, low level of motivation, poor leadership and the like are expected challenges in the implementation of school improvement program.

As Khosa (1999) stated, 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 demanded by the curriculum. In addition, district support and monitoring functions are inadequate and in effective. Last but not least, community supports of schools are low. Lack of skilled educational leaders, resource scarcity, resistance of stakeholders to implement the initiatives and the other are also the challenges of SIP practices (MoE, 2011).

Besides, Berhan (2010), in his research on the implementation of school improvement program point out that the following challenges of SIP implementation: lack of school facilities, in sufficient budget, lack of necessary awareness, attitude and practical involvement as well as support among the community, teachers and students in SIP implementation. Moreover, he added staff turnover or shortage of human power, lack of trained teachers for special needs education, lack of rewards/ motivation for those who

deserve it, difficulty in understanding SIP guide lines and overcrowded class rooms were the challenges in implementing SIP. In general, the challenges of the implementation or practices of School Improvement Program can be

2.7.1. Resistance to change

Resistance to change is the act of opposing or struggling against modifications or transformations that alter the status quo in the workplace. In supporting this O'Connor (1993) describes resistance as a slow motion response to meet agreements or even a complete refusal to cooperate with change. When you want to change something different than before, employees are start to complain and resist the attempt of the change effort even though they know the old way of doing things is not working anymore .Because they are already used to the status quo and they feel in secure going out of their comfort zone. The same is true for the implementation school improvement program as it is an educational change initiative. Where there is a resistance on the practicing of the SIP, its implementation will be challenged (MoE, 2013).

2.7.2. The capacity of the school leader

School principals in Africa face serious of challenges because they are often appointed on the basis of successful record as teachers with an implicit assumption that this provides a sufficient starting point for school leadership (Tony and George, 2006). They also added that in developing countries where principals often receive no special management training, this leads school mangers to lead and manage without having skill and knowledge of leadership and management. In addition Tony and George (2006) illustrates that in Ethiopia , school principals are the ones who are either out standing in their teaching assignments or those who are popular among colleagues or their superiors. At regional level and even more so at worda level, school leadership capacity has been a serious problem , with shortage of qualified managers(MoE, 2008) in (Tesfaye, 2012). This indicates us, there is a skill/capacity gap on the side of school leaders or managers that enforces school leaders not to practice or implement school improvement program as per needed in their school.

The problem behind is, the practice of school principal assignment to be incumbent is still more confined to nomination from among teachers. This nomination of school principals usually takes place at Woreda or sub-city levels. Yet, the majority of school principals do not meet the standard set in the blue print by Ministry of Education which suggests graduates of the first degree for primary schools and master's degree holders for secondary schools (MoE, 2010) but the practical position of the principal is opposite of this ideas. Most of the school principal who are in the leading position did not get adequate educational training leadership. Even those who are trained also are not effective in leading the schools. Due to this reason they lack the ability to design vision and coordinate the school community so as to lead for the attainment of the goals (MoE, 2007).

2.7.3. Lack of commitment on the side of both leaders and teachers

As it is clearly known managing the school or any organization without an appropriate use of leadership styles may lead teachers to low commitment to their organization or school. For this reason lack of commitment on the side school leaders and teachers is one of the challenges that hinders the management of educational change in the school as per planned. Therefore it is logical to assume that principal's leadership style will have a significant relationship with the development of teacher's commitment (MoE, 2007).

2.7.4. Lack of stakeholders participation

Schools needs participation of all stakeholder in school plan (strategic and annual plan), but most of the time school plan is prepared by school principals. Therefore, the school mission and vision is not visible to all stakeholders and the intended student's outcome and ethical centered activities are not achieved without participation of stakeholder (MoE, 2007).

2.7.5. Lack of conducive environment in school

If students feel safe they attend their schooling with interest. So, schools should be conducive for all students (male and female) ethical improvement and academic

achievement. Therefore, schools should be prepared based on the needs and interest of students secured their school environment (MoE, 2007).

2.7.6. Lack of educational input

Due to the lack of commitment of school society, other stakeholder and non-government organizations are not enough to solve the problem of the schools by providing instructional materials and other financial supporting; currently schools lack the required educational inputs (MoE, 2007). Generally the above factors are the challenges of the implementation of SIP in the secondary schools. In conclusion, lack of qualified teachers required, lack of proper leadership training for school principals and poor commitment to enforce the school improvement program, defective strategic school improvement plan preparation and implementation and weak follow up monitoring and evaluation of the program implementation by all concerned are some of the major expected challenges in leading schools for improvement(MoE,2007).

2.8. Summary of the Review of Related Literature

Now a day, there are various educational changes in the world in general and Ethiopia in particular as the world is in a dynamic change and competition because of the technological advancements, the development of science, globalization and the failures of business and education quality. This requires effective management these changes unless and otherwise the organization lag behind. Especially, there is a problem of quality education in the world in general and in our country Ethiopia in particular. As a result of this, to bring efficient access to quality education in the country, Ethiopian introduced GEQIP that consists of six pillars including SIP that has four school domains namely teaching and learning domain, school environment, school leadership and management domain and school community in 2007.

The reason behind is that, school improvement program is a distinct approach to the management of educational change that enhances student's outcomes as well as strengthens the school's capacity for managing improvement initiatives and it is about raising student's achievement through focusing on the teaching and learning process and

those conditions which support it. School improvement process is a systematic approach that follows its own principles. For the success full implementation of the program, all stakeholders should have to involve in all of its stages namely self assessment, planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the program.

Specially, the school leadership and management have a key role in the implementation of school improvement program. Improved or good schools are characterized by clear and focused vision of learning, safe and orderly school environment, climate of high expectations for students success, high level of students achievement through an emphasis on learning activities, have an instructional leadership, frequent monitoring of student progress and strong home school relations. There are various challenges of school improvement program implementation in the school.

These are lack of awareness on the implementation and planning, lack of commitments on the side of school leaders and management, lack of adequate budget in order to implement the program, lack of stake holders' involvement on the activities of program, lack of skills and competences on the side of school principals, lack of adequate educational facilities, lack of continuous monitoring and supervision from the top managers and the resistance change is also another challenges of the implementation of SIP. So as to tackle these factors and challenges, effective and committed school leadership and management is required. Also it is advisable to use strategic approaches in order to solve these challenges and successfully implement the program as to achieve the goals of education quality that plays great role in the management of educational change as to cope up with the dynamic changing world.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with the description of the study area, research design, sources of data, population, sample size and sampling techniques, instruments of data collection, Procedure of data gathering, method of data analysis and ethical consideration.

3.1. Description of the Study Area

This study was conducted in Oromia Regional State in West Hararghe Zone, which is geographically located in the Eastern part of Ethiopia and is one of 19 Zones in the Oromia regional State. It is located between $8^{\circ} 40'20''.82''$ north latitudes and $40^{\circ} 50'55.86''$ east longitudes. It is the Zone with an estimated total population of 1,871,706 and it covers an estimated area of 1,506, 586 square kilometers. This zone divided in to 17 Woredas and 2 administrative towns. Coffee and ‘‘Chat’’ are the back bone of farmers as cash crops with significant agricultural and pastoral areas supporting of livelihood of the majority of the population (CSA, 2008).

Moreover, the agro climatic range includes lowland area kolla 20-30%, midland area weyna dega 50 %, and highland area dega 20-25%. Moreover, the dominant languages spoken in the zone are Afan Oromo and Amharic. Besides, Islamic and Christianity are the major religions practiced in the Zone. According to West Hararghe Zone Education office until 2016, there were 34 secondary schools, one governmental teachers’ college and university, around three private university and college and 14 preparatory schools. From these, the researcher conducted a research in Eight (8) Woredas’ and one Administrative town of West Hararghe Zone and in nine selective government general secondary schools which accounts 26.5% of West Hararghe Zone. These schools were named as:-Ancher secondary school, Chercher, Komona, Bordode, Gelemso, Miesso, Hirna, Bedeyi and Doba. The study did not include preparatory school for the manageability of the study.

3.2. Research Design

In this study, descriptive survey research design was employed with mixed approaches of data analysis because it enabled the researcher to make investigations with predictions, narration of events, comparisons, and drawing of conclusions based on the information obtained from relatively large and representative samples of the target population. In this regard, Cohen (1994) stated that descriptive survey research design as it helps to gather data at a particular point in time with the intention of describing the nature of existing condition or identifying standards against which existing conditions can be compared or determining the relationship that exist between specific events. The descriptive survey design is more effective in assessing the current practices in its natural setting. Moreover, descriptive research design makes the prediction of the future on the basis of findings on prevailing conditions possible. Likewise, Jose and Gonzales (1993) noted that descriptive research provides a better and deeper understanding of a phenomenon which helps as a fact-finding method with adequate and accurate interpretation of the findings.

3.3. Sources of Data

To gather relevant information from respondents the researcher used both primary and secondary source of data.

3.3.1. Primary sources

To obtain reliable and objective information, data were collected from various sources and efforts were made to cross check the reliability of the collected data. The researcher used primary source of data or information taken from principals, supervisors, teachers, School improvement Committee, Department heads, students' representatives (council) and Woreda education officer (WEO) through semi structured interviews and open ended and closed ended questionnaire were used to collect relevant information.

3.3.2. Secondary sources

Secondary sources of data were obtained through reviewing documents of the school such as school guide line, three year strategic plan and its implementation report, SIP implementation files and different reports that are used to indicate the practices of SIP in the selected government secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone in order to know practices and challenges of SIP implementation in selected governmental secondary schools of West Hararghe zone and other related literatures that assist the researcher to get necessary information for the study.

3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

In West Hararghe administrative Zone, there were 34 governmental General Secondary Schools. Out of these nine (9) of them were selected. To select the sample schools, the researcher used stratified random sampling technique. The way the researcher selected these nine schools was by dividing the schools in their geographical proximity (cluster) and making strata followed by simple random sampling based on geographical location and lower level educational administrations, with fair sample representation to address all areas of the administration.

The researcher classified the Zone in to four clusters or groups so as to select the schools. These were Bordade, Chiro, Tulo and Gelemso. From Bordode cluster Ancher, Badeyi and Bordade from Chiro cluster Miesso and Chercher were included, from Tullo cluster Hirna and Doba were included, and from Gelemsso cluster Gelemsso secondary school and Komona were included in the sample of the schools for the study. Besides, to determine the sample size of the teachers the following formula was used.

$$n_i = \frac{N_i}{1+N(e^2)}$$

Whereas Ni=total population

ni= sample size

e=sample error significant at $\alpha=0.05$

Source (Yemane cited in Gemechu and Teklemariam, 2016).

Table 3.1. Population, Sample Size and sampling Techniques

No	School Name	Teachers			Department heads			Principals & vice principals			Supervisors			SIP Committee			WEO			Student representatives		
		Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%	population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%	population	Sample	%
1.	Anchar	32	19	58	5	5	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	7	7	100	1	1	100	1	1	100
2.	Chercher	55	32	58	5	5	100	2	2	100	1	1	100			100	1	1	100	1	1	100
3.	Bordode	13	8	58	5	5	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	7	7	100	1	1	100	1	1	100
4.	Gellemso	50	29	58	5	5	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	7	7	100	1	1	100	1	1	100
5.	Doba	25	14	58	5	5	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	7	7	100	1	1	100	1	1	100
6.	Hirna	50	29	58	5	5	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	7	7	100	1	1	100	1	1	100
7.	Komona	20	12	58	5	5	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	7	7	100	1	1	100	1	1	100
8.	Miesso	20	12	58	5	5	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	7	7	100	1	1	100	1	1	100
9.	Badeyi	20	12	58	5	5	100	2	2	100	1	1	100	7	7	100	1	1	100	1	1	100
To tal	9(26.5%)	285	167	58	45	45	100	18	18	100	9	9	100	63	63	100	9	9	100	9	9	100
	Stratified random Sampling	Stratified random Sampling			Purposive sampling			Purposive sampling			Purposive sampling			Purposive sampling			Purposive sampling			Purposive sampling		

Source: WHZ Education office of 2017 report

Generally, as it was indicated on the above Table 3.1 the population, sample size and sampling techniques were briefly described. In accordance with the Table, the subjects of the study were teachers, principals, School improvement Committee, the department heads, WEO, student representatives and school supervisors. Stratified random sampling technique was used to select the teachers from each government secondary school because it is different strata and it is from different schools. Purposive sampling technique was used for the selection of the principals, SIC, Department heads, WEO, students' representatives and Secondary school supervisors because the number of their population was relatively small and the data collected from them is more valuable.

3.5. Data collection Instruments

To collect relevant data from respondents the researcher was used the following data collection instruments.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

Questionnaire is commonly used to gather data for descriptive research. To gather the appropriate information about the current practices of SIP and its challenges in West Hararghe Zone secondary schools, questionnaires were prepared for 167 teachers and 126 school leaders including 63 SIP Committees, 45 Department heads, 9 principals and 9 vice principals to assess the practices and challenges of SIP implementation in the zone. The questionnaire was prepared by referring to the SIP manual, school improvement plan, process of planning and the selected or established standards set by SIP in self assessment format. Fifty three (53) closed ended and six (6) open ended items were prepared for 167 teachers and 126 school leaders such as 63 SIP Committees, 9 principals, 9 vice principals and 45 Department heads, totally for 293 respondents.

All of the questionnaires were written in English as the researcher believes that the respondents could understand the items. Here five (5) point likert scale items were used for respondents to know their feelings about the practice and challenges of SIP in secondary schools of the zone. Item scores for each category were arranged under five rating scales. The range of rating scales were strongly agree =5, agree =4, undecided =3,

disagree =2 and strongly disagree =1. For analysis purpose, the above with 5 rank responses of closed-ended questionnaires were grouped and labeled into three categories i.e. agree, undecided and disagree. In categorizing the rating scales, the frequency and percentage results of 'strongly agree' and 'agree' were combined into 'agree' and the results of 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree' merged to 'disagree. The mean value was interpreted as > 3.5 agree 2.5-3.5 undecided (moderate), and < 2.5 (disagree). Moreover, open ended questionnaire was used so as to provide opportunity to express their feelings, perceptions, problems and intentions related to the practices and challenges of SIP implementation in secondary schools of the zone. The questionnaire had seven(7) parts to get necessary information about background information of the respondents, the practice of SIP through the stages of SIP implementation, assessing the domains of SIP implementation by focusing on teaching and learning and school leadership and management domains, the roles and responsibilities of school leaders in implementing SIP , the strategies used to implement SIP, the challenges of implementing SIP and the suggested solutions for the challenges of SIP implementation.

Reliability and validity test

First draft of the questionnaire was checked by making pilot test because the main objective of conducting pilot test is to check the reliability and validity of the questionnaires before giving to the actual study. The pilot test was carried out at Chorora secondary school which found in Anchar woreda which was not included as a sample schools and respondents in the actual study. The researcher gave orientation for 14 teachers and 14 school leaders such as 7 SIP committees, 5 department heads, 1 principal and 1 vice principal about the objective of the study and how to answer the questions. Totally, 28 respondents were taken for answering the questionnaire. Then, the responses of the respondents were put in to SPSS to test the reliability of the items with Cronbach's-Alpha. The Cronbach's Alpha value for pilot test was 0.884 which is good, showing items in each construct were measuring a similar concept. As suggested by Cronbach cited by Tech-Hong and Waheed, (2011), the reliability coefficients between 0.70-0.90 are generally found to be internally consistent. The results of reliability test of the items were summarized as in the following Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Reliability Statistics

No	Variables	Numbers of items	Cronbach's Alpha Value
1	Items on the phases of SIP	10	0.829
2	Items on the teaching learning Domain of SIP	10	0.906
3	Items on the Leadership and Management Domain	8	0.748
4	Items on the Roles and Responsibility of School leaders in implementing SIP	8	0.831
5	Items on the Strategies used to Implement SIP	8	0.733
6	Items on the Challenges of SIP Implementation	9	0.782
7	Total Reliability Coefficient	53	0.884

Then the content validity was reviewed by the researcher's major and co- advisor and one teacher of preparatory school and one WEO expert. Then necessary corrections and amendments were made based on their comments, suggestions and feedback. The reason behind is according Charles(1995) validity is the most critical criterion and indicates the degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure, but a measuring instrument is reliable if it provides consistent results.

3.5.2. Interview guide

Semi structured type of interview was used to obtain further information from nine student representatives, 9 Secondary School Supervisors and 9 District Education Officers by taking the same ideas from the questionnaire. For each of these respondents nine similar items was prepared and 30 minutes was given for each interviewer. Moreover, interview schedule was developed based on the interest and willingness of the interviewees and then the interview was conducted to get supplementary information for the study. The interview was conducted in their respective schools and offices respectively. During the interview, the researcher was used audio tape recorder and note taking to record and take the answer of the respondents respectively.

3.5.3. Document review

The researcher reviewed different documents such as school guide line, files and different reports that were used to indicate the practices of SIP implementation in the selected government General secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone. The researcher was used it in order to cross check with the existing reality.

3.6. Procedures of the Study

The researcher used the following procedure to assess the practices and challenges of the SIP implementation in the selected secondary schools of west Hararghe zonal Administrations. First of all the researcher was established the basic question of the study on which questionnaire was designed. Secondly, structured questionnaires for teachers and school leaders like SIP Committees, principals, vice principals and Department heads were developed and pilot tested. After checking the items reliability and validity by using SPSS version 21 computers program, necessary corrections and amendments were made and then distributed to the sampled respondents. On the other hand interview guide and document review were prepared and interview schedule for, Secondary school supervisors, students' representatives and WEO were arranged based on their interest and used to collect information from the respondents.

Then the researcher took letter of cooperation from Haramaya university department of EDPM. After that he distributed official letter requesting cooperation and support to respective schools and WEO to access primary and secondary data. Thirdly, during the time of gathering primary and secondary sources of data, necessary orientation was given by the researcher. Hence the researcher first collected quantitative and qualitative primary sources of data and finally the secondary sources of data were followed. In general, the researcher followed the necessary data collection procedure to increase validity and reliability of the study. In further due attention was given to analyze relevant reviewed literature and the intended data to be collected.

3.7. Methods of Data Analysis

The researcher collected both quantitative and qualitative data from the respondents. Then the quantitative data collected through close ended questionnaires were organized and tabulated. The characteristics of the respondents were analyzed by using descriptive statistics like frequency and percentage. The quantitative data collected from teachers and school leaders like SIC, department heads, principals and vice principals were analyzed by using descriptive statistics like mean, weighted mean and standard deviations. This method of data analysis was employed for all of the first four basic questions of the study. The scores of each item was organized and imported in to SPSS computer program version 21 to get the mean values, weighted mean, standard deviation.

The mean score was used to interpret the data collected by the questionnaires and standard deviations was also employed to indicate whether there was a variability or not on the responses of the respondents. Qualitative data obtained from document review, semi structured interview and open ended questionnaires were analyzed by narrating and describing in words and presenting it. This was employed for the last basic question of the study. Finally, the results of the discussion was summarized and concluded to come up with recommendations.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

To conduct this research, supportive letters from the department of educational planning and management was written from Haramaya University. After receiving supportive letter from the department, the researcher moved to the study area and contact with principals, SIP Committees, teachers, secondary school cluster supervisors, Department heads, students' representatives and Woreda education officers to get their willing and to arrange their convenient time to the questionnaire and interviews. In the study, the researcher was made the purpose of the study clear in the introduction part of the questionnaire and interview guide to the respondents, and confirmed that their confidentiality was protected. Finally they were informed of the information obtained from the respondents; the data obtained was used for research purpose only.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter deals with the data analysis, interpretation and discussion of the results. To this effect it contained two main parts. The first part deals with the characteristics of the sample population involved in the study and Part two of this chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the main data in the study. The purpose of this study was to assess the practices and challenges of SIP implementation in government secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State. To accomplish this purpose, quantitative and qualitative data were gathered by using the data gathering instruments such as questionnaire, interview and document reviews. The data gathered collected by using the document review and interview was believed to support the quantitative data gathered by questionnaire. One hundred Sixty seven (167) copies of questionnaires for teachers and one hundred twenty six (126) school leaders including forty five for department heads ,sixty three for school improvement committees and nine for principals and nine for vice principals were distributed.

When we see the returned rate of questionnaire 155 copies from teachers and 126 copies from school leaders including 45 from department heads, 63 from school improvement committees, nine from vice principal and nine from vice principals were returned back successfully. However, among the distributed questionnaire 12(7%) from teachers were not returned. From the total questionnaires of 293 distributed, 281(93.00%) copies of questionnaires were collected, rated and analyzed statistically. Besides, nine secondary school supervisors, nine students' representatives and nine WEO were interviewed as per planned. Also the documents of nine secondary schools that related with the implementation of SIP were reviewed based on the checklist prepared for this purpose.

4.1. Background of the Respondents

This section includes the background information of the respondents. There were seven types and two groups of respondents asked to tell their background information. The detail characteristics of the respondents were indicated in Table 4.1

Table 4.1: Sex and Age of the Respondents

Variables	Respondents																	
	Teachers				School leaders													
No	Characteristics	F	%	Principals		Vice principal		Department heads		SIC		WEO		Supervisors		Student Council		
				F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	
1	Sex	Male	127	81.9	9	100	9	100	39	86.6	43	68.3	9	100	8	88.8	6	66.6
		Female	28	18.1	-	-	-	-	6	13.4	20	31.7			1	11.2	3	33.4
		Total	155	100	9	100	9	100	45	100	63	100	9	100	9	100	9	100
2	Age	<25	2	1.3	-	-	-	-			2	3.2					9	100
		25-35	143	92.4	8	88.8	7	77.7	38	84.4	40	63.4	6	66.6	7	77.7		
		35-45	8	5.2	1	11.2	2	22.3	7	15.6	8	12.7	3	33.3	2	22.3		
		>45	2	1.3	-	-	-	-			13	20.7						
		Total	155	100	9	100	9	100	45	100	63	100	9	100	9	100	9	100

Note: f=frequency /numbers of respondents, SIC= School improvement Committees and WEO=Woreda Education Officers

As one can see from Table 4.1 of item one, about 127 (81.9%) of teachers, 9(100%) of principals, 9(88.9%) of supervisors), 39(86.6%) of department heads, 34 (75.5%) of students' representatives, 43(68.3%) of school improvement committees and 9(100%) of WEO ,9(100%) of vice principals were males and about 28(19.1%) of teachers, 1(11.1%) of supervisors), 6 (13.4 %) of department heads, 11(24.5%) of students' representatives, and about 20(31.7%) of SIC were females . Moreover, in Table 4.1 item 2, also indicated that about 2(1.3 %) of teachers, 2(3.2%) of SIC,41(91.1%) of age range was below 25 years, 145(93.5%) of teachers, 8(88.8%) of principals, 7(77.7%) of supervisors, 38(84.4%) of department heads, 40(63.4%) of SIC, 4(8.9%) of students' representatives, 6(66.6%) of WEO and 7(77.7%) of vice principals age range was between 25 and 35 years ,about 8(5.2%) of teachers, 1(11.2%) of principals, 2(22.3%) of supervisors, 7(15.6%) of department heads, 8(12.7%) of SIC, 3(33.4%) of WEO and 2(22.3%) of vice principals age range was between 25 and 35 years and about 13(20.7%) of SIC age range was 45 years and above.

As it was clearly indicated on Table 4.2 below all most all of the school leaders in the study area were not specialized their field of studies in EDPM. This itself negatively affected the implementation of SIP in the sampled secondary schools of the zone.

Regarding the educational level of the respondents as stated on Table 4.2 , about 23(36.5%) of SIC were certificate holders. 2(1.3%) of teachers and 18(28.8%) of SIC were diploma holders, 149(95.8%) of teachers , 8(88.8%) of principals, 7(77.7%) of secondary school supervisors, 43(93.6%) of department heads, 11(17.5%), 9(100%) of WEO and 9(100%) of vice principals were first degree holders, 1(1.5%) of SIC, 2(23.3%) of supervisors, 2(4.4%)of department heads and about 1(11.2%) of the principals were MA/MSc holders where as 10(15.7 %) SIC and about 45(100%) of students' representatives were grade 9 and 10.

Table 4.2: Level of Education and field of qualification of the Respondents

Variables		Respondents																
		Teachers		School leaders				Department heads		SIC		WEO		Supervisors		Student council		
No	Characteristics	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%	F	%	F	%	
3	Field of specialization	EDPM	-	-	1	11.2					1	1.5	2	22.3	2	22.3	-	-
		Other subjects	155	100	8	88.8	9	100	45	100	62	98.5	7	77.7	7	77.7	-	-
		Total	155	100	9	100	9	100	45	100	63	100	9	100	9	100	-	-
4	Level of Education	Grade9-10 Certificate	2	1.3	-	-	-	-			2	3.2					9	100
		Diploma	143	92.4							23	36.5						
		Degree	2	1.3							18	28.8						
		MA/MSc	149	95.8	8	88.8	9	100	43	93.6	9	17.5	9	100	8	88.8		
		Other	4	2.9	1	11.2			2	6.4	1	1.5			1	11.2		
Total	155	100	9	100	9	100	45	100	63	100	9	100	9	100	9	100	9	100

Note: f=frequency /numbers of respondents, SIC= School improvement Committees and WEO=Woreda Education Officers

Table 4.3: Having Training on School Improvement Program and Work Experience of the Respondents

Variable	Respondents																	
	Teachers		School leaders				Department heads				WEO		Supervisor		Student council			
N	Characteristics	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
5	Training on SIP	Yes	-	-	3	33.4					1	23.8	2	22.3	3	33.4	-	-
		No	155	100	6	66.6	9	100	4	100	4	76.2	7	77.7	6	66.6	-	-
		Total	155	100	9	100	9	100	4	100	6	100	9	100	9	100	-	-
6	Experience	0-5	49	31.6	2	22.3	6	66.6	3	68.8	5	80.9	3	33.4			9	100
		6-10	60	38.7	7	77.7	3	33.4	1	26.6	1	19.1	6	66.6	7	77.7		
		11-15	37	23.9					2	4.6					2	22.3		
		16 & above	9	5.8														
		Total	155	100	9	100	9	100	4	100	6	100	9	100	9	100	9	100

In further, as one can see from Table 4.3 of item one, about only 24(19.04%) of school leaders/managers had training on SIP implementation and 122 (80.96%) of them were not trained in SIP implementation. This revealed as there was a shortage of training in practicing or implementing SIP in the sampled secondary schools of west Hararghe Zone. This affects negatively the process of teaching learning process. In line with this, Donaldson (2007) revealed that school leaders exert influence on teachers and teaching practice because of both their role in motivating teachers and the collegial professional climate they create. This shows us that trained personnel could do more.

In case of the work experience of the respondents, 49(31.6%) of teachers, 4(44.4%) of principals, 31(68.8%) of department heads, 51(80.9%) of SIC, 9(100%) of students' council, 6(66.6%) of WEO and 6(66.6%) of vice principals had a work experience between 0 and 5 years, 60(38.7%) of teachers, 5(55.6%) of principals, 12(26.6%) of department heads, 12(19.1%) of SIC, 7(77.7%) of secondary school supervisors, 3(33.4%) of WEO and 3(33.4%) of vice principals had a work experience between 6 and 10 years, 37(23.9%) of teachers, 3(33.4%) of secondary school supervisors and 2(4.6%) of department heads respondents had a work experience between 11-15 years and 9(5.8%) of teachers had work experience above 16 years.

4.2. The Practice of School Improvement Program implementation

To assess the practices of SIP implementation status in the sampled schools, this study assessed different activities that related with the four phases /stages of SIP. In doing so 10 items likert rating scales were prepared and distributed for the respondents so as to give their degree of agreement on the implementation of the stages. Besides, from the four domains of SIP the first two domains of the program that is 10 likert rating scale of items of teaching learning and eight items of the leadership and management domain of SIP were prepared and distributed to the respondents. Item scores for each category were arranged under five rating scales. The range of rating scales were strongly agree =5, agree =4, undecided =3, disagree =2 and strongly disagree =1. For analysis purpose, the above with 5 rank responses of closed-ended questionnaires were grouped and labeled into three categories i.e. agree, undecided and disagree. In categorizing the rating scales, the

frequency and percentage results of 'strongly agree' and 'agree' were combined into 'agree' and the results of 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree' merged to 'disagree'. The mean value was interpreted as > 3.5 agree 2.5-3.5 undecided (moderate), and < 2.5 (disagree).

4.2.1. Analysis of the respondents' response on the phases of school improvement Program

According to MoE (2010) it was agreed that a SIP guideline which has the four stages of SIP should be developed to fully understand the strengthened strategic planning process to realize improved student results. In relation to this, the four stages of SIP should be conducted in order to achieve the desired objective. The four stages of the SIP cycle are self-assessment, planning, implementation and monitoring. Accordingly in this section the researcher presented and discussed the practices of SIP implementation by touching the implementation status of the four phases or stages of school improvement program implementation. Hence the responses of teachers and school leaders' respondents' response on each and every items were discussed in detail in order to assess the practice of SIP implementation in sampled secondary schools of West Haraghe Zone because the researcher believed as that practicing these SIP phases in our schools implies improving the schools that results the improvement of students academic achievement the main objectives of SIP. For the respondents' questionnaire which had five rating-scales were attached in order to get the degree of their agreement on the implementation of the stages. The result was summarized in the Table 4.4.

As it was revealed on item 1 of Table 4.4, respondents were requested to explain their level of agreement on conducting self- enquiry continuously in the implementation of SIP. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.50$, $m_2=3.19$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and school leaders were not decided on the self enquiry that have been conducted continuously in the school regarding SIP implementation. However the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.929$, $Std_2=1.194$) was clearly shown us there was some variability between the group. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.81$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not

decided on the self enquiry that have been conducted continuously in the school regarding SIP implementation.

Table 4.4: Respondents Response on the Phases of School Improvement Program Implementation

No	Items	Teachers N= 155		School leaders N= 126		W.M
		M	SD	M	SD	
1	The self-enquiry was conducted continuously in the school on SIP implementation	2.50	1.929	3.19	1.294	2.81
2	The school actively involved PTA, KETB, SIC & other stakeholders in the self-enquiry stage of SIP.	2.28	1.023	3.17	1.205	2.68
3	The level of school performance on SIP implementation is identified in a good manner.	1.92	1.038	2.79	1.168	2.31
4	The school has prepared the SIP implementation plan as it is indicated on the SIP guideline of MoE.	2.02	0.943	2.94	1.331	2.43
5	The school has three years SIP strategic plan, one year and properly designed action plan for SIP implementation	3.55	1.191	3.94	1.071	3.73
6	The school leader properly ensures the necessary resource for the implementation of SIP plan.	2.95	1.229	2.84	1.255	2.90
7	The implementation of SIP plan was communicated in a good manner for the community.	1.86	0.950	2.79	1.155	2.30
8	The woreda education office and Secondary school supervisors are providing necessary support for the implementation of SIP.	2.05	0.959	2.82	1.347	2.44
9	The school conducted regular monitoring and evaluation for the successful implementation of SIP.	2.48	1.113	1.83	0.913	2.19
10	There is a habit of providing feedback on the implementation of SIP.	3.20	1.215	3.42	1.236	3.31

Key: M=mean SD =standard deviation Df = Degree of freedom, W.M=Weighted mean, the mean value > 3.5 agree 2.5-3.5 undecided (moderate), and < 2.5 (disagree).

This shows that the respondents did not believe on whether self enquiry was carried out continuously on the SIP implementation. Moreover, the data collected from document review reveals that in all observed schools three year school improvement plan was developed by the school directors. Besides, their activities do not involve key stakeholders

and self-evaluation of schools and prioritizing problems. However, MoE (2006) suggested that school self-evaluation is the starting point to draft school improvement plan, as it gives direction to what issues should be addressed first and followed based on the priority given by school leaders, students, parents and teachers.

From this it can be concluded that there is no school self-evaluation during preparation of strategic plan in sample schools. Hence, it is clear that inadequate self-evaluation in SIP planning was taken as one of the major factors that negatively affects implementation of SIP. In general, from the above response we can conclude that the status of conducting self enquiry in the secondary schools of the study area was low.

As stated on Table 4.4 item2, the respondents were asked to show their agreement on whether the school actively involved PTA, KETB, SIC & other stakeholders in the self-enquiry stage of SIP. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.28$, $m_2=3.17$) of the respondents were clearly identified that most of the teachers were disagreed and school leaders were not decided on whether the school actively involved PTA, KETB, SIC and other stakeholders in the self-enquiry stage of SIP. Besides, the computed standard deviation ($Std1=1.023$, $Std2=1.205$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the group. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.68$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on the actively involvement of PTA, KETB, SIC & other stakeholders in the self-enquiry stage of SIP implementation.

Moreover, the document reviews carried out in sampled schools of study area confirm that the presence of self – enquiry tools as document of the school but it was not carried out in a continuous ways in the sampled schools. In further, the data obtained from interview held with WEO, supervisors and student council indicated that the participation of PTA, KETB, SIC and other stakeholders in a self-enquiry phase of SIP was not adequate. The school improvement committee members were not functional as per needed and they did not conduct regular meeting and discussion on SIP. This needs great attention from all concerned bodies in the sampled study area. In line with this, MoE (2012) suggest that active involvement of SIC members in self-enquiry is crucial to run the implementation of SIP effectively.

From Table 4.4 of item 3, the respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on whether the level of school performance on SIP implementation is identified in a good manner or not. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=1.92$, $m_2=2.79$) of the respondents were clearly identified that majority of the teachers were disagreed and most of the school leaders were not decided /uncertain on the level of school performance that have been identified in a good manner on SIP implementation. Besides, the computed standard deviation ($Std1=1.038$, $Std2=1.168$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the group. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.31$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on identifying the level of school performance on SIP implementation in a good manner.

This means there was a problem of identifying the level of SIP implementation by different ways like conducting self enquiry, monitoring and evaluation. However, from the computed Std of the respondents as it was stated above, it was identified that there was some variability between the respondents on identifying the level of school performance on SIP implementation. Besides, the information found from WEO, secondary school supervisors and student council during the interview session and document review of sampled secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone generally indicated that the low status of identifying the performance level of SIP implementation. Therefore, from the above response one can conclude that the level of identifying school performance in the implementation of SIP was relatively low.

As it was revealed on item 4 of Table 4.4, respondents were requested to explain their level of agreement on whether the school has prepared the SIP implementation plan as it is indicated on the SIP guideline of MoE. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.02$, $m_2=2.94$) of the respondents were clearly identified that the majority of the teachers were disagreed and most of the school leaders were not decided on whether the school has prepared the SIP implementation plan as it is indicated on the SIP guideline of MoE. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.43$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on the SIP implementation plan that have been prepared as it is indicated on the SIP guide line of MoE. From this result one can understand as there was a problem of preparing SIP plan as per the MoE guide line in the

sampled schools. However the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=0.943$, $Std_2=1.331$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the issue. In addition to this, the document reviews carried out in sampled schools of study area confirm that the presence of SIP implementation plan as a tools as document of the school but most of the plans were not prepared as per the SIP guideline of MoE.

In case of item 5 of Table 4.4 above, the respondents were requested to show their degree of agreement on the presences of three years strategic SIP plan, one year plan and properly designed action plan for SIP implementation. Hence, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=3.55$, $m_2=3.94$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and school leaders were agreed on the presences of three years strategic SIP plan, one year plan and properly designed action plan for SIP implementation.

Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.73$) of the respondents were indicated that they were agreed on the presences of three years strategic SIP plan, one year plan and properly designed action plan for SIP implementation. Similarly the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.191$, $Std_2=1.071$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the issue. Moreover, the information obtained from document reviews of sample school indicates the presences of SIP strategic plan, yearly plan and designed action plan within most of the school; it is available within seven out of nine schools' document reviewed as a document of the school but it was not implemented as per planned.

As depicted in Table 4.4 of item 6, the respondents were requested to show their degree of agreement on the status of ensuring the necessary resource for the implementation of the SIP plan. Accordingly, it was shown that the computed mean ($m_1=2.95$, $m_2=2.84$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and school leaders were not decided on ensuring the necessary resource properly for the implementation of the SIP plan by the school leaders. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.90$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not sure on ensuring the necessary resource properly for the implementation of the SIP plan by the school leaders. Similarly the computed standard

deviation ($Std_1=1.229$, $Std_2=1.255$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the issue.

Regarding resource, literature revealed that school improvement planning can only lead to genuine and profound change if schools have at least a minimum level of resources to work with and without such resources, the school improvement program could become de-motivating (MoE, 2010). As a result of this school leaders should do all their best in order to insuring the necessary resources for the implementation of SIP.

With respect to item 7 of Table 4.4, the respondents were requested to show their agreement whether the implementation of SIP was communicated properly for the community. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=1.86$, $m_2=2.79$) of the respondents were clearly identified that the majority of the teachers were disagreed and most of the school leaders were not decided on the implementation of SIP that have been communicated properly in the school for the community. Besides, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.30$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on the implementation of SIP was communicated properly for the community. However the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=0.950$, $Std_2=1.155$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups.

Moreover, as shown in Table 4.4 of item 8, the respondents were asked to give their agreement on whether the WEO and secondary school supervisors are providing necessary support for the implementation of SIP. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.05$, $m_2=2.82$) of the respondents were clearly identified that the majority of the teachers were disagreed and most of the school leaders were not decided on whether the WEO and secondary school supervisors are providing necessary support for the implementation of SIP. Besides, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.44$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on the whether the WEO and secondary school supervisors are providing necessary support for the implementation of SIP. However the computed standard deviation ($Std=0.959$, $Std_2=1.347$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups.

This shows that the low provision of technical support in the implementation of SIP by Woreda education office and secondary school supervisors. The information obtained from the interview guide held with WEO and secondary school supervisor indicated that there was a provision of technical support on the implementation of SIP. But it was inadequate because most of the time they were busy in different routine works. However, the MoE (2011) has set different activities to be done by Woreda Education Office and school supervisors to provide technical support to the implementation of the SIP.

Accordingly, the WEO is responsible for the success of the school improvement program in each Woreda. It is also responsible in organizing Woreda School Improvement Program Training Workshop and selecting three representatives from each School to attend the Woreda School Improvement Program Training Workshop. Additionally, it provides support to Schools and monitors the School Grants Program. But from the result of the study, the WEO and supervisors were not providing support and monitor the SIP implementation as per needed in the sampled schools of the Zone

As it was reflected on Table 4.4 of item 9 above, the respondents were asked to give their agreement on whether the school conducted regular monitoring and evaluation for the successful implementation of SIP. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.48$, $m_2=1.83$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and school leaders were disagreed on monitoring and evaluation that have been conducted regularly in the school regarding the successful SIP implementation. Besides, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.19$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on monitoring and evaluating about conducting regularly for SIP implementation. However the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=0.113$, $Std_2=0.913$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups. Generally, this data shows that there was a great gap in conducting regular monitoring and evaluation for the implementation of SIP in the sampled schools.

As it was reported on Table 4.4 of item 10, the respondents were asked to reveal their agreement on whether there is a habit of providing feedback on the implementation of SIP by all concerned bodies. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean

($m_1=3.20$, $m_2=3.42$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and school leaders were not decided on feedback that have been provided continuously by all concerned bodies regarding the SIP implementation. Moreover, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.31$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on feedback provision regularly on SIP implementation. Similarly, the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.215$, $Std_2=1.236$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups.

This interpretation deduced to the status of the practice of SIP implementation in contribution to communicating the implementation of SIP plan properly for the community, actively involving PTA, SIC, KETB and other stakeholders in self enquiry phase of SIP, conducting regular monitoring and evaluation for the implementation of SIP, identifying the level of school performance on SIP implementation and conducting self-enquiry in progress on SIP implementation was not practiced as per needed. Therefore, it needs great attention from all concerned bodies for the practices of SIP implementation through the assessment of SIP phases.

4.2.2. Analysis of the respondents response on the domains of School Improvement Program

As indicated in review of related literature there are four domains or focus areas for school improvement program (MoE, 2006), which are supposed to enhance students' achievement and ultimately improves quality of education. This part discusses the major activities that should perform to bring about school improvement. Therefore, in this respect, the extent of implementation on the selected two domains namely; teaching-learning domain and school leadership and management domain had been treated based on the selected items that represent the successful implementation of SIP in each school. For each domain two groups of respondents such as teachers and school leaders were asked to rate issues raised in each domain with five likert scales.

4.2.2.1. Teaching- learning domain

Teaching learning domain is the major determinant of students' achievement that indicates what is going in the class room. Not much powerful and sustainable change

happens in teaching learning process unless it happens in class rooms (Earl, 2003). This domain focuses on the actual interaction between teachers and learners. This part included the three core elements of teaching learning domains such as quality of teaching, learning and assessment and the curriculum. Therefore, in this section the researcher had gone through all these elements in order to assess the practice of SIP implementation in sampled schools.

From Table 4.5 below, the respondents were asked to explain their level of agreement on whether the school has a set of collaboratively developed values that emphasis quality of teaching and learning. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.95$, $m_2=3.56$) of the respondents were clearly identified that the majority of the teachers were not decided and most of the school leaders were agreed on whether the school has a set of collaboratively developed values that emphasis quality of teaching and learning. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.25$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether the school has a set of collaboratively developed values that emphasis quality of teaching and learning. However the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.229$, $Std_2=1.114$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the issue.

As it was stated on Table 4.5 of item 2, the respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on whether the teachers know their students' and make early identification of their specific needs. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.58$, $m_2=2.12$) of the respondents were clearly identified that the majority of the teachers were not decided and most of the school leaders were disagreed on whether the teachers know their students' and make early identification of their specific needs. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.37$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on whether the teachers know their students' and make early identification of their specific needs.

Table 4.5: Respondents Response on the implementation of the teaching learning domain of School Improvement Prpogram

No	Items	Teachers		School leaders		W.M
		N= 155 M	SD	N= 126 M	SD	
1	The school has a set of collaboratively developed values that emphasis quality of teaching and learning.	2.95	1.229	3.56	1.114	3.255
2	Teachers know their students and provide them necessary support based on their specific needs.	2.58	1.227	2.12	1.009	2.37
3	Teachers understand contemporary and effective teaching methods and apply it in a classroom	3.13	1.215	2.17	1.002	2.65
4	The school explicitly supports students' personal development as part of its curriculum.	2.68	1.210	2.56	1.170	2.63
5	There is a habit of using teaching aids in teaching learning process.	2.96	1.263	2.19	1.079	2.62
6	Students' do class work, homework and assignments.	2.70	1.245	3.10	1.251	2.88
7	Teachers evaluate students' performance through continuous assessment.	3.34	0.270	2.72	1.171	3.06
8	The principal visits the class room instruction and provide class observation feedback regularly.	2.35	1.023	3.51	1.158	2.87
9	The school conducted a staff meeting that supports the curriculum, encourages text book evaluation and gives respects for teachers' comments.	2.41	1.149	2.34	1.208	2.38
10	The curriculum is meaningful, engaging and appropriate to the developmental stage and needs of the students.	2.23	1.031	3.31	1.229	2.72

Key: M=mean SD =standard deviation & W.M=Weighted mean, the mean value > 3.5 agree 2.5-3.5 undecided (moderate), and < 2.5 (disagree).

However the computed standard deviation (Std₁=1.227, Std₂=1.009) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the issue.

As observed in Table 4.5 of item3, respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on whether teachers understand contemporary and effective teaching methods and apply it in a classroom. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean

($m_1=3.13$, $m_2=2.17$) of the respondents were clearly identified that the majority of the teachers were not decided and most of the school leaders were disagreed on whether teachers understand contemporary and effective teaching methods and apply it in a classroom. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.65$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether teachers understand contemporary and effective teaching methods and apply it in a classroom. However the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.215$, $Std_2=1.002$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups 'response on whether teachers understand the contemporary and effective teaching methods and apply it in class room in the sampled schools. This shows teachers of the study area had a fairly good perception on contemporary and effective teaching methods .According to MoE, (2009), listed the following components of good teaching that are expected from teachers :professional knowledge, understanding(up-to date subject matter, and curriculum knowledge, good understanding of classroom pedagogy), teaching skills (learning plan for students' involvement, use of active learning methods, reflect on classroom practice,) values and attitudes(love of profession, form excellent relationship with colleagues, strive for learning and self improvement, high expectation for students), learning environment(maintaining an attractive and , supportive learning environment, creating safe and orderly environment, use of appropriate teaching aids).

Regarding item 4 of Table 4.5, the school leaders and teachers were asked whether the school explicitly supports students' personal development as part of its curriculum. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.68$, $m_2=2.56$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and school leaders were not decided whether the school explicitly supports students' personal development as part of its curriculum. In general, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.63$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided whether the school explicitly supports students' personal development as part of its curriculum.

Similarly, the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.210$, $Std_2=1.170$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the issue. Moreover, the data obtained from document review, in the SIP document minutes revealed that there was

a problem of providing adequate support to different groups of students including special needs and girls by teachers in the sampled schools. This is due to lack of commitment on the side of teachers and school leaders as well.

As it can be seen from Table 4.5 of item 5, the respondents were asked to show their degree of agreement on whether there is a habit of using teaching aids in teaching learning process. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.96$, $m_2=2.19$) of the respondents were clearly identified that the majority of the teachers were not decided and the school leaders were disagreed on whether there is a habit of using teaching aids in teaching learning process. In general, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.62$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether there is a habit of using teaching aids in teaching learning process.

On Table 4.5 of item 6, the respondents were asked to show their degree of agreement on whether the students do class work, home work and assignments. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.70$, $m_2=3.10$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were not decided on whether the students do class work, home work and assignments. In general, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.88$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether the students do class work, home work and assignments. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.245$, $Std_2=1.251$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item. Hence the result of the study showed that there is a gap on the side of students in doing homework, assignments and class work in teaching learning process.

As it was depicted in item 7 of Table 4.5, the respondents were requested to provide their level of agreement on whether teachers evaluate students' performance through continuous assessment. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=3.34$, $m_2=2.72$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were not decided on continuous assessment that have been employed by teachers regarding to the evaluation of the students' performance. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.06$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not

decided on continuous assessment employed by the teachers about the evaluation of the students' performance. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=0.270$, $Std_2=1.171$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item.

As stated in item 8 of Table 4.5, the respondents were asked to provide their level of agreement on whether or not the principal visits the class room instruction and provide class observation feedback regularly. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.35$, $m_2=3.51$) of the respondents were clearly identified that teachers were disagreed and the school leaders were not decided on visiting the classroom instruction and provision of feedback that have been carried out by teachers regarding to the regular provision of support for the teachers. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.87$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on visiting the classroom instruction and provision of feedback. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.023$, $Std_2=1.158$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the item.

Moreover, on Table 4.5 of item 9, the respondents were asked the extent to which the school conducted a staff meeting on curriculum, text book evaluation and giving respects for teachers' comments. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.41$, $m_2=2.34$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were disagreed on staff meeting that have been conducted by the schools regarding to give respects for teachers' comments, supporting the curriculum and encourages text book evaluation. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.38$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on staff meeting about conducting curriculum, text book evaluation and giving respect ion for teachers comments. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.149$, $Std_2=1.208$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item.

Finally, as it was stated on the last item of the Table 4.5, the respondents were asked to give their level of agreement on whether the curriculum is meaningful, engaging and appropriate to the developmental stage and needs of the students. Consequently, it was

indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.23$, $m_2=3.31$) of the respondents were clearly identified that the teachers respondents were disagreed and the school leaders were not decided on the curriculum that have been applied in the school regarding to its meaningfulness, engagement and appropriateness to the developmental stage and needs of the students. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.72$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether the curriculum is meaningful, engaging and appropriate to the developmental stage and needs of the students. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.031$, $Std_2=1.229$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the item.

In addition to the above closed ended questions, there was one item regarding the academic achievements of the students that said what is the level of students academic achievement after SIP implemented? From the respondents of the interviews one secondary school supervisor said that:

“The improvement of students” achievement after SIP implementation was at moderate level; but not continuous as it varies from year to year because there was a support given by schools, parents, and attention given by the student itself was insignificant. In my school, the majorities of the students were not come to class and attend their education continuously and also they do not actively participate on different activities given from their teachers and the school. Besides my school teachers and school leaders Are also lacks commitment including me.”

Generally, from the above information it can be concluded that student's achievement improved moderately, but the improvement varies from school to school and not continuous because of the various challenges or factors found at school levels. In line with this According to (EIC, (2000) a school improvement plan is a road map that sets out the changes of schools needs to make to improve the level of students” achievement and show

how and when these changes would be made. Furthermore, the central focus areas of the four domains are improving students' achievement in education.

In addition to the above descriptive statistical analysis on the practices of SIP implementation through the assessment of its phases/stages, inferential statistical tools stepwise regression or multiple regressions was employed in order to test to what extent the independent variable would affect and correlate with the dependent variable

4.2.2.2. The school leadership and management domain

The school leadership and management have a key role in the implementation of the school improvement program. Without the meaning full activities of the leadership and management of the school, implementation of the program is unthinkable (MoE, 2006). The school leadership and management is one of the four domains of SIP, which needs to be improved. This domain encompasses three main elements such as: - strategic vision, leadership behavior and school management.

From Table 4.6 of item 1 below, the respondents were asked to rate the presence of school vision and mission in the implementation of SIP. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.69$, $m_2=2.70$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were not decided on school vision and mission that have been used by the schools regarding to the SIP implementation. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.69$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on the presence of school vision and mission in the implementation of SIP. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.346$, $Std_2=1.161$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item. In line with this (Waters et al., 2004) Suggested that a part from establishing a vision and setting goals, effective school leaders place high emphasis on achieving high level of student learning and provide resources towards the effort to improve the achievements and general well-being of the students.

Table 4.6: Respondents Response on the implementation of the leadership and management domains

No	Items	Teachers		School leaders		W.M
		N= 155 M	SD	N= 126 M	SD	
1	The school leader has vision and mission of the school.	2.69	1.346	2.70	1.161	2.69
2	The values, ethics, guiding principles and purpose of the school are defined and known by the whole school community.	2.58	1.227	3.24	1.216	2.94
3	Strategies are in place to communicate and implement the whole school strategic plan.	1.82	0.963	2.24	1.084	2.01
4	The school leadership and management has the ability to identify and understand the training needs of the school.	2.83	1.139	3.13	1.189	2.97
5	The school leadership has competency in the implementation of SIP.	2.26	1.025	2.52	1.185	2.38
6	The school leadership and management have a regular time to discuss on the implementation of SIP.	2.44	1.026	2.76	1.229	2.50
7	School policies are documented, developed, reviewed and updated regularly.	1.74	0.757	2.84	1.141	2.23
8	Human, material and financial resources are managed, aligned and used to support the achievement of high levels of students' attainment.	2.38	1.060	3.20	1.246	2.69

Key: M=mean SD =standard deviation & W.M=Weighted mean, the mean value > 3.5 agree 2.5-3.5 undecided (moderate), and < 2.5 (disagree).

More over on Table 4.6 of item 2, the respondents were requested to give their level of agreement on the extent to which the values, ethics, guiding principles and purpose of the school are defined and known by the whole school community. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.58$, $m_2=3.24$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were not decided on values, ethics, guiding principles and purpose of the school that have been defined and known by the whole community regarding to the practices of SIP implementation. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.94$) of the respondents were indicated that they were

not decided on the values, ethics, guiding principles and purpose of the school are defined and known by the whole school community. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.227$, $Std_2=1.216$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item. Therefore researcher concluded that, the values, ethics, guiding principles and purpose of the school are defined and known by the whole school community was insignificant.

As it can be seen on item 3 of Table 4.6, the respondents were asked to show their agreement on whether Strategies are in place to communicate and implement the whole school strategic plan. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=1.82$ $m_2=2.24$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were disagreed whether Strategies are in place to communicate and implement the whole school strategic plan. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.01$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on whether Strategies are in place to communicate and implement the whole school strategic plan. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=0.963$, $Std_2=1.084$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item.

In item 4 of Table 4.6, the respondents were asked to give their agreement on whether the school leadership and management has the ability to identify and understand the training needs of the school. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.83$ $m_2=3.13$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were not decided on whether the school leadership and management has the ability to identify and understand the training needs of the school. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.97$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether the school leadership and management has the ability to identify and understand the training needs of the school. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.139$, $Std_2=1.189$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item.

It is obvious that, the ability and skill of school leader is very important in implementing school improvement program. Hence, to impalement school improvement programs

effectively and sustainably school leadership capacity has to be enhanced. However, as depicted on Table 4.6 of item 5, the respondents were requested to rate whether the school leadership has competency in the implementation of SIP. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.26$ $m_2=2.52$) of the respondents were clearly identified that teachers were disagreed and whereas the school leaders were not decided on the competency of school leaders that have been had regarding school improvement program implementation.

Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.38$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on the competency of school leaders about the SIP implementation. Whereas, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.025$, $Std_2=1.185$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the item. This means, in the sampled schools of West Hararghe Zone, there was a problem of competent and skilled school leaders in implementing SIP. Therefore, it needs attention to promote the competency of school leadership for the effective implementation of SIP.

As indicated in item 6 of Table 4.6, the respondents were asked to rate whether school leadership and management had the regular time to discuss on the implementation of SIP. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.44$ $m_2=2.76$) of the respondents were clearly identified that teachers were disagreed and whereas the school leaders were not decided on the school leadership and management's regular time that have been discussed regarding the implementation of SIP. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.50$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on the school leadership and management's regular time about SIP implementation. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.026$, $Std_2=1.229$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the issue under the study.

As reported in the same Table 4.6 of item 7, the respondents were requested to rate whether School policies are documented, developed, reviewed and updated regularly. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=1.74$ $m_2=2.84$) of the respondents were clearly identified that teachers were disagreed and whereas the school

leaders were not decided on the school policies that have been documented, developed, reviewed and updated regularly regarding the implementation of SIP. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.23$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on the school policies about documenting, developing, reviewing and updating regularly for SIP implementation. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=0.757$, $Std_2=1.141$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the issue under the study.

With regard to Table 4.6, of item 8, the respondents were requested to rate their degree of agreement on the extent to which human, material and financial resources are managed, aligned and used to support the achievement of high levels of students' attainment. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.38$ $m_2=3.20$) of the respondents were clearly identified that teachers were disagreed and whereas the school leaders were not decided on the human, material and financial resources are managed, aligned and used to support the achievement of high levels of students' attainment. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.69$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on human, material and financial resources are managed, aligned and used to support the achievement of high levels of students' attainment. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.060$, $Std_2=1.246$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the issue under the study. From this result of the study, one can concluded that, human, material and financial resources are managed, aligned and used to support the achievement of high levels of student attainment was not performed significantly. For this reason, it could be intervened timely by all concerned bodies.

Moreover, this interpretation deduced to the status of the practice of SIP implementation in the assessment of leadership and management domain in contribution to the school leaders have regular time to discuss on the implementation of SIP, Human, material and financial resources are managed, aligned and used to support the achievement of high levels of students' attainment, the school leader ship has competency in the implementation of SIP, School policies are documented, developed, reviewed and updated regularly, and the values, ethics, guiding principles and purpose of the school are defined

and known by the whole school community was not practiced as per needed in the sampled secondary schools. Therefore, it needs great attention from all concerned bodies to do on leadership and management domain of SIP in order to implement SIP in the schools.

4.3. Analysis of Respondents' Responses on the Roles and Responsibility of School Leaders in Implementing School Improvement Program

The school leadership and management have a key role in the implementation of school improvement program. Without the meaning full practices and activities of the leadership and management of the school, the implementation of the program is unthinkable (MoE, 2006). Besides, principals are the key players in the improvement process. It is their role to ensure that all stake holders are given a voice and that they are listened to and their views respected. As a result of this, this section includes the analyzing results of the respondents' response on the practicability of the roles and responsibilities of school leaders in implementing SIP in the sampled secondary schools. Its purpose was to answer the basic question of this study and was to assess the gab in order to give a possible solution in study area. In doing so the researcher prepared eight items for this purpose, that assess the respondents' views by using a five likert scale and minimizing it into three scale for the sake of analyzing.

From the Table 4.7 of item 1 below, the respondents were asked to show their degree of agreement on whether the school leader has created awareness for school community in the implementation of SIP. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=1.82$ $m_2=2.24$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders disagreed on whether the school leader has created awareness for school community in the implementation of SIP.

Table 4.7: Analysis of Respondents Response on the Roles and Responsibility of School Leadership in Implementing School Improvement Program

No	Items	Teachers		School leaders		W.M
		N= 155		N= 126		
		M	SD	M	SD	
1	Creating awareness for school community on the implementation of SIP.	1.82	0.963	2.24	1.084	2.01
2	Allocating the necessary resource for SIP implementation.	1.74	0.757	2.84	1.141	2.23
3	Establishing SIC by participating necessary stakeholders as to the blue print.	2.68	1.151	2.95	1.158	2.80
4	The school leaders collected necessary information on the school domains in order to implement SIP.	2.70	1.158	2.78	1.095	2.74
5	The school leaders enable parents of students to have adequate and updated information regarding the learning efficiency and their academic results.	2.54	1.141	2.60	1.089	2.56
6	Designing a strategy which the school community and other stakeholders contribute highly for the improvement of schools.	2.83	1.242	2.23	1.104	2.56
7	Organizing short term trainings and experience sharing forums to teachers and the school community	2.55	1.129	2.50	1.010	2.53
8	Submitting annual report to the school community and parents on SIP implementation	2.56	1.123	2.51	1.064	2.54

Key: M=mean SD =standard deviation & W.M=Weighted mean, the mean value > 3.5 agree 2.5-3.5 undecided (moderate), and < 2.5 (disagree).

Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.01$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on whether the school leader has created awareness for school community in the implementation of SIP. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=0.963$, $Std_2=1.084$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item. From this finding the researcher concluded that, the awareness creation for the community for the implementation of SIP carried out by the school leaders was low. Besides, the interview held with WEO, and secondary

school supervisors indicates that awareness creation for stake holders for the implementation of SIP were not adequately carried out. Moreover, one of the sampled WEO said:

“In my respective district schools, School leaders provide low frequent awareness about SIP for the school community. Therefore, lack in the awareness of SIP leads to inability of performing the program for School leaders and school community effectively in my woreda”

In line with this, Mesele (2011), suggested that enough awareness creations were not made for stakeholders in order to make them play active role in implementing the school improvement program at school level.

With regard to item 2 of Table 4.7, the respondents were asked to show their agreement on the status of allocating the necessary resources for the implementation of SIP. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=1.74$ $m_2=2.84$) of the respondents were clearly identified that teachers were disagreed and whereas the school leaders were not decided on the necessary resources that have been allocated by the concerned bodies regarding SIP implementation. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.23$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on necessary resources about allocating it as per needed for the SIP implementation. This shows us there was a low status of allocating the necessary resources for the implementation of SIP in the sampled schools. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=0.757$, $Std_2=1.141$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the issue under the study. In line with this, an interview held with school supervisors, WEO and student representatives from these respondents one of the secondary school supervisor also confirmed that:

“The budget allocated for SIP implementation was not enough. Only school grant was allocated for our school to implement SIP; so this is not enough to carry out all the activities of SIP implementation program efficiently and

effectively. Hence as to me inadequate budget allocation was one factor that hinders SIP implementation in my respective school.”

With regard to the item 3 of Table 4.7 depicted that, the respondents were asked to show their degree of agreement on whether the school leaders are establishing SIC by involving the necessary stakeholders as to the blue print. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.68$ $m_2=2.95$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were not decided on whether the school leaders are establishing SIC by involving the necessary stakeholders as to the blue print. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.80$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether the school leaders are establishing SIC by involving the necessary stakeholders as to the blue print. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.151$, $Std_2=1.158$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item.

From this one can easily understand that more than half of the school leaders have established SIC by participating necessary stakeholders as to the blue print. Besides, the information obtained from document analysis of sample schools of the study area indicates that the establishment of SIC and the presence of the committee's document. Hence we can conclude as the school had established the committee but they were not effective.

As displayed in the Table 4.7 of item 4, the respondents were requested to indicate their degree of agreement on the status of collecting the necessary information in line with the school domains for the purpose of SIP implementation. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.70$ $m_2=2.78$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were not decided on necessary information that have been collected on school domains regarding the SIP implementations. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.74$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on collecting necessary information about school domains for the SIP implementation. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.158$, $Std_2=1.095$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups'

response on the item. From this we can conclude that the status of collecting the necessary information in line with four school domains for the purpose of SIP implementation needs further attention to improve the problems.

According to item 5 of Table 4.7, the respondents were asked to reveal their degree of agreement on whether the school leaders enable parents of students to have adequate and updated information regarding the learning efficiency and their academic results. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.54$ $m_2=2.60$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were not decided on whether the school leaders enable parents of students to have adequate and updated information regarding the learning efficiency and their academic results. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.56$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether the school leaders enable parents of students to have adequate and updated information regarding the learning efficiency and their academic results. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.141$, $Std_2=1.089$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item.

As can be observed from table 4.7, of item 6, the respondents were requested to give their degree of agreement on whether the school leaders design a strategy by which the school community and other stakeholders contribute highly for the improvement of schools. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.83$ $m_2=2.23$) of the respondents were clearly identified that teachers were not decided and whereas the school leaders were disagreed on whether the school leaders design a strategy by which the school community and other stakeholders contribute highly for the improvement of schools. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.56$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether the school leaders design a strategy by which the school community and other stakeholders contribute highly for the improvement of schools. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.242$, $Std_2=1.104$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the issue under the study.

Concerning to item 7 of Table 4.7, the respondents were asked to reveal their degree of agreement on whether the school leaders organize short term trainings and experience sharing forums to teachers and the school community on issues useful for the school improvement. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.555$ $m_2=2.50$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were not decided on whether the school leaders organize short term trainings and experience sharing forums to teachers and the school community on issues useful for the school improvement. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.54$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether the school leaders organize short term trainings and experience sharing forums to teachers and the school community on issues useful for the school improvement. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.129$, $Std_2=1.010$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item.

With regard to item 8 of Table 4.7, the respondents were asked to reveal their degree of agreement on whether the school leaders were submitting annual implementation report of SIP after completing the evaluation of the program. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.56$ $m_2=2.51$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were not decided on whether the school leaders were submitting annual implementation report of SIP after completing the evaluation of the program. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.54$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether the school leaders were submitting annual implementation report of SIP after completing the evaluation of the program. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.123$, $Std_2=1.064$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item.

Moreover, this interpretation deduced to the status of the school leaders discharging their roles and responsibility in implementing SIP in contribution to the school Leaders has allocated the necessary resource for the successful SIP implementation, the school leader has created awareness for school community in the implementation of SIP, they design a strategy by which the school community and other stakeholders contribute highly for the improvement of schools, and the school leaders have established school improvement

committee by participating necessary stakeholders as to the blueprint was not practiced as per needed in the sampled secondary schools. This means the school leaders in the sampled schools did not discharged their responsibility in implementing SIP. This affects the implementation of SIP negatively.

4.4. Analysis of the Respondents' Response on the Strategies Used to Implement School Improvement Program

To implement school improvement program effectively in our school there must be an effective strategy should be designed and practiced so as to ensure school improvement program succeed, creating workable techniques is vital. In the first place the school has to organize structures that can serve as a bridge between school communities. In doing so this section included the respondents views on the possible strategies those used to implement School improvement program in selected secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone. For this purpose, five likert scales were prepared for the respondents so as enable those to show their agreement on the applicability of the strategies explained in Table 4.8 below.

As shown in Table 4.8 of item 1, the respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on whether trainings were Organized for all concerned bodies on SIP. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.81$ $m_2=3.25$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were not decided on the presence of organizing trainings for all concerned bodies on SIP. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.01$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on the presence of organizing trainings for all concerned bodies on SIP. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.194$, $Std_2=1.191$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item. Therefore from this finding one can conclude that, school leaders organizing training for concerned bodies on SIP implementation at low performance level because of different reasons as it was explained in interview held with WEO and supervisors indicated. Some of these problems were lack of budget, lack of interest on the side of trainees and being occupied by different routine works.

Table 4.8 of item 2 indicated, the respondents were requested to give their level of agreement on whether there is Conducting self evaluations and Identifying the problems and formulate action plan. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.44$ $m_2=2.42$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were disagreed on whether there is Conducting self evaluations and identifying the problems and formulate action plan.

Table 4.8: Analysis of Respondents Response on the strategies used to implement School Improvement Program

No	Items	Teachers		School leaders		W.M
		N= 155		N= 126		
		M	SD	M	SD	
1	Organizing trainings for all concerned bodies on SIP	2.81	1.194	3.25	1.191	3.01
2	Conducting self evaluations and Identifying the problems and formulate action plan.	2.44	1.026	2.42	0.950	2.43
3	Formation of implementation committees (teams) at different level and put the level of responsibility and accountability	2.81	1.064	3.29	1.253	3.02
4	Searching for extra source of budget by involving all partners for the implementation of SIP.	2.32	1.043	2.94	1.215	2.60
5	Scheduling of monitoring and evaluation for the realization of the program.	2.72	1.251	2.30	1.260	2.53
6	Facilitating the exchange of experience among the schools.	1.96	0.896	2.03	1.035	1.99
7	Organizing of consultation forums at least after each semester	2.35	1.036	2.44	1.024	2.39
8	The school leaders modified its SIP implementation plan in progress.	1.99	1.081	2.47	1.231	2.20

Key: M=mean SD =standard deviation & W.M=Weighted mean, the mean value > 3.5 agree 2.5-3.5 undecided (moderate), and < 2.5 (disagree).

Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.43$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on the self evaluation that have been conducted in progress in the school regarding identifying the problems and formulating action plan for the SIP

implementation. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.026$, $Std_2=0.950$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item.

As it was depicted in Table 4.8 of item 3 indicated, the respondents were asked to give their level of agreement on whether there is formation of implementation committees (teams) at different level and put the level of responsibility and accountability. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.81$ $m_2=3.29$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were not decided on whether there is formation of implementation committees (teams) at different level and put the level of responsibility and accountability. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.03$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether there is formation of implementation committees (teams) at different level and put the level of responsibility and accountability. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.064$, $Std_2=1.253$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item.

As can be revealed from Table 4.8 of item 4, the respondents were asked to show their level of agreement on whether the school leaders were searching for extra source of budget for the implementation of SIP. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.32$ $m_2=2.94$) of the respondents were clearly identified that teachers were disagreed and whereas the school leaders were not decided on whether the school leaders were searching for extra source of budget for the implementation of SIP. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.60$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether the school leaders were searching for extra source of budget for the implementation of SIP. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.043$, $Std_2=1.215$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the issue under the study.

As one can be observed from Table 4.8 of item 5, the respondents were asked to show their level of agreement on whether the school leaders were Scheduling of monitoring and evaluation for the realization of the SIP program. Consequently, it was indicated that the

computed mean ($m_1=2.72$ $m_2=2.30$) of the respondents were clearly identified that teachers were not decided and whereas the school leaders were disagreed on whether the school leaders were Scheduling of monitoring and evaluation for the realization of the SIP program. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.53$) of the respondents were indicated that they were not decided on whether the school leaders were Scheduling of monitoring and evaluation for the realization of the SIP program. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.251$, $Std_2=1.260$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the issue under the study.

As can noticed from Table 4.8 of item 6, the respondents were requested to give their agreement on whether there is facilitating the exchange of experience among the schools in the sampled schools. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=1.96$ $m_2=2.03$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were disagreed on whether there is facilitating the exchange of experience among the schools in the sampled schools. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=1.99$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on whether there is facilitating the exchange of experience among the schools in the sampled schools. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=0.896$, $Std_2=1.035$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item.

Concerning Table 4.8 of item 7, the respondents were requested to give their agreement on whether the school leaders were organizing of consultation forums at least after each semester. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=2.35$ $m_2=2.44$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were disagreed on whether the school leaders were organizing of consultation forums at least after each semester. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.39$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on whether the school leaders were organizing of consultation forums at least after each semester. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.036$, $Std_2=1.024$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item. This indicates there were no organizing consultation forums at each semester on SIP implementation in the sampled schools.

As one can note from Table 4.8 of item 8, the respondents were requested to give their agreement on whether the school leaders modified its SIP implementation plan in progress. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=1.99$ $m_2=2.47$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were disagreed on whether the school leaders modified its SIP implementation plan in progress. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.20$) of the respondents were indicated that they were disagreed on whether the school leaders modified its SIP implementation plan in progress. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.081$, $Std_2=1.231$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item. This indicates there were no organizing consultation forums at each semester on SIP implementation in the sampled schools.

4.5. Analysis of Respondents' Response on the Challenges of School Improvement Program Implementation

This section included the core challenges or obstacles those negatively affect the implementation of school improvement program in the selected secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone. It is obvious that there were various challenges of the implementation of SIP. From these the challenges were the difficulty of understanding of school improvement, the status of shortage of educational finance, the status of school facilities, limited support from woreda education office, from cluster supervisors, from PTA members and practical training on the use of SIP guide line is a serious problems those negatively affected the implementation of SIP. Therefore so as to assess these challenges in the sampled schools, Teachers and school leaders were requested their level of agreement to the statements, which describe the challenges of school improvement program implementation in sampled secondary schools of West Hararghe zone. The result was presented and analyzed as follows in the following Table 4.9.

From the Table 4.9 of item 1 below, the respondents were requested to give their agreement on whether there is a difficulty of understanding of school improvement program implementation on the side of various stakeholders. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=3.51$ $m_2=3.57$) of the respondents were clearly

identified that both teachers and the school leaders were agreed on the difficulty of understanding that have been implemented in the school regarding SIP implementation on the side of various stakeholders.

Table 4.9: Analysis of Respondents Response on the Challenges of School Improvement Program implementations

No	Items	Teachers N= 155		School leaders N= 126		W.M
		M	SD	M	SD	
1	There is a difficulty of understanding of school improvement program implementation on the side of various stakeholders.	3.51	1.153	3.57	1.305	3.54
2	There is a high resistance of school improvement program from teachers and school leaders.	3.86	1.001	3.58	1.254	3.74
3	There is a shortage of educational facilities and finance.	3.59	1.205	4.10	0.856	3.82
4	There is lack of commitment on the side of teachers and school leaders.	3.81	1.007	3.29	1.272	3.58
5	There is a limited support from woreda education office & secondary school supervisor	3.70	1.136	3.81	0.977	3.75
6	There is a lack of practical training on the uses of SIP documents prepared by MoE.	3.88	1.184	3.15	1.398	3.56
7	There is a low capacity of the school leader in the school.	3.55	1.191	3.94	1.071	3.73
8	There is a lack of stakeholder's participation on the implementation of SIP.	3.57	1.269	4.02	0.824	3.78
9	There is a lack of a policy document that guides the implementation of SIP in the school.	4.21	0.787	4.16	0.763	4.19

Key: M=mean SD =standard deviation & W.M=Weighted mean, the mean value > 3.5 agree 2.5-3.5 undecided (moderate), and < 2.5 (disagree).

Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.54$) of the respondents were indicated that they were agreed on the difficulty of understanding of SIP about implementing it in the school on the side of the stakeholders. However, from the computed standard

deviation ($Std_1=1.153$, $Std_2=1.305$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item. In general, most of the respondents stated as this were serious problems in the sampled schools on the implementation of SIP.

Concerning item 2 of Table 4.9, the respondents were asked to rate on whether there was high resistance on SIP implementation from teachers and school leaders. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=3.86$ $m_2=3.58$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were agreed on the presence of high resistance of SIP implementation on the side of school leaders and teachers. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.74$) of the respondents were indicated that they were agreed on whether there was high resistance on SIP implementation from teachers and school leaders. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.001$, $Std_2=1.254$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item. which shows that the resistance of teachers and school leaders in the implementation of SIP was taken as serious problem.

As indicated in Table 4.9 of item 3, the respondents were requested to give their agreement on whether there is a shortage of educational facilities and finance for the implementation of SIP. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=3.59$ $m_2=4.10$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were agreed on the presence of a shortage of educational facilities and finance for the implementation of SIP. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.82$) of the respondents were indicated that they were agreed on the presence of a shortage of educational facilities and finance for the implementation of SIP. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.205$, $Std_2=0.856$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item. Therefore, from this we can conclude that a shortage of educational facilities and finance were the serious problem in the implementation of SIP in secondary schools. In supporting this Mesele (2011), suggested that lack of educational finance was one of the major challenges in the implementation process of SIP.

As depicted in Table 4.9 of item 4, the respondents were asked to rate the status of their agreement on whether there is a lack of commitment on the side of teachers and school leaders on the implementation of SIP. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=3.81$ $m_2=3.29$) of the respondents were clearly identified that teachers were agreed and whereas the school leaders were not decided on whether there is a lack of commitment on the side of teachers and school leaders on the implementation of SIP. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.58$) of the respondents were indicated that they were agreed on whether there is a lack of commitment on the side of teachers and school leaders on the implementation of SIP. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.007$, $Std_2=1.272$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the issue under the study.

With regard to item 5 of Table 4.9, respondents were requested to give their agreement whether there is a limited support from WEO and secondary school supervisors for the implementation of SIP. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=3.70$ $m_2=3.81$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were agreed on whether there is a limited support from district education office and secondary school supervisors for the implementation of SIP. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.75$) of the respondents were indicated that they were agreed on whether there is a limited support from district education office and secondary school supervisors for the implementation of SIP. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.136$, $Std_2=0.977$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the issue under the study. From the above result we can conclude that limited technical support from district education office and supervisors in the implementation of SIP was one of the serious problems in the sampled secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone.

As depicted in item 6 of Table 4.9, respondents were requested whether or not there is a lack of practical training on the use SIP document prepared by MoE. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=3.88$ $m_2=3.15$) of the respondents were clearly identified that teachers were agreed and whereas the school leaders were not decided on whether or not there is a lack of practical training on the use SIP document prepared by

MoE. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.56$) of the respondents were indicated that they were agreed on whether or not there is a lack of practical training on the use SIP document prepared by MoE. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.136$, $Std_2=0.977$) was clearly shown us there was a variability between the groups' response on the issue under the study.

As it was reported in item 7 of Table 4.9, respondents were requested to give their degree of agreement whether there is a low capacity of the school leader for the implementation of SIP in the sampled school. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=3.55$ $m_2=3.94$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were agreed on whether there is a low capacity of the school leader for the implementation of SIP in the sampled school. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.73$) of the respondents were indicated that they were agreed on whether there is a low capacity of the school leader for the implementation of SIP in the sampled school. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.191$, $Std_2=1.071$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the issue under the study. From the above result we can conclude that there is a low capacity of the school leader was one of the serious problems in the sampled secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone.

With regard to item 8 of Table 4.9, the respondents were asked to reveal their degree of agreement on whether there is a lack of stakeholders' participation on the implementation of SIP in the sampled schools. Accordingly, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=3.57$ $m_2=4.02$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were agreed on whether there is a lack of stakeholders' participation on the implementation of SIP. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.78$) of the respondents were indicated that they were agreed on whether there is a lack of stakeholders' participation on the implementation of SIP. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=1.269$, $Std_2=0.824$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item. From the above result we can conclude that there is a serious problem on stakeholders' participation on the implementation of SIP in the sampled secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone.

Finally, in Table 4.9 of the last item, the respondents were requested to give their agreement on whether there is a lack of a policy document that guides the implementation of SIP in the school. Consequently, it was indicated that the computed mean ($m_1=4.21$ $m_2=4.16$) of the respondents were clearly identified that both teachers and the school leaders were agreed on whether there is a lack of a policy document that guides the implementation of SIP in the school. Generally, the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=4.19$) of the respondents were indicated that they were agreed on whether there is a lack of a policy document that guides the implementation of SIP in the school. However, from the computed standard deviation ($Std_1=0.787$, $Std_2=0.763$) was clearly shown us there was a little variability between the groups' response on the item.

Similarly, data collected from secondary school supervisors , WEO and student representatives through interview reported that shortage of financial resources are the most determinant factors that affect SIP implementation; since the school grant budget allocated for schools was not enough to keep effective schools improvement process. Besides, the respondents reported that lack of commitment of teachers and school leaders is the main problem that negatively affects SIP implementation. As a result of this, to solve this problem adequate awareness creation should practiced by school leaders and concerned bodies.

Moreover, this interpretation deduced to the status of the practice of SIP implementation in the assessment of teaching learning domain in contribution to the principal visits the class room instruction and provide feedback regularly, the curriculum is meaningful, engaging and appropriate to the developmental stage and needs of the students, the school has a set of collaboratively developed values that emphasis quality of teaching and learning, teachers understand contemporary and effective teaching methods and apply it in a classroom, teachers evaluate students' performance through continuous assessment and teachers evaluate students' performance through continuous assessment was not practiced as per needed in the sampled secondary schools. Therefore, it needs great attention from all concerned bodies to do on teaching learning domain of SIP in order to implement SIP in the schools.

Moreover, through open ended questions and interview held with secondary school supervisors and WEO and both teachers and school leaders asked to describe the challenges that negatively affect the proper implementation of SIP. In response to this, all of them stated that:

The resource allocated to the school to in implementing SIP is not enough and community participation to support schools in implementation of SIP program was low. Besides, there is also a problem of awareness on the program itself because there is no training on the program implementation in progress and there were insufficient school facilities to implement SIP. The other problem was there was a poor practice of school leaders in searching extra sources of budget, lack of experience of school leaders and there is a lack of commitment on the side of teachers and school leaders on the implementation of the program as per planned.

In general from the open ended questionnaires and interview held with the respondents , one can conclude the challenges as: lack of adequate budget, lack of awareness on the program itself, lack of commitment on the side of school leaders and teachers and other corned bodies, lack of adequate policy document in the school, lack of experienced, qualified in EDPM and capable school leaders, the resistance of stakeholders on the program school leaders not to do for searching extra budget being with government and NGOs and lack of providing technical support from all concerned bodies like WEO and supervisors.

In line with this, some of the major expected challenges as summarized by OEB (2009) include; lack of qualified teachers required mainly at secondary level; Lack of proper leadership training for school principals and there under going poor commitment to enforce the program; defective strategic school improvement plan preparation and implementation and of course; weak follow up monitoring and evaluation of the program implementation by all concerned.

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This part of the study deals with the summary of the findings of the study, the conclusions and the recommendations forwarded on the basis of findings that is the practice and challenges of SIP implementation in the sampled secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State.

5.1. Summary

The general objective of this study was to assess the practice and challenges of school improvement program implementation in the secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State and to suggest possible solutions and come up with recommendation. As a result of this, so as to achieve the main objective of this study, the following basic research questions were listed concerning to:-

- What were the practices of SIP implementation in secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone?
- What were the challenges of SIP implementation in secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone?
- What were the strategies used to implement SIP in secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone?
- What were the roles and responsibilities of school leaders in implementing SIP in secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone?
- What were the suggested solutions for the challenges of SIP implementation in secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone?

In this study descriptive survey research design was used with both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis. In this Zone there are 17 districts; among these 9 of them were selected by using stratified random sampling techniques. For this study total populations size and total sample size were 474 and 356 respondents respectively. The total sample size included 167 teachers, 126 school leaders, 9 supervisors and 9 Student representatives and 9 district education officers as sources of information from the 9 selected secondary schools. The sampling techniques employed were stratified random

sampling for teachers; purposive sampling techniques for school leaders, supervisors, district Education officer and student representatives. The collected data through close ended questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive statistical tools such as frequency, percentages; mean, weighted mean and standard deviation were used to analyze the data found. The data collected through open- ended questions, semi structured interview and document review were analyzed qualitatively by narration.

Regarding the first basic question of the study, 28 items were distributed and data was gathered and analyzed. Accordingly, concerning to the implementation of the activities of four stages of SIP, the respondents were clearly identified that the performance of the school on conducting self- enquiry continuously in the implementation of SIP with the weighted mean ($\mu=2.81$ and the combined $sd=1.56$), the school actively involved PTA, KETB, SIC & other stakeholders in the self-enquiry stage of SIP with the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.68$ & $sd=1.14$), the level of school performance on SIP implementation is identified in a good manner the respondents reported with computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.31$ & $sd=1.10$) that showed the low status performance of the school.

Concerning whether the school has prepared the SIP implementation plan as it is indicated on the SIP guideline of MoE indicated with the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.43$,& $sd=1.13$), the status of ensuring the necessary resource for the implementation of the SIP plan with the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.90$ and 1.242), the presences of three years strategic SIP plan, one year plan and properly designed action plan for SIP implementation was indicated that with the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.73$ and 1.13), the implementation of SIP was communicated properly for the community with the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.30$ and 1.05), the WEO and secondary school supervisors are providing necessary support for the implementation of SIP with the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.44$ and $sd=1.15$), the school conducted regular monitoring and evaluation for the successful implementation of SIP with the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=2.19$ and $sd=0.13$), and there is a habit of providing feedback on the implementation of SIP by all concerned bodies consequently the respondents were clearly indicated with the computed weighted mean score ($\mu=3.31$ and $sd=1.22$) of the

respondents were indicated that they were not decided on feedback provision regularly on SIP implementation.

In general, The result of the study also shows that, the involvement of PTA, KETB and SIC members in the implementation of SIP was low and the provision of technical support by Woreda education office and supervisors were not adequate to support the implementation of SIP in the sampled schools. Concerning the ability of school leadership and management to identify and understand the training needs of the school community the respondents were rated the item with the low level of identifying and understanding training needs of school.

With regard to teaching learning domain of school improvement program were moderately implemented with a weighted mean value 2.71 because of lack of teaching-learning facilities and financial resources. Teachers' commitment in helping students and students' active participation was in significant.

With regard to domain of leadership and management whether the school leaders had schools vision , mission and goals , the schools effort in promoting shared vision, mission, objectives and goals to improve students' learning, consistency implementation of school activities, putting strategies in place to communicate and implement SIP, announcing the values, ethics, guiding principles and purpose of the school for the whole community, whether the school leaders and management had ability of identifying the training needs of the school and has the ability to implement SIP, whether school policies were documented , developed and reviewed regularly, discussing on SIP implementation and managing and aligning the human , material and financial resources for the support of students' achievement was low with weighted mean 2.45 in the sampled schools of the zone .

Regarding the roles and responsibilities of the school leaders in implementing SIP, as the majority (85%) of the respondents reported the school leaders were not discharged their roles and responsibilities as per the guide lines with the weighted mean 2.38 . As a result of this the practice of SIP implementation in the sampled secondary school was in adequate.

Concerning the strategies used to implement school improvement program, even if there were various strategies of implementing SIP was designed by the MoE and provided for the schools, the majority of sampled secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone were not used those strategies with the weighted mean 2.42 . Because of this, the practice of SIP implementation becomes low.

With regard to the assessment of the major challenges hindering the successful implementation of SIP, the finding specifically revealed that school improvement program was not implemented successfully in the schools, there were inadequate financial resource, lack of some teaching learning facilities, low level of commitment of school leaders and teachers, lack of parents and community participation , lack of competency on the side of school leaders, lack of policy document, and high resistance on the side of teachers and school leaders were the major challenges that hinders the implementation of SIP with weighted mean 3.7 which indicates the seriousness of the problems.

So as to minimize these challenges, all concerned bodies needs to allocate enough financial resources to schools and full filling school with all necessary facilities, providing continuous monitoring and evaluation for schools especially in case SIP implementation, assigning qualified principals who are committed to SIP implementation, creating awareness for all stake holders regarding to SIP , preparing effective and efficient strategic plan, creating strong relationship with partner organization like NGOs and governmental organizations for financial and technical support, finding extra sources of budget for the implementation of SIP, participating community members actively on SIP implementation, motivating teachers and school leaders in order to enable them not to resist , develop a sense of ownership on the side of the school community and enabling all school leaders as to discharge their roles and responsibilities in implementing SIP.

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the basic research questions, findings of the study and the summary of the study, the following conclusions were drawn.

From the study it was found that principals, supervisors, and woreda education officers were relatively less experienced than teachers in the sampled woredas of west Hararghe zone secondary schools. As a result teachers may not get necessary support from these school leaders/management bodies and teaching and learning processes negatively affected and this also affected negatively the implementation of SIP. Besides, the finding of the study indicated that, in the sampled secondary schools of West Hararghe Zone, self assessment phase of SIP did not implemented with stakeholders as per needed before planning whereas, planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation phase of SIP were moderately implemented .

Generally, as shown in the finding by the majority of respondents, the major activities of SIP such as provision of adequate training regarding SIP to stakeholders, the status of providing the necessary resources and facilities for the implementation of SIP, the status of conducting self-enquiry, the evaluation process of SIP implementation, and the practice of modifying school improvement plan based on the information obtained from the result of evaluation was low. Therefore, we can conclude that the practices of major activities of SIP phases were moderately implemented. This implies as there is gab in the implementation of phases of SIP.

Regarding the two SIP domains of SIP, the finding revealed that the teaching learning was moderately implemented and school leadership domain implemented at low level because of lack of teaching-learning facilities and finical resources Teachers of the study area were not used teaching aids in progress as per planned and the school leaders have not adequate capacity to implement SIP in the sampled schools and because lack of work experience and there were no enough qualified school leaders in leading position. This leads to inability of performing the school improvement program.

With regard to the roles and responsibilities of the school leaders in implementing SIP, as the majority of the respondents reported the school leaders were not discharged their roles and responsibilities as per the guide lines. As a result of this the practice of SIP implementation in the sampled secondary school was in adequate.

Concerning the strategies used to implement school improvement program, even if there were various strategies of implementing SIP was designed by the MoE and provided for the schools, the majority of sampled secondary schools of west Hararghe Zone were not used those strategies. Because of this, the practice of SIP implementation becomes low. With regard to the assessment of the major challenges hindering the successful implementation of SIP, the finding specifically revealed that school improvement program was not implemented successfully in the schools because , there was a problem of awareness, there were inadequate financial resource, lack of some teaching learning facilities, low level of commitment of school leaders and teachers, lack of parents and community participation , lack of competency on the side of school leaders, lack of policy document, and high resistance on the side of teachers and school leaders were the major challenges that hinders the implementation of SIP.

In general, the Findings of the revealed that the phases and teaching learning domain of school improvement program were moderately implemented with a weighted mean value 2.65 and 2.71 respectively however leadership and management domain of the program was implemented at low level in the study area and the sampled schools were not performed well in the phases of School improvement program implementation and most of activities across the two domains were not fully implemented. Besides, the finding of the study indicated as there was gab on the side of school leaders in discharging their roles and responsibilities and using different strategies on the implementation of school improvement program with the weighted mean 2.38 and 2.42 respectively.

Moreover, the study clearly showed the challenges of School Improvement Program implementation were lack of budget, learning facilities, lack of financial and material resources, lack of commitment on the side of teachers and school leaders, low capacity of teachers, inadequate block grant budget allocation by district education offices, lack of awareness, lack of community participation on SIP implementation, lack of technical skills of leaders which affect the implementation of school improvement program and in turn the teaching learning process and students' academic achievement with weighted mean 3.7 which indicates the seriousness of the problems. Hence it is suggested that School leaders needs discharge their responsibilities in implementing school improvement

program and they have to use the strategy designed by Ministry of Education. School, district education offices, Zone Education offices Regional Education Bureau and Ministry of Education needs to provide continuous technical assistance for stakeholders and allocate budget and fulfilling school facilities and materials as to implement school improvement program.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the summary of findings, basic questions of the study and conclusions made above, the following recommendations were suggested

- The result of the study indicated that the practices of major activities of SIP phases were not implemented as adequately in the sampled schools of the study area. As a result of this, the school leaders, teachers, schools, WEO, ZEO, REB and the MoE of the government of Ethiopia had better to give attention for the successful implementation of these activities through carrying out continuous monitoring, evaluation and by providing timely constructive feedback on these activities implementation.
- The result of the study indicated as there was problem of awareness on the school improvement program. Therefore Woreda Education Offices, Sub City Educational Offices and Ministry of Education in collaboration with non-governmental organizations need to facilitate the training programs for the effectiveness of the practice of SIP implementation and on how to alleviate those challenges.
- The result of the study indicated as there was a low performance on the self enquiry phase of SIP in sampled schools. As a result, the sampled schools in the study area have to conduct need assessment in progress to identify problems that are associated with SIP implementation; design and provide the training for school leaders, SIP committee members, teachers and other stakeholders; and finally they need to evaluate the training at the end.

- The findings showed that involvement of stake holders in SIP implementation were not at the required level. It is advisable for the sampled Schools to make an effort to involve stake holders (teachers, students and parents) for the success of SIP implementation. Moreover, the involvement of stake holders (teachers, students and parents) in the planning of SIP was low. To improve the problems related to planning even implementation, all stake holders may be participated in planning process. To do so school leaders are expected to mobilize the stake holders to actively participate in planning process.
- In order to improve students' achievements in teaching learning process, Practicing and developing the status of SIP implementation was crucial but improving teaching learning was not achieved yet as the result of this, it is had better for the community, school leaders, teachers, WEO, ZEO, REO and MoE to give great attention for the successful implementation of school improvement program so that continuous monitoring and evaluation may be carried out in progress.
- The findings of the study indicated that the allocation of budget for implementation of SIP was low. Therefore, the schools themselves had better to design fund raising mechanisms by involving all the necessary partners and stakeholders. Besides, the district educational office and schools have to allocate budget so as to motivate the school leaders, teachers and other stake holders those who have a good performance in their work. Also the MoE need to allocate additional budget to the school grant for successful implementation of SIP and in addition, as to solve their problems of finance and material resource,
- Besides, this study showed that most of the school leaders in the sampled schools lack experience and they were not trained in EDPM or school leadership but experienced, qualified and committed school leaders are required for schools. Thus, it is important to design and works on how to bring the experienced and qualified teachers to the leadership position, providing training can be the immediate solution and assigning principals those trained in EDPM or school

leadership is better long term solution. Thus, the ZEO and WEO have to closely work to solve the problem and give solution as soon as possible.

- The Woreda Administration and WEO need to discuss on the budget allocation of secondary schools and should allocate the Block grant budgets properly as it is clearly addressed in the blue print of MoE (2002) and the school leaders also should have to use the scarce resources of the school economically and selectively for the prioritized activities of the school improvement program.
- Moreover, Secondary school leaders need to make great effort to minimize the challenges of SIP implementation by evaluating themselves through feedbacks given to them in the day to day activities. Supervisors, Woreda and Zone Education Offices and other top management bodies are also responsible and need to give continuous training to fill the skill gaps of school leaders and to have close to with school leaders in order to help them as to implement SIP successfully.
- As indicated in the study, school leaders and school improvement team committee did not discharge their roles and responsibilities as per needed. Therefore, the school and all concerned bodies had better to make the school leaders and SIC functional for its better contribution to the success of the SIP implementation plan. In addition, empowering the capacity of school principals and SIP team committee in each school to work successfully and closely with stakeholders so as to make the implementation visible requires attention.
- Concerning the strategies used to implement school improvement program, even if there were various strategies of implementing SIP was designed by the MoE and provided for the schools, the majority of sampled secondary schools of west Hararghe Zone were not used those strategies. Because of this, the practice of SIP implementation becomes low. Therefore, to solve this problem the school leaders, WEO, ZEO, REO , NGOs and MoE need to enable all the school leaders in order to use the strategies of SIP implementation so as to succeed in the SIP implementation.

6. REFERENCES

- Abeya Gelata and Tamiru Jote.2009.Educational Supervision School Improvement Unpublished Teaching Material. Jimma University, Jimma, Ethiopia.
- Adelman, L, and Taylor, H (2007).Festering school, family, and involvement; effective strategies for creating safer schools and communities. Washington Hamilton Fish.
- Berhan Hailu, 2010. Implementation of the School Improvement Program in Addis Ababa City Administration: Achievement, Challenges and Prospects. Proceeding of the 8thNational Conference on private Higher Education in Ethiopia. SMUS Printing press, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Central Statistics Agency. 2008. Population and Housing Census. First Draft Report on Population .Office of the Population and Housing Census Commission. Addis Ababa. Ethiopia.
- Center for Research on Evaluation, Standard and Student Testing. 1994. A Guides to Parents and Communities Seeking Excellent in Education .A Research Unit of the Graduate School of Education. Los Angeles, CA 90024-1521.
- Charles, C. M. 1995. Introduction to Educational Research 2nd Edition. San Diego, Longman, England.
- Chinsamy, B. 2002. Successful School Improvement and the Education District Office in South Africa: Some Emerging Propositions in Alberta Mentoring Partnership. (2014).
- Cohen, L. 1994. Research Methods in Education 4th Edition. Routhledge, New York, USA.
- Dereje Hafosha . 2012. The Implementation and Challenges of SIP in Government Secondary Schools of Oromia Special Zone Surrounding Finfinne.Unpublished M.A Thesis. Addis Ababa University. Ethiopia.
- Donaldson, G. A., Jr., 2007.What do teachers bring to leadership? *Educational Leadership*, 65(1), 151-153.

- Education Improvement Commission. 2000. *School Improvement Planning: A Hand Book for Principals Teachers and School Council* Accessed from <http://eie.edu.gov.on.ca>. On 21 May 2017.
- Essayas Ampune .2009. An Assessment of the Progress of SIP in Gullelie Sub-city Government Primary Schools. Unpublished M.A Thesis. Addis Ababa University. Ethiopia.
- Frew Amsale. 2010. Practices and Challenges of Implementing School Improvement Program in Primary Schools o Jimma City Administration. Unpublished Senior Essay. Addis Ababa University.
- Fullan, M. 2001. *Leading in A Culture of Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. USA.
- Galesburg, 2007. Stake holders' Involvement .Extracted from <http://WWW.ci.galesburg.il.us> on march 2017.
- Gemechu Abdisa and Teklemariam Fitwi.2016.Factors Affecting Performance of Micro and Small Enterprise in South West Ethiopia: *The Case of Benchi MajiSheka and Kefa Zones Global Journal inc.USA, 16(1): 6-8*.
- Harris, A and Linda, B. 2003. *Building Leader Ship Capacity for Improvement*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Harris, A. and Daniel, M. 2005. *Improving School through Teacher Leadership*: Open University Press, London, England.
- Harris, A. 2005. *Teacher Leadership and School Improvement*. In Harris, A. et al. Eds, *Effective Leadership for School Improvement*. London: Rutledge Falmer.
- Harris, A. 2006. *Leading Change in Schools in Difficulty*. *Journal of Educational Change*, 7(1):9-18.
- Hopkins, D. 1994. *School Improvement in the Area of change*. London: Chassell.
- Hopkins, D. 2001. *School Improvement for Real*. Routledge.Flamer.

- Hopkins, D. 2002. *Improving the Quality of Education for All: A Handbook of Staff Development Activities*, 2nd Edition. David Fulton publishers Ltd, London, England.
- Hopkins, D. (2004). *School Improvement for Real*. London: Roulledge Falmer, England.
- Jeilu Oumar, (2010). *Strategic and School Improvement planning*. Addi AbabaUniversity. (Unpublished)
- Jose, F and Gonzales 1993. *Methods of Research and Thesis Writing*. National Boore, Acept Marulas, Paris, France.
- Khosa, G. 1999. *Sustainable School Improvement: A partnership between the State, the private Sector and Civil Society* Retrieved from www.jet.otga.za on May 14,2017
- Kotler 2003. *Strategic Marketing for Educational Institutions*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Mac beath, J. 2006. *School Evaluation for Quality Improvement*. Paris: IIEP
- Marlow, S. and Minehira, N , 2003. *Principals as Curriculum Leaders: New perspectives for the 21st Century*. Extracted from [http://: WWW.prel.org](http://WWW.prel.org) on Appril 2017.
- Mesele W/Senbet.2011. *Current Practices and challenges of School Improvement Program in Some Selected Primary Schools of Sodo Zura Woreda in Wolyita Zone*. Unpublished M.A Thesis. Addis Ababa University. Ethiopia.
- Ministry of Education, 1999. *School Improvement Program Guidelines* (blueprint). Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- _____, 2002. *The Education and Training Policy and its Implementation*: Addis, Ababa, Ethiopia.
- _____, 2006. *Decentralized Management of Education in Ethiopia: A reference Manual*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Ministry of Education, 2007. *School Improvement Program: The Frame Work*: Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

_____, 2008. General Education Quality Improvement Package. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

_____, 2010. School Improvement Program Guidelines, Final Draft: Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

_____, 2011. Guideline for the Implementation of the School Improvement Program. Revised Edition. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

_____, 2013. Management of Educational Change. Unpublished Teaching Modules, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Moran, A. and Bright man, B.K. 2001. Leading Organizational Change. *Career Development International*, 6(2): 111-119.

Morrison, K. 1998. Management theories for educational change. London: Sage Publications Company.

Nickols, F. 2004. Changemanagement: Aprimer. Retrieved from <http://home.att.net/nickols/change.htm> on march 2017.

O'Connor, C.A. 1993. Resistance: The repercussions of change. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 14(6): 30-36.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. 2001a. New School management approaches. Paris: OECD.

Oromia Education Bureau .2009. Implementation of Current Education and Training Policy: Training Manual for Teachers Addis Ababa: OEB.

Oromia Regional Education Bureau. 2016. Educational statistics Annual Abstract. Addis Ababa. Ethiopia.

- PlanInternational.2004.TheSchoolImprovementProgram.Retrievedfrom:<http://www.pln.international.org> on May 25, 2017
- Stacey, R. 1993. Strategic Thinking and the Management of Change: International Perspectives on Organizational Dynamics. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Szamosi, L.T. and Duxbury, L. 2002. Development of a measure to assess organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 15(2): 184- 201.
- Teck Hong, T.and Waheed, A.2011.Herthberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory and Job Satisfaction in the Malaysian: *The Mediating Effects of Love of Money Asian Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.16, No.1, 73-94.
- Temesgen Melaku.2008. Education Policy Formulation, Implementation and GEQAP in Ethiopia: Mojule two, Packages and Frame works. Bahardar, Bahardar University.
- Tesfaye Belachew. 2012. Government Secondary School Principals’ Leadership Capacity and Challenges as Perceived by Teachers in Bale Zone. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Teshale Duguma. 2011.Assessing the Effectiveness of School Principals in Implementing SIP: The Case of Government Secondary Schools of East Shoa Zone,Oromia Regional State. M.A Thesis, Haramaya University.
- Tony, B. George, K. 2006. New principals in Africa: Preparation, Induction and Practice. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(4): 359-375.
- Waters, J.T., Marzano, R.J. & McNulty, B. 2004. Leadership That Sparks Learning.
- Wudneh Almaz.2012. Assessing the Practices of the School Leadership Domain in SIP in the Government Primary Schools of Harari Regional State. Un published M.A Thesis. Haramaya University. Ethiopia.
- Zsolnai, L. 2011. Ethics Needs Spirituality. In Spirituality and Business. Springer Berlin Heidelberg,German.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1.

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE

College of Education and Behavioral sciences

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Questionnaire to be filled by Teachers and School Leaders (School Improvement Program Committee, Department heads, Principals and vice principals

Dear Respondents!

This questionnaire is designed to collect primary and relevant data for the thesis titled “Practices and Challenges of School Improvement Program Implementation in General Government Secondary Schools of West Hararghe Zone, Oromia Regional State.”As a result of this, your genuine response is very important for the success of this thesis. You are politely ordered to read all items and reply it as per the instructions. Be sure that your response will not be used for other purpose. It is used for only academic purpose.

- ✓ Please do not write your name
- ✓ Try to answer all the questions by writing your answer as per the instructions on the space given to you.

THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR COOPERATION!!!

Part I- Background and Information of the respondents

1. Name of the school _____
2. Sex A. Male B. Female
3. Age A. < 25 years 25-30 years C. 30-35 years D. 35-40 years
 E. > 40 years

4. Level of education A. Certificate B. Diploma C. Degree
D. MA/MSc
5. Current position A. Teacher B. Department head C. School improvement committee D. Principal E. Vice principal f. Supervisor
6. Total service year A. 0-5 years B. 5-10 years C. 10-15 year D. ≥ 15 years
7. Do you have training on "SIP implementation?" A. Yes B. No

Part .II. Assessing the practices of SIP implementation through the stages/ phases of SIP

Instructions: To assess the SIP implementation stages/ phases such as: self-enquiry, Planning, Implementation and Evaluation, please rate the following activities by using (\surd) mark in the space provided to you by choosing from (1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree and, 3= undecided, 4= agree and 5= strongly agree).

No	Stages/phases of SIP	Scales				
	Stage /phase 1. Self –enquiry/Assessment					
	Items	1	2	3	4	5
1	The self-enquiry was conducted continuously in the school regarding SIP implementation					
2	The school actively involved PTA, KETB, SIC & other stakeholders in the self-enquiry stage of SIP.					
3	The level of school performance on SIP implementation is identified properly.					
	Stage/phase 2. Planning					
4	The school has prepared the SIP implementation plan as it is indicated on the SIP guideline of MoE.					

5	The school has three years SIP strategic plan, one year and properly designed action plan for SIP implementation					
Stage/phase 3. Implementation						
6	The school leader properly ensures the necessary resource for the implementation of SIP plan.					
7	The implementation of SIP plan was communicated in a good manner for the community.					
8	The woreda education office is providing necessary support for the implementation of SIP.					
Stage/phase 4. Monitoring and Evaluation						
9	The school conducted regular monitoring and evaluation for the successful implementation of SIP.					
10	There is a habit of providing feedback on the implementation of SIP.					

Part III. Domains of SIP

Directions: the following questions are key elements to be considered in assessing the domains of SIP Implementation.

Therefore, to assess the Practices of School Improvement Program Implementation mainly by focusing on the two domains of SIP Teaching and learning and school leadership , Please indicate your opinion by rating the following activities using scales: (1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree and, 3= undecided, 4= agree and 5= strongly agree)

Table 2: Questionnaires on Teaching Learning Domain

No	Domain 1. Teaching and learning	Scales				
	Element i. The quality of teaching and learning					
	Items	1	2	3	4	5
1	The school has a set of collaboratively developed values that emphasis quality of teaching and learning.					
2	Teachers know their students and make early identification of their specific needs.					

3	Teachers understand contemporary and effective teaching methods and apply it in a classroom					
4	Teachers provide adequate support to different groups of students including special needs and girls.					
5	There is a habit of using teaching aids in teaching learning process.					
	Element ii. Learning and assessment					
6	Students' class work, homework and assignments.					
7	Teachers evaluate students' performance through continuous assessment.					
	Element iii. Curriculum					
8	The Principal visits the class room instruction and provide class observation feedback regularly					
9	The school conducted a staff meeting that supports the curriculum, encourages text book evaluation and gives respects for teachers 'comments.					
10	The curriculum is meaningful, engaging and appropriate to the developmental stage and needs of the students.					
	Domain 3. Leadership and Management					
	Element i. Strategic vision					
1	The school leader has vision and mission of the school.					
2	The values, ethics, guiding principles and purpose of the school are defined and known by the whole school community.					
3	Strategies are in place to communicate and implement the whole school strategic plan.					
	Element ii. Leadership behavior					
4	The school leader ship and management has the ability to identify and understand the training needs of the school.					
5	The school leader ship has competency in the implementation of SIP.					
	Element 3. School Management					

6	School policies are documented, developed, reviewed and updated regularly.					
7	The school leadership and management have a regular time to discuss on the implementation of SIP.					
8	Human, material and financial resources are managed, aligned and used to support the achievement of high levels of students' attainment.					
Questionnaires on the Roles and Responsibilities of School Leaders on SIP Implementation						
1	The school leader has created awareness for school community in the implementation of SIP.					
2	The school Leaders has allocated the necessary resource for the successful SIP implementation.					
3	The school leaders have established school improvement committee by participating necessary stakeholders as to the blue print.					
4	The school leaders collected necessary information on the school domains in order to implement SIP.					
5	The school leaders enable parents of students to have adequate and updated information regarding the learning efficiency and their academic results.					
6	They design a strategy by which the school community and other stakeholders contribute highly for the improvement of schools.					
7	Organize short term trainings and experience sharing forums to teachers and the school community on issues useful for the school improvement at a convenient time schedule.					
8	Submitting annual report to the school community and parents regarding the current status of the school based on the school improvement works undertaken and the evaluation and					

	facilitate discussions on observed problems to find solutions.					
Questionnaires on the Strategies Used to Implement SIP						
1	Organizing trainings for all concerned bodies on SIP implementation.					
2	Conducting self evaluations in schools to identify weaknesses and strengths and formulate a common plan.					
3	Formation of implementation committees (teams) at different level and put the level of responsibility and accountability.					
4	Searching for extra source of budget for the implementation of SIP.					
5	Scheduling of monitoring and evaluation for the realization of the program.					
6	Facilitating the exchange of experience among the schools in the Woreda through the Woreda School Improvement Coordinating Unit and striving for the realization of better outcomes.					
7	Organizing of consultation forums at least after each semester result has been notified and responds properly to queries of the public and take the appropriate corrective measures.					
8	The school leaders modified its SIP implementation plan in progress.					
The Questionnaires on the Challenges of SIP Implementation						
1	There is a difficulty of understanding of school improvement program implementation on the side of various stakeholders.					
2	There is a high resistance of school improvement program from school leaders or management bodies like principal.					
3	There is a shortage of educational facilities and finance.					
4	There is lack of commitment on the side of teachers and school leaders.					
5	There is a limited support from woreda education office, secondary school supervisor and other concerned bodies.					
6	There is a lack of practical training on the uses of SIP documents prepared by MoE.					
7	There is a low capacity of the school leader in the school.					
8	There is a lack of stakeholder's participation on the implementation of SIP.					
9	There is a lack of a policy document that guides the implementation of SIP in the school.					

Open ended questions

1. What is the current status of SIP implementation in your school?-----

2. If your answer for question No.1 is low, why? Specify the reasons behind briefly and precisely.-----

3. What other major challenges do you think that hinder the implementation of SIP? -

4. What solutions do you suggest to improve the implementation problems raised under question No 3? -----

5. What are problems observed concerning improvements of student's achievement after SIP has been applied? -----

6. What solution do you suggest for the problems identified above? -----

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR COOPERATION!!!

Appendix 2.

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

POST GRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interview Guide Questions for the students' representatives, School Supervisors and Woreda education officer.

The purpose of this **interview** is to gather information on the practices and challenges of school improvement program implementation in Government General Secondary schools of West Hararge Zone, Oromia Regional States Therefore; you are kindly requested to give your genuine response for the following questions.

Part I- personal information

1. Sex -----
2. Age-----
3. Level of education -----
4. Current position -----
5. Do you have training on “SIP implementation?” -----

Part II- Interview Guiding Questions

Please; frankly reflect your idea on the questions raised below.

1. What were the major activities performed during the Four stages/phases of SIP in your school?
2. Is there the habit of involving all the stakeholders in the Four stages/phases of school improvement program in the school?
3. How do you rate the level of school improvement program implementation in secondary schools of your school, cluster or woreda?
4. What were the major challenges in the implementation of SIP in secondary schools?
5. What measures should be taken to solve the problems in the implementation of SIP in secondary schools?
6. What are the strategies that you use in the implementation of SIP in secondary schools of your school, cluster or woreda?
7. What are the roles and responsibilities you are discharged for the implementation of SIP as a school principal, super visor or woreda education officer in secondary schools of your school, cluster or woreda?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!!!

APPENDIX 2a. Interview Questions In Afan Oromo Version

YUNVARSIIITII HARAMAYAATTII

**DAAYIIREEKTOOREETII SAGANTAA BARNOOTA EBBAAN
BOODA**

KOLLEEJII BARNOOTAA FI SAAYIINSII AMALAA

MUMMEE KAROORAA FI HOOGGANSAA BARNOOTA

SAGANTAA BULCHIINSAA MANNEEN BARNOOTA

Gaaffii qomaa bakka bu’oota barattoota, supervaayizera MB sad 2ffaa fi I/G Waj/barnootaa Aanooleef qophaahe.

Kabajamtootaa deebistootaa,

Gaafannoon kun kan qophaa’e manneen barnoota mootummaa sad.2ffaa Godina Harergee lixaa keessaatti hojiirraa oolmaa SFMB fi sababoota raawii sagantaa fooyya’insaa mana barumsaa (SFMB) irraatti dhiibbaa geessisan sakatta’uufi dha.

Odeeffannoon gaafannoo kanaan argeman dhimma qorannoo barnootaa qofaaf fayyadamna.

Kutaa 1^{ffaa} Odeeffannoo waliigalaa

Saala-----umrii-----sadarkaa barnoota-----Gosa barnoota-----
tajajila-----Gahee hojii-----Leenjii dhiimmaa SFMB irratti ni qabda-----

Kutaa 2ffaa

Gaaffii qomaa gaafatamitaniif sirritti dhaggeeffachuudhaan deebii sirrii,gababaa fi qulqulluu kenna

1. Gochaawwan/Wantootni hojiirra oolma sadarkaalee Afraan/phases SFMB irratti akka M/B keessanitti hojjeetaman maal maal fa’i ?

2. M/B keessaan hangaam qooda fudhattoota hunda murnaalee SFMB irratti hirmaachisuun hojjecha jira?
3. Leenjiin hubaannoo hoojiirraa oolmaa SFMB irratti hagam kennitani jirtu?
4. Raawattootni waajjirraa barnootaa, dureen M/B fi supervaayizerri sagantaa fooyya'insaa mana barumsaa hojji irra ooluu isaatiif sagantaa idilee dawwanna qabachuun hagam deeggarsaa Oggummaa fi leeccalloo kennaa jiran maal fakkata?
5. M/B keessanitti raawwii sagantaa fooyyaa'insa mana barumsaa sadrkaa kamitti madaltu?
6. Sagantaa fooyya'insaa mana barumsaa (SFMB) hojirra olchuu keessatti rakkoleen ijoodha jettaan yaaddan maalfadha?
9. Rakkoollee kanaatiif furmaanni isaa maalii dha jettaan yaadduu?
7. Haalii waliigala qabxii barattootaa sagantaa fooyya'insaa mana barumsaa (SFMB) erga hojiirraa oolee fi osoo hin oliin maalfakkataa?
8. Tooftaleen nutii SFMB hojiirraa oolchuuf fayyadamu qabnu maalfadha jeettani yaaddu?
9. Gaheeni fi itti gaafatamummaan isin akka duree, supervaayizeeraa fi gaggeessa waajira barnoota tokkotti hojiirra oolmaa SFMB irratti qabdan maal maal fadha?

Appendix 3

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

POST GRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE

College of Education and Behavioral sciences

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Document Review Check list

The document review checklist will be conducted based on the following school documents through checking their availabilities and proper application of the in the school to collect secondary data on the current status of SIP implementation

Table

No	Document reviews items	Available in the school	Not available in the school
1	The school annual plan		
2	School Strategic plan		
3	Minutes of meeting on SIP		
4	Continuous assessment formats		
5	Training reports on SIP		
6	Self-assessment documents		
7	Community involvement records		