

**UTILIZATION OF SCHOOL GRANT AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO  
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM IN SECONDARY  
SCHOOLS OF DIRE DAWA ADMINISTRATION**

**MA THESIS**

**EJETA MEKONNEN**

**APRIL 2018**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA**

**Utilization of School Grant and Its Contribution to School Improvement  
Program in Secondary Schools of Dire Dawa Administration**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Educational Planning and  
Management, Directorate for Postgraduate Program  
HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
MASTER OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT**

**Ejeta Mekonnen**

**APRIL 2018**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**  
**DIRECTORATE FOR POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM**

We here certify that we have read and evaluated this thesis entitled: Utilization of School Grant and Its Contribution to School Improvement Program in Secondary Schools of Dire Dawa Administration Prepared under my guidance by Ejeta Mekonnen. We recommend that it be submitted as fulfilling the thesis requirement.

Dr. Bahar Adem

\_\_\_\_\_

Advisor

Signature

Date

Mr Tadesse Hailu

\_\_\_\_\_

Co-Advisor

Signature

Date

As a member of the Board of Examiners of the M.A. thesis Open Defense Examination, We certify that we have read, evaluated the thesis prepared by Ejeta Mekonnen and examined the candidate. We recommend that the thesis be accepted as fulfilling the thesis requirement for the degree of Master of Educational Leadership and Management.

\_\_\_\_\_

Chair person

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

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 SGCS).

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this thesis to my family and all individuals who are always helped me to cope up all those works.

## STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR

First, I declare that this thesis is my own work and that all sources of materials used for this thesis have been duly acknowledged. This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfilments of the requirements for MA Degree at Haramaya University and is deposited at University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the library. I also declare that this thesis is not submitted to any other institution for the awarded of academic degree, diploma or certificate.

Brief quotation from this thesis is allowable without special permission, provided th at accurate acknowledgement of the source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of department or the Dean of the school of Postgraduate Program Directorate. When in his or her judgment the proposed use of material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instance, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

Name: Ejeta Mekonnen

Signature -----

Place: Haramaya University

Date of Submission: June2017

## **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

The author was born in April 1972 in Dado Sire Budo kebele in Jimma Horro Woreda Horro Guduru Zone of Oromia Regional State. He attended his Primary education in Dado Sire Budo Primary school and Secondary school in Shambu Sineoir Secondary school in Jimma Horro Woreda of Horro Guduru. In 1989E.C he sat for Ethiopian School Leaving Certificate Examination and joined to Robe Teacher Training Institute and awarded with TTI in 1991E.C He was employed by Dire Dewa Administration as a teacher and worked at Halo Busa, Harla and Jelo Balina primary schools for 10 years. Later school director in Wahel and Afatessa primary and secondary school. He then, accomplished the diploma program in Physics at Haramaya University in 1996E.C.

Furthermore, in 1998E.C. he attended his undergraduate program at Haramaya University and graduated with degree in Physics. After graduation, he worked for one year (2002E.C.) in Lega Hare secondary school of Dire Dawa Administration. Then, he worked for three years (2003E.C.-2005E.C.) as school principal in Wahel Primary and Secondary school of Dire Dawa Administration. Currently he is serving as school principal in Melka Jebdu Primary and secondary school of Dire Dawa Administration and he joined College of Education and Behavioural Sciences, Department of Educational Leadership and Management of Haramaya University in 2003E.C. to pursue his MA Degree in School Leadership and Management in summer program.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The successful completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the support, guidance and assistance of many people, amongst others, the following need special thanks:-It is with great respect and honor that I acknowledge the guidance, intellectual advice, and regular discussions of my major advisor, Dr. Bahar Adem. Thank you for all your words of encouragement and support throughout my thesis process. Also, I would like to express my sincere and deepest gratitude to my co-advisor Tadesse Hailu (Asst. Professor) for his sustained direction and continuous encouragement that guided this thesis to its completion.

I would also like to extend very sincere and special thanks to Ato Mohamed Kedir previously the head department of Educational Planning and Management Haramaya University, for his sustained direction and continuous encouragement that guided to this thesis completion. I would also like to thank supervisors, Principals, teachers, and different school committee (SGC, SIPC and PSTA) of the sampled schools, for their hospitality and heartily contribution in providing data for my work. Furthermore, I extend my appreciation to Ministry of Education and my organization, the Dire Dawa Education Bureau for the legal permission and sponsoring me to work for my second degree.

Also, my appreciation goes to my wife Tilaynsh Fata, my sons Naol Ejeta, Robson Ejeta, and my daughter Fenet Ejeta for their consistent support and whole hearted help in making my dream a reality. I would like to express also my heartfelt grateful to all my friends and especially to Ato Elias Kebede for his sustained direction and continuous encouragement to this thesis completion. Finally, I am thankful to Haramaya University College of Education and Behavioural Science Department of Educational Planning and Management for providing me accommodations during my research work.

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<b>AACA</b>	Addis Abeba City Administration
<b>ABE</b>	Alternative Basic Education
<b>BOFEDs</b>	Bureaus of Finance and Economic Development
<b>DDA</b>	Dire Dawa Administration
<b>DDEB</b>	Dire Dawa Education Bureau
<b>DPCs</b>	Direct Private Costs
<b>ESDP</b>	Education Sector Development Program
<b>ETP</b>	Educational and Training Policy
<b>GEQAP</b>	General Educational Quality Assurance Program
<b>GEQIP</b>	General Educational Quality Improvement Package
<b>GoE</b>	Government of Education
<b>IIEP</b>	International Institute for Educational Planning
<b>JRM</b>	Joint Review Mission
<b>MAP</b>	Management and Administration Program
<b>MoE</b>	Ministry of Education
<b>NRS</b>	National Regional State
<b>PSTA</b>	Parent Student Teachers Association
<b>REB</b>	Regional Education Bureau
<b>SGC</b>	School Grant Committee
<b>SIMA</b>	School Instructional Materials Account
<b>SIP</b>	School Improvement Program
<b>SIPC</b>	School Improvement Program Committee
<b>SMC</b>	School Management Committee
<b>SNNPR</b>	South Nation and Nationality Peoples Region
<b>TGE</b>	Transitional Government of Ethiopia
<b>WEOs</b>	Woreda Education Offices
<b>WOFEDs</b>	Woredas of Finance and Economic Development

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS	PAGE
DEDICATION	IV
STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR	V
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	VI
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	VII
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	VIII
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IX
LIST OF TABLES	XII
ABSTRACT	XIII
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Research Question	5
1.4. Objectives of the Study	6
1.4.1. General objectives	6
1.4.2. Specific objective	6
1.5. Significance of the Study	7
1.6. Delimitation of the Study	7
1.7. Operational Definition of Term	7
<b>2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</b>	9
2.1. Concept of Educational Finance	9
2.2. Concept of School Grant in Education	10
2.3. Types of School Grant	
111	
2.4. Block Grant	
122	
2.5. International Experience on School Grant Utilization	
122	
2.6. African Experience on School Grant Utilization	
133	
2.7. School Grant in Ethiopia	
144	

2.8. Contribution of School Grant to SIP	166
2.9. International School Finance Sources	177
2.10. Sources of School Finance in Ethiopia	188
2.11. Practice of Financial Management in Schools	20
	ix
2.12. Practice of School Principals in Financial Management	21
2.12.1. School management committees	21
2.12.2. School improvement program committee	22
2.13. Practice of PSTA in Financial Management	22
2.14. Role of the Community in Financial Management	23
2.15. Challenges in Utilization of School Grant	23
2.15.1. Stakeholders skill to manage school grant	24
2.15.2. Delay of school grant	25
2.15.3. Lack of accountability during utilization of school grant	25
2.16. Monitoring and Control of the Use of the School Grant	26
2.16.1. Internal monitoring at school levels	26
2.16.2. External monitoring	26
2.17. Auditing in School Grants Utilization	27
2.17.1. Internal auditing	27
2.17.2. External auditing	28
2.18. Strategies for Proper Utilization of School Grant	28
<b>3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>30</b>
3.1. Description of the Study Area	30
3.2. Research Design	30
3.3. Sources of Data	30
3.3.1. Primary sources	30
3.3.2. Secondary sources	31
3.4. Target Population, Sample and Sampling Technique	31
3.5. Instruments of Data Collection	34
3.5.1. Questionnaire	34

3.5.2. Interview guide	34
3.5.3. Document analysis	35
3.6. Procedures of Data Collection	35
3.7. Methods of Data Analysis	36
3.8. Ethical Consideration	37
<b>4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS</b>	
388	
4.1. Characteristics of Respondents	
388	
x	
4.2. Linking Priority Need of School Improvement Program with the School Grant	42
4.3. Views of Respondents about Communication of School Grant Utilization	46
4.4. Management of school grant	49
4.5. Contribution of School Grant to School Improvement Program	54
4.6. Challenges that Hinders the Utilization of School Grant	
588	
4.7. Monitoring and Evaluating School Grant Utilization	63
<b>5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	67
5.1. Summary of Findings	67
5.2. Conclusions	70
5.3. Recommendation	72
<b>6. REFERNCES</b>	75
<b>7. APPEDNDICES</b>	79



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	School grant allocation per pupil per year at secondary school	16
Table 2	Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques	33
Table 3	Characteristics of the respondents	39
Table 4	Concept on School Grant Utilization	43
Table 5	Training on School Grant Utilization	45
Table 6	Communication of school grant utilization	46
Table 7	Management of school grant	49
Table 8	Contribution of school grant to school improvement program	54
Table 9	Factors that affect the utilization of school grant	58
Table 10	Ways of monitoring and evaluation of school grant utilization	63

**Utilization of School Grant and Its Contribution to  
School Improvement Program in Secondary  
Schools of Dire Dawa Administration**

**Ejeta Mekonnen**

**ABSTRACT**

*The purpose of this study was to assess the utilization of school grant and its contribution to school improvement program in secondary school of Dire Dawa Administration. The research design employed was descriptive survey design. The study mostly used systematic sampling and available sampling techniques to gather various kinds of data with minimum resources. The data were collected through questionnaire, interviews and documents analysis. A sample of 6 secondary school supervisors, 30 PSTA, 35 SGC, 44 SIP Committee and 110 Teachers. Besides, 5 school principals were interviewed and total population used for the study were 230. The data were analysed using frequency and percentage, statistics of mean, grand mean and t-test by using SPSS version 20 computer programme .The results of the study revealed that priority of their plan the allocation of school grant on time, the awareness, participation of school committee, transparency and accountability, experience, follow up and in all current status of school grant utilization were low. Furthermore, the study revealed that: lack of committee involvement, late and irregular disbursement, and lack of matching school grant plan with SIP priority need plan, lack of external auditing and lack of priority need to what to be purchased were high. School grant fund utilization in need assessments was inadequate. Most of the respondents disagree on: using effectively, participating all school community, evaluating the progress, identifying the problems, facilitating different workshop and training and the expenditure and balance available only displayed on the notice board of the school. Finally, to improve the situation, it is suggested that: Education bureau should give the awareness, different training and workshop, follow up and improve late and irregular disbursement of school grant fund, facilitate external audit, record-keeping, focal person of school grant at school level and school was great need for capacity building on how to keep adequate financial records. Principals should have transparency and accountability, give priority need and shall participate all stakeholders and committees.*

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with background of the study, statements of the problem, research questions, and objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation, and definition of basic terms as follows.

## 1.1. Background of the Study

The value of education is largely responsible for economic growth and national development. Only an educated people can command the skills necessary for sustainable economic growth and for a better quality of life (World Bank, 2008). Economic development will be achieved if and only if the society gets proper education, so to achieve the objectives the priority should be given to minimize the scarcity of finances and inefficiency of administration practices. The teaching-learning process can be more successful in an educational institution where resources are available and well managed and utilized. It is true that the availability of skilled human power with the required knowledge, skill and attitude is a key factor for sustainable socio-economic development.

Finance contributes to incredibly exerting influence in any organization's plan realization and a desired goal achievement. Because, the contribution of financial resources in obtaining the skilled human and relevant material resources is the most indispensable element of all others required facilities (Mbamb, 1992). This means that School grant serves as an input for the realization of school objectives through implementing school improvement program. Now days as the quality of education are a burning issue in the education world, by strengthen the financial utilization capacity of schools to benefits all the stakeholders by improving school improvement program (SIP).

Schools, which before such policies had very little or no say about financial management, now receive grants directly from central authorities. Now day education systems around the world decentralize school grant to better serve and bring services closer to their beneficiaries: students, parents, and communities. School managements must use an important tool to improve efficiency, quality and equity of the schools (Donald, 1995). This means in present an

increasing number of countries, school grant policies represent a major reform in educational management. They are at present not only asked to deal with these grants but also to use them more or less as they see fit in order to improve the school's improvement program.

Capacity building for School improvement program should be implemented under the Management and Administration program (MAP) component of GEQIP to ensure complementarities with other decentralized education planning and management capacity building programs. Many studies of the school improvement process suggest that the involvement of teachers, students, and communities are vital for effective change (MoE, 2008). The decentralization of grants management brings additional responsibilities to school actors, who are to develop new skills the need for a clear understanding of the programs.

The objectives of school grants vary widely. It is precisely the capacity to address multiple and different objectives that makes school grants an attractive policy tool for school improvement program. World Bank (2006), the enhance of school community participation in resource utilization decision, enhancement of quality and relevance school inputs, increased provision and relevance of textbooks and school materials, improved schools infrastructure-motivate many school grant projects. This means the schools need school grant for improving the quality of schools inputs for teaching - learning process and students learning outcome by providing basic and quality operational resources to schools. Additionally, for filling the required materials for school infrastructure the school grant has good contribution.

In other words, school grants are expected to make a positive contribution to access, quality and equity. However, there can be a great distance between a policy and its implementation and the existence of school grants in no way guarantees that these improvements will be realized. This study will focus on contribution of school grants to SIP. Therefore, to utilize properly it need a good performed school principal and participation of school community. So far, there has been little research on the way in which school grants are actually used within and by the schools to realize SIP.

As commented by Buckland, Many studies of school grants programs and school-based management interventions are based on analysis of program documents which describe the way in which initiatives were designed, and do not document sufficiently the extent to which and in what ways strategies were actually implemented on the ground, so that success or failure may often be more a function of failures or weaknesses in implementation rather than technical design (Buckland, 2011). For this reason the required strong/substantial/ planning, budgeting, management responsibilities and utilizing the allocated school grants are transfer to realized school objective.

According to Ethiopia MoE (2001), the concept of school grant is operating costs additionally for non-salary expenditures the school receive with the number of students enrolled in the school. School grant budget disbursement to the schools with the number of student enrolled in the schools. This program entails the provision of additional resources to schools and support implementation of the School improvement program.

Moreover, the World Bank Group(1994), based on its study in Sub Saharan Africa, suggested “... the central role of the individual school, in all its complexity, needs the planned school grant utilization according to SIP priorities and evaluation to bring organizational mission.”That means provision of school grants needed to supports implement SIP effectively.

As MoE (2008), school grant program is a pillar of SIP and has challenge in utilizing school grant properly for the contribution of school improvement program. This lead the researcher study focuses the assessment on utilization of the school grant and contribution to school improvement program in secondary schools of DDA.

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

Education systems around the world decentralize school grant management to better serve and bring services closer to their beneficiaries: students, parents, and communities. School grants are important tool for the purpose of improves efficiency, quality and equity of schools. However, the Problem of Public education in developing countries such as Gahana, Malawi,

Loseto, Keniya and Ethiopia causes are not well known. Both coverage and quality of instruction are inadequate, especially for the poor country. Ministry of education lack the capacity to efficiently and effectively deliver resources, including school construction, Salary expenditures crowd out essential non-salary resources such as textbooks, incentives for good performance are almost nonexistent. School grants are a tool that can help to address some of these problems in the context of decentralized education systems (Budlender D & Woolard I, 2006).

As MoE (2008), school grant fund program is a pillar of school improvement program which entails the provision of additional funds to all government primary and secondary schools to support the implementation of school improvement program as well as realize measurable improvement in the learning teaching process. While the implementation of some activities out lined in the school improvement program will need resources to achieve the objective.

School grant contributed by World Bank to ensure the General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP). The school grant budget is announced by the Federal Ministry of Education. The fund helps the Ministry of Education, regional Education office, University, Teacher Training College, schools in addition to Adult Basic Education (MoE, 2010). These school grant policies were generally introduced to accompany fee-free education. School grants were expected to make up for the loss of income due to the abolition of school fees. Ministry of education designed SIP priorities are integrated with school grant properly to cover several key activities to be undertaken such as enrolment of students, provision of teaching and learning materials, school management, repairs, etc (MoE, 2001).

In DDA, 10 government secondary schools that have completed the second three years SIP implementation on the intention of significantly improving student learning and learning out come. But the feedback from MoE Supervision (2002), and the Dire Dawa education bureau GEQAP Community Mobilization Plan (2003), indicated that the SIP has a limitation. However, these documents do not explain the nature of the gap in detail but the school grant is a pillar SIP. However, the limitation /the gap/ seen to school grant contribution on SIP

implementation. Therefore in DDA secondary schools, there are some similar challenges in the implementation of school grant. Especially, preparing a participatory budget plan with stakeholders linking with school improvement program and timely supervising the performance of the school were the major problems in the schools.

The previous study was concerned only on “the use and usefulness of school grant”. In other words, school grants are expected to make a positive contribution to access, quality and equity. Though, there can be great challenges between a policy guideline and its implementation and the simple existence of school grants is no way of guarantees that these improvements were realized Buckland, (2011). In addition school grant was the pillar of school improvement program also which is expected to make a positive contribution to school improvement program.

However, it is not implemented on time for the needed purpose because allocated grant distribution was lag. More over financial report to the concerned body and following up by school supervisor were implemented some times. For this reason, accountability and responsibilities were very less. Since accountability and responsibilities were very less, the contributions of school grants to SIP is also less. Therefore, this researcher aimed at filling the gap through assessing the utilization of school grant and its contribution to SIP in secondary schools of DDA.

### **1.3. Research Question**

The study focused on the following basic research questions:

- 1) How do the schools link their school improvement program plan with the school grant plan in DDA secondary schools?
- 2) How do schools communicate utilization of school grant to school community in DDA secondary schools?
- 3) How do schools manage and evaluate the utilization of school grant in DDA secondary schools?

- 4) What are the contributions of school grant to school improvement program in secondary school of DDA?
- 5) What are the factors that affect the utilization of the school grant in DDA secondary school?
- 6) What should be done to improve the utilization of school grant in DDA secondary school?

#### **1.4. Objectives of the Study**

##### **1.4.1. General objective**

The major objective of this study is to: -examine the contribution of school grant to school improvement program, identifying the factors that affect the proper utilization of the school grant and to find the possible solutions under the study.

##### **1.4.2. Specific objectives**

The specific objective of the study was to:-

1. Examine how the schools link their school improvement program plan with the school grant plan in secondary school of DDA.
2. Examine how schools communicate the utilization of school grant in secondary school of DDA.
3. Explore how the schools are managing and report the utilization of school grant to the concerned body in secondary school of DDA.
4. Assess the current contribution of school grant to school improvement program in secondary school of DDA.
- 5) Identify factors that affect the proper utilization of school grant in secondary school of DDA.
- 6) Make suggestions towards the improvement of school grant utilization in secondary school of DDA.

### **1.5. Significance of the Study**

The school grants utilization has been given little attention under study. Therefore this study focused on assessing the utilization of school grant and its contribution to school grant regarding school improvement program in secondary schools of DDA. It may help for school principals and school administrators to understand the proper utilization of school grant and its contribution to school improvement program and it helps for educational officials at different levels to find ways of improving the utilization of school grant relating with school improvement program. Additionally it serves as a clue for stakeholders to aware about the benefits of school grant for school improvement program and quality education as well as it helps to suggest the possible solutions that solve the problem under the study and also the study could be a springboard for further research works on the area.

### **1.6. Delimitation of the Study**

The scope of the study was delimited to assess school grant in selected government secondary schools in DDA. The school grant was independent variable and it concentrates on that was further discussed in the literature in 5 selected secondary schools. The researcher has a notion that these teachers and schools could be the represented by systematic and simple random sampling respectively that enables to generalize to all secondary schools in the administration and school committees (SGC, SIPC and PSTA) and supervisors were selected by available sampling techniques. The basic reason why the researcher decided this study to be conducted in five selected secondary schools were only because the researcher was grow up and he studied there and this should given him a better opportunity to get reliable information and cooperation to carry out the study, based on findings made recommendation to regional education bureau, bureau of finance and the schools included in the study.

### **1.7. Operational Definition of Terms**

The following definition of terms/phrases/ offer the readers a context for understanding the terminology used in the current research.

**Contribution:**-Refers to the expected positive contribution of school grant for of school improvement program implementation.

**School grant:** -Refers to a payments made to all government schools in Ethiopia, based on the number of students' enrolled in each schools with a special focus on improving of teaching and learning process through school improvement program.

**School improvement program:**-Refers to improving school facilities and learning teaching process in the school.

**Utilization:**-Refers to the process of implementing school grant. The practices of applying physical school grant and instructional materials in the approved manner to minimize unnecessary problems that can positively affect school improvement program of schools.

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

The review literature part of the research tries to discuss the major theoretical concepts related to the education finance and sources of education finance in Ethiopia especially for schools. Based on this, the definition and concepts of school grant, types of school grants, contribution and advantages of school grants and major challenges in utilization of the school grant.

### **2.1. Concept of Educational Finance**

Nelson (2000), noted that in educational institutions finance refers to the activity that is concerned with decision on how to procure funds, of organization financial resources, manage, disburse and give account of funds provided for the implementation of educational programs. In Nigeria, the amount of government grants allocated to particular institution vary depending on factors like size of the institution, number of enrolled students, and particular need of the institution. Government grants alone cannot be adequate to finance education, individuals, communities, and organizations benefit directly from education; so they should directly share the burden of financing education. Furthermore, PSTA of the schools in the country charge levies in secondary schools though the amount vary from school to school. Generally, the tuition fees decided by government and PSTA are not adequate to carryout school programs.

The role of budget and finance is incredibly exerting influence in any organization's plan realization and a desired goal achievement. Because, the contribution of financial resources in obtaining the skilled human and relevant material resources is the most indispensable element of all others required facilities (Mbamba, 1992). This means that School grant serves as an input for the realization of school objectives through implementing school improvement program. Now days as the quality of education are a burning issue in the education world, by strengthen the financial utilization capacity of schools to benefits all the stakeholders by improving school improvement program.

John and Morphet (1999), noted that planning for the financing of education begins with planning for improvements in the educational undertakings. The main objective in financial planning is to confirm that appropriate goals of education be achieved effectively. It should be kept in mind that financial planning and education planning must be closely interrelated. Budget for schools serve as a guide to financial planning and program management to permit orderly operation for a sated period. It serves as an instrument for planning so that the educational program will not be interrupted or restricted because of insufficient funds (Jordan, 1985). Education planners should work to allocate resources to the educational activities which will have the greatest impact and are likely to be able to solve educational problems (Wadsley, 1993).

## **2.2. Concept of School Grant in Education**

The school grant refers to remarked budget support for the implementation of GEQIP in an endeavor to enhance the provision of quality education by improving school improvement program. The ministry of education in collaboration with development partners designed it. In Ethiopia, school grant is not a substitute to the block grant, it a supplement design intended to fill the gap of the block grant as an effort to provide quality education through school improvement program (MoE, 2008).

Ethiopia is a country that moved to a new culture from a deep ingrained centralized system to a decentralized system. As ETP (1994), this decentralized educational management practice helps to solve the problem of low access, inequality, low quality, irrelevance, efficiency, and organization and management problems. Winkler and Schlegel (2005), point out those education systems around the world decentralize management to better serve and bring services closer to the beneficiaries; students, parents, and communities. They further assert that school grants are an important tool that can improve efficiency; quality and equity of the decentralization process.

Winkler and Schlegel (2005), indicate that school grants are transfers of financial resources and authority from governments or non-governmental organizations directly to schools or small networks of schools. School grants are usually formula-based related to poverty rates and student population. This determines that the amount funds are managed by the school director and parent-teacher association. Also from the ideas of the scholars, we can understand that school grants are necessary inputs that can help to improve the services given by schools to its customers and needs to be managed adequately to bring changes to the school. Additionally school administrators such as school principals, PSTA's and school administrators need to actively involved in school financial management activities. School grants are financial resources transferred to the school level for the purpose of school improvement program.

In Ethiopia the abolition of school fees were visible because the country had traditionally had low enrollment and wide disparities across and within the regions (UNESCO, 2009). The abolition of school fees for primary and secondary schooling was viewed as a positive development overall by various stakeholders including parents, school principals, teachers, also it was matched by a compensating increase in public funding to schools. So, the Ethiopian government allocates grants for schools to the school improvement activities. Generally, schools grant has contribution on school improvement program.

### **2.3. Types of School Grant**

As Egziabher (2010), there are two types of grants that are used to support education in Ethiopia. The first is the block grant that is assigned to the education sector and is mostly used to pay salaries. The second type of grant is school grant and according to the (MoE 2001), the school grant is a pillar of SIP and has contribution on school improvement preprogram. All types of school grants shall be utilized as per the guidelines during the Academic year. The SMC shall make resolutions to utilize all types of grants. Social audit shall be done by SMC on utilization of the grants. Stock and Issue Registers shall be maintained for the items procured and utilized. Expenditure and balance available shall be displayed on the notice board. Discussion on utilization of school grants shall be conducted at monthly SMC

meetings. The SIMA grant is purely for the purchase of instructional materials, repairs and maintenance, etc. However, as stipulated in the free education policy, each grant is managed by a different set of actors (MoE, 2009).

#### **2.4. Block Grant**

The block grant was introduced in 2002 E.C. and it is a modality by which primed to swell the effectiveness and efficiency of educational financing by moving down decision making to the local levels. Primarily it was also aimed at creating equal access to education for all citizens under the banner of the MoE (1994), In principle, as stated in the block grant guideline MoE (2002), schools are expected to get their recurrent budget based on the number of employees (teachers and administrative staff salary) plus the running costs of the school-based on the number of students enrolled.

In practice, however, part of the block grant amount (the running costs) that arrives at the school level has been reported exceedingly low and the implementing capacity of schools seems inadequate (JRM, 2006). It is also appreciated by Ethiopian government a GEQIP project to improve the quality of education was accompanied by the school grants primed by the government of Ethiopia in collaboration with development partners.

#### **2.5. International Experience on School Grant Utilization**

One way to better understand school grant is to think of it in terms of the adequacy and equity of resources. Adequacy is based on the principle that states should provide enough funding for all students to be able to meet academic expectations. According to the most recent data available from the National Centre for Education Statistics, nationwide, the average state spending per pupil was \$10,297 (205.94 ETB) in 2008 ranging from a high of \$11,572 (231.44 ETB) in New York. It is difficult, to determine exactly how much money is needed to give all students an adequate education (Education Research Centre, 2011).

A wave of state school finance lawsuits that started in California in 1971 has served as one of the main means for spurring changes in states' education finance systems. From that first case in California through the 1980s, most cases were waged as challenges to the equity of state finance systems on behalf of disadvantaged children. In the late 1980s, however, many finance litigants shifted their focus to addressing the overall adequacy of finance systems and equity among districts (Education Research Centre, 2011).

The notion of equity in school funding focuses on strategies for closing the gap between local districts' abilities to raise revenues for their schools. Since local funds are commonly based at least in part on property taxes, less wealthy communities are not able to raise as much money for schools as wealthier districts, leaving their children at a considerable disadvantage. The higher the share of funding that states provide for education and the more states target that money, the better the chances for increasing equity in the system (Education Research Centre, 2011).

## **2.6. African Experience on School Grant Utilization**

There are two basic types of business school grants: grants that are awarded by a business school and grants that are awarded by the federal government. There are a surprising number of business school grants available through the federal government. These grants typically go by names like the federal Pell grant and the federal supplemental education opportunity grant. The size of these grants, as well as the availability, can vary depending on the time you apply, your level of need and other factors. MBA students are not eligible for any of the broad-based grants available from the federal government; these grants are only awarded to undergraduate students. School grants most business schools have business school grants to award to students who have merit or need. Some schools call them grants; others call them fellowships or scholarships (Hussien *et al.*, 2014).

The size of these grants, as well as the availability, can vary depending on the school. Some business schools have large grant funds and others do not. School-based grants are almost

always available to both undergraduate students and Master Business Art students alike. Most business school grants are awarded on a first come, first serve basis. This is especially true of school-based grants. To get the most grant money possible, it is a good idea to ask for it early. Next, contact your business school's financial aid office and inquire about grant money, scholarship money, or any other type of financial aid that doesn't have to be paid back. Business school grants may not be heavily advertised, but they are available to students who seek them out (Mukirae *et al*, 2014).

## **2.7. School Grant in Ethiopia**

The school grant refers to remarked budget support for the implementation of GEQIP in an endeavor to enhance the provision of quality education by improving school improvement program. The ministry of education in collaboration with development partners designed it. In Ethiopia, school grant is not a substitute to the block grant, it a supplement design intended to fill the gap of the block grant as an effort to provide quality education through school improvement program (MoE, 2008).

School grant education was officially introduced in Ethiopia in 1994 for Grades 1 to10, with the purpose of creating equal access to education for all, as stipulated by the education and training policy of Ethiopia. While this policy assures the provision of free general education for all citizens, it also ensures the implementation of fiscal decentralization, creating conditions for schools to generate their own income, providing special support for their education. As a result of decentralization, the previous system of budget allocation, when funds were primarily controlled by the Ministry of Education at the central level, has been changed.

According to a World Bank project appraisal document (2008), the school grant is designed to provide minimum funds to all schools, both primary and secondary and Alternative Basic Education (ABE) centres to address at least what is prescribed in the Blue Book (MoE, 2002). Hence, the school grant policy was designed to fill the gap created by the shortfall of the block

grant (MoE, 2009). All government schools, both primary and secondary, and ABE centres are eligible for school grants as long as they fulfil the requirements described in the school grant guide lines. Although the guidelines were developed in 2008/2009, schools received funds from the school grant for the first time in 2009/2010. The guidelines stipulated that the school grants would be released twice a year, in August/September and January/February. The school grant guidelines document stated that, if successful and there is adequate funding, the programme may continue beyond this date (MoE, 2009).

During the first wave of decentralization, the regional education bureau (REB) took on the responsibilities of requesting and allocating an educational budget to their respective zones, weradas and schools. The government in 2002 moved the decision-making authorities to the woreda level (second wave of decentralization) in conjunction with a new approach to educational financing named the block grant (Hussien *et al*, 2014).

The school grants policy to uphold the implementation of the GEQIP and more specifically, the SIP. As one of the six GEQIP components, the SIP aims to enhance student achievement and by increasing the capacity of schools to manage change in the following areas: teaching-learning process, school environment, school leadership and management, and community participation. The principal rationale for the introduction of a school grant policy was to enhance the quality of education. School-level actors, mainly the school Director; SIPC members, and PSTA chairpersons and members, described school grants as a means of improving the teaching–learning process (MoE, 2009).

Table1. School grant allocation per pupil per year at different levels of primary and secondary school.

No.	Grades	GEQIP school grant allocations	
		2009	2016
1.	1 to 4	15	50
2.	5 to 8	20	55
4	9 and 10	30	60
	11 and 12	50	70

Source: School grant utilization guideline, 2009 Source: School grant utilization guideline, 2016.

## 2.8. Contribution of School Grant to SIP

School grants have a great advantage in improving quality of education through school improvement program and overall school activities. As Atou Seck (2007), outlines the school grants has the following contribution; the school grant has an advantage of improving equity in access to education and quality of learning. It also helps to significantly improve access to education, increases the involvement of the stakeholders in school activities, and improves the management of the school and its performance. Moreover, it helps to reduce direct cost of education for parents, increase resources to schools in terms of providing resources for teaching material and basic operational expenses, replace school fees, operational expenses, and serves as increasing resources for schools.

Moreover, school grant, also have the contribution of strengthen the role and involvement of parents and local communities, improve the quality of supervision of management and ensure that the abolition of fees does not lead to the disengagement of parents and the community, replace resources of schools previously generated from school fees, and financing the

availability of quality resources, vulnerable groups can be benefited by differentiating the grant amounts (girls, orphans, poorer schools and/or communities; promote the decentralization of decision making and procurement to maximize the use of local expertise, teaching materials and funds for operational expenses have improved the learning environment and roused the interest of pupils, moreover, grants are used as a good tool for improving the integration of poverty in the education strategy, through differentiating the amount for girls, orphans, and the poor, brings improvement of transparency the schools receiving funds and gives schools and communities the power to decide what must be do to improve quality education through school improvement program and revitalize the schools.

As Gertler (2007), School grant has the following benefits; increasing access through more cost effective construction and reduction of household costs, often to offset the impact of fee reduction or abolition, improving equity in access through grants that are targeted to be pro-poor, pro-rural, or pro-girl, improving internal efficiency of schools through reducing repetition and failure rates, and to lesser extent, dropout rates, impacting on teacher behavior through incentives and greater accountability brought about by community involvement in many cases and improving learning outcomes as measured by standardized test scores.

## **2.9. International School Finance Sources**

Studies of education costs can contribute to improved decision-making, planning, and monitoring in education (Tsang, 1988). The costs of education refer to the economic value of the inputs used in education. The cost or economic value of an education input is defined as its opportunity cost and is measured by the value of the input in its best alternative use. This definition of cost implies that the costs of education consist not only of public educational expenditures on personnel, school facilities, supplies and equipment, but also parental and/or students' expenditures on education (direct private costs of education (DPCs) such as tuition and other education-related fees and expenditures on text books, uniform, school bag, writing supplies, transportation, boarding, etc.), students' foregone opportunities (indirect private

costs, such as foregone earnings), as well as private contributions to education (contributions in cash or in kind, by individuals, parents or private organizations).

In addition to fiscal decentralization government expenditures budget, the financing reform in education in 1980s also promoted the diversification of resource mobilization for education Tsang (1993), especially from non-government sources. Education institutions at various levels are encouraged to generate their own resources (e.g. revenue from production and sale of products by school), intensify their effort together social contributions and contributions from overseas Chinese, and collect fees from students.

At the local level, education surcharges and levies have been imposed to support school expenditures. Therefore, currently 'self-generated' school revenue is used to purchase school equipment, provide welfare benefits for school staff and for repair or replacement of school buildings; social contributions are primarily used for school construction; school fees are used to support non-personnel school expenditures; and education surcharges and levies are used on non-personnel inputs, the repair or replacement of school building and on school equipment.

## **2.10. Sources of School Finance in Ethiopia**

The education sectors strategy of Ethiopia states that “The financing of educational system shall be improved by increasing the government budget allocation particularly for infrastructure, building and provision of educational materials. The focus will be on elementary and secondary education” (MoE, 1994). To produce in quality and quantity within the education system, it requires the provision of adequate finance from varying sources. The sources are broadly categorized in to two major areas: Internal and external sources.

In developing countries great deal of public expenditure for education obtained from the central government budget. Even in those countries, where state and local governments exercise power for financial management their educational fund comes from the central government revenue. The source of financing includes general taxes,

earmarked taxes, and property, salary and sales taxes. It is dangerous for the education sector to depend on the revenue that comes from the central government which has weak tax system (Forojalla, 1993). In Ethiopia, “Financial support from the government will be up to the completion of general secondary schooling with increased cost sharing at high levels of education and training“ (MoE, 1994). In five years period (1997-2002) ESDP total outlay of 12 billion Birr and this program would nearly double public spending on education in the next five years. In this program public revenues are expected to cover 75 percent (World Bank, 1997).

Indirect way of reducing government expenditure for education is to encourage nongovernment schools. The rich households can self- target themselves by sending their children to expensive private schools where available. This enables the government to provide education to the poor who cannot afford to pay for private schools. Most African governments depend on bilateral and multilateral loan grants. There is an economic burden on developing countries when they try to repay the loans in foreign exchange (Kuma, 1996).

The primary responsibility for child education must remain with parents. On the other hand society has a legitimate interest in children’s education and socialization (Forojalla, 1993). The fund raising initiative of schools and local communities are reactive rather than anticipatory. Communities give response to finance education when there is as ever short fall in the resources promised by the national or local government. Parents as a whole do not seem very excited by the financial management of their children’s school, except in crisis situations (Knight, 1993).

MoE (2002), states that the community shall be participate in all educational matters without the mere dependence on government involvement on educational issues. The communities’ involvement is broadly categorized in to rural and urban where the rural community is subdivided in to three according to the context of their income and living conditions. The first ranking community members are anticipated to build schools and the government provides them with furniture and teachers. The second ones

expected to cover 65% of the expense for construction amongst which 30% is in labor and in kind and 35% in cash). The third category is the neediest who are only take part in labor. For both the 2<sup>nd</sup> and third category of the community, the government makes the remaining resources available.

Ibid (2002), went on adding and contended that the urban community is relatively better in living conditions in contrast to the rural. However, they were also categorized in similar vein to the rural on the basis of welfare monitoring unit identified by ministry of finance and economic development. Thus, the group of the community would participate according to per capital income expenditure in the three divisions. In urban areas the government and the community equally share the expenditures to construct primary schools; whereas, the community cover the total expenditure to construct secondary schools. Expenditures for furniture, teachers, and other resources for primary and secondary schools are covered by the government.

Generally, there is a wide variety of ways of financing education. Governments devise mechanisms for shifting part of the financial burden of education to individual students and their families, to employers or to local communities. Furthermore, some governments levy new taxes earmarked for education. Now much more attention is given to such questions that central or local government funding is not the only, or necessarily the most desirable to finance all educational investment (Psacharopoulos, 1991).

### **2.11. Practice of Financial Management in Schools**

Financial management according to Shakiro (1995), involves financial planning and budgeting, financial accounting, financial analysis and financial decision making and action. From management point of view schools currently have the autonomy of managing finances for proper usage. The school principal with governing body of the school accepts the responsibility ensuring that the school finances are administered correctly. It is truth universally acknowledged that a single school in a possession of its own decision making must

be provide better quality education than a school run by a centralized bureaucracy. So, schools need to manage effectively and efficiently the school finance allocated to them.

## **2.12. Practice of School Principals in Financial Management**

According to Levacic (1995), school principals engaged in budget planning and making decision with stakeholders for proper management of finance, this in turn helps to improve the services given to customers. The core business of schools is teaching and learning and the schools exist so that students can learn and the central activity of schools is instruction. The efficiency and effective management physical resources can enhance instructional programmers.

The major role as the education manager is to create an environment in the school that will facilitate effective and successful teaching learning. This is done through the effective management of the schools human, material and financial resources. Therefore, important to stress that financial management is one of the major functions as education manager. Haig (1997), supports this view when he states that; Those who have been promoted and run departments or peer groups, or who are heads and deputy heads, must, whether they like it or not, be managers. They must know about budgeting and the proper implementation of school grants.

### **2.12.1. School management committee**

It was noted by the research team that there was an additional decision-making body in the AACA schools, the SMC. This structure did not exist in the schools in Oromia NRS and Somali NRS. According to several actors, the SMC plays a very important role in managing all the activities of the schools. The SMC consists of the school director, the chairperson of the PSTA, the school's finance unit, and several other elected members. As reported by all school-level actors interviewed the school directors serve as chairpersons of SMCs. In AACA, the school-level actors portrayed this committee as an essential decision-maker for the functioning of the schools (Hussien *et al.*, 2014).

### **2.12.2. School improvement program committee**

The other important organizational structure, recently introduced through the General Education Quality Improvement Project (GEQIP), is the school improvement committee. School improvement committees had been established in nearly all the schools visited. However, the degree of their functioning differed among regions, woredas and schools. Observations during school visits, reflections from various interviews as well as discussions held with teachers, revealed that the SIC members are relatively more active in Oromia NRS than in AACA and Somali NRS. In Oromia NRS in particular, the SIPC members drew up a plan, set their school's priorities, and discussed them with the school leadership and parent student teachers associations.

In AACA, SICs were not very active at all. In some schools they did not have a well-defined plan, were established but not operational, and some members were not clear on their roles or the responsibilities of the SIPC and its objectives. The research team realized this from the remarks of the participants involved in the interviews. For instance, in one of the schools visited in AACA, a teacher said, 'I was assigned as a member of the SIPC by our school director last year. However, as a committee we did not come together more than two to three times. We have no plan or clear job descriptions' (Hussien *et al.*, 2014).

### **2.13. Practice of PSTA in Financial Management**

As Aghenta (1984), the following are some of the ways through which the roles of the parent student-teacher-association (PSTA) can be strengthened towards better service delivery in the schools. They participate actively with the school in participatory planning activities to include the voice of parents, students and teachers. Additionally, PSTA as participate in budget plan implementation and evaluation of the budget for effective and efficient usage. Moreover, PSTAs can participate in decision making activities to utilize school grant effectively in the school.

#### **2.14. Role of the Community in Financial Management**

According to Govinda, R. (1995), the concept of community participation in educational management, planning, decision making, monitoring and evaluation, management of discipline and school improvement program effort of educational facilities and financial management have gained wide popularity during the last decades. Because of this, educational planners and policy makers are convinced on the fact the intended beneficiaries must be involved in efforts to change and improve their life through primary education, system and transfer of significant power and authority directly to the local community members.

But it should be done with considerable care in defining the roles and responsibilities on both the central government and local community members. The teaching-learning process, beyond the interaction between the teacher and the student, depends on the support, follow up and runs among educational professionals, parents, the community and the government. So, the community needs to actively participate in doing with the school administrators by planning, decision making and implementing school grants allocated from part.

#### **2.15. Challenges in Utilization of School Grant**

There are various problems in managing school grants for schools. As Atou Seck (2007), outlines the challenges such as; school principals and other stakeholders unable to managing financial issues and inefficient allocation of public resources and the capacity to mobilize these resources and transform them into results and the need to be accountable for results and the use of resources within the context which requires more flexibility in the implementation of programs are the major one. Another challenge of the school grant was that it only catered for repairs and maintenance but not for the building of new infrastructure. Many schools were grappling with shortages of essential infrastructure such as new classrooms (MoE, 2009). This was further complicated by the upsurge in enrolment with the advent of free Education and the fact that parents had pulled back from school development initiatives after the introduction of the policy.

### **2.15.1. Stakeholders skill to manage school grant**

One of the critical challenges in the school grant implementation is the lack of skill to manage finance issues. As MoE (2012), presented on school grant dissemination process report, on research team formulation are meeting, one of the school principal said ‘we were provided with adequate and practical training before we started implementing the school grant. Hence, we know the purposes the school grants are expected to be used ‘.On the other hand, school level actors such as cashiers, school improvement committee members, PSTA members and teachers did claim for provision of training on finance related issues.

The above issues as emphasizes, the trainings given to educational officials at different levels (Regional Education Bureau, Zonal Education Office, Woreda Education Office, Keble Education Desks, and school principals) alone is not adequate to effectively implement the school grant allocated to schools. It also needs to train and build the capacity of all school actor stakeholders to have adequate knowledge and skill to manage school grant and other finance related issues.

In addition to this Akintelure (2007), he argues more in the capacity of school principals to implement school grant and general managing of finances as follows; Principals play the most critical role in ensuring schools’ effectiveness and performance. Without the necessary skills and competencies, many heads are over whelmed by these enormous tasks. In most of the developing countries, principals have hardly any formal managerial and leadership training and most of them are appointed because of their teaching record other than their leadership potentials. Induction and support are usually limited and principals have to adopt a pragmatic approach of leadership.

Despite their poor managerial and leadership training, principals often work in poorly equipped public primary and secondary schools with inadequately trained subordinate staff in the finance department. As the above idea suggests the expected role of school principals is

high while what actually perform is low. This condition harm schools largely not to perform as the service users need. This in turn have a great negative impact on quality of education.

### **2.15.2. Delay of school grant**

As presented about school grant implementation through the Ethiopian Research team; ministry of education disseminate the blue print for block grant MoE (2002), and the school grant guideline MoE (2001), however, as school grant is a major endeavor to ensure the provision of quality education for citizens through school improvement program, this initiative was accompanied by school grants- primed by the government of Ethiopia in collaboration with development partners. However, due to the problem of timely submission of reports and other related factors, the money allocated to schools may delay and schools not able to accomplish their tasks as planned.

### **2.15.3. Lack of accountability during utilization of school grant**

Evidently, the purpose of school grant is to improve the quality of education primary, secondary and Alternative Basic Education (ABE) through school improvement program. However, most of schools were not participating the stakeholders on utilization of school grant to enable those accountable for results to manage their resources within context which requires more flexibility in the implementation of the program (Atou Seck, 2007). As the above idea emphasizes, schools need to manage their resources (finances) to the activities they need to employ has an effect on the proper usage of the school grant.

Winkler and Schlegel (2005), point out that education system around the world decentralize management to better serve and bring services closer to their beneficiaries; students, parents, and communities. They further assert that school grants are an important tool that can improve efficiency, quality, and equity of the decentralization process. They also indicate that school grants are transfers of financial resources and authority from governments or non-governmental organization directly to schools or small networks of schools. School grants are

usually formula-based related to poverty rates and student population. However, the school grant allocated to schools is restricted to use on some areas and the interest of schools to use the money for activities they want to accomplish is incompatible to them that in turn make obstacle to use it as intended by bilateral or multilateral funding organizations.

## **2.16. Monitoring and Control of the Use of the School Grant**

Monitoring is a periodically recurring task already beginning in the planning stage of a project or program. Monitoring allows results, processes and experiences to be documented and used as a basis to steer decision-making and learning processes. Monitoring is checking progress against plans. The data acquired through monitoring is used for evaluation (Hussien et al, 2014).

### **2.16.1. Internal monitoring at school level**

Monitoring at school level is done in various ways. Firstly, the use of the school grant is governed tightly by the MoE guidelines which indeed dictate the schools' budgets. As a result, there is little need for specific control mechanisms within the schools. Secondly, the school grant policy is designed to ensure the participation of several stakeholders in decision-making, ranging from the head teacher to parents. Apart from the two parents who are members of the SIMSC, the larger parents' body plays a critical monitoring role. When schools will received the school grant, the SMC meets and prioritizes the school's needs before calling a parents meeting. Where they are informed the amount received and the proposed activities. At this stage, the parents provide their input. Parents can visit the institutions to monitor the progress of the various projects as well as the quality of the work (Chawla M.et al, 1996).

### **2.16.2. External monitoring**

External monitoring is carried out by officers, mainly from the Federal and City administration. The city administration team visits schools at least two times a year. They

should cover all of the schools. They stay for most of the day and check everything. They visit the classrooms where they verify that pupils have textbooks and as everything fulfilled. They inspect the buildings to ascertain what renovations have been carried out. The auditor looks at the financial records. At the end of the exercise, they hold a meeting with all the teachers, the deputy head teacher and the head teacher and point out the strengths and weaknesses of the school. During a subsequent visit, the city administration team usually checks whether the previous recommendations have been acted upon (MoE, 2009).

### **2.17. Auditing in School Grants Utilization.**

Auditing is a process whereby all accounts of the school are examined and evaluated in detail by a competent auditor in order to determine and report on the financial standing of the school for the period under review. A school audit of financial statements also establishes the credibility of the accounting records as specified in the statutory accounting principles and practices. To understand the audit process you should know the common books in accounts which are the key records used in auditing (National Audit Office, 2010). There are two main types of auditing that a school can use. These are internal and external auditing.

#### **2.17.1. Internal auditing**

Internal auditing is usually a management activity and is a service intended to ensure regular and frequent checking on a school's financial transactions and records. An internal auditor is normally an employee of the school, for example school principal, whose main role is to supervise the accounts staff to ensure efficiency in the day to day management of the school finances. It also serves to check whether all financial transactions have taken place according to budget, to set procedures, and following management policies. The objectives of internal auditing may differ from school to school, but the general aim is to promote efficiency in the school's financial control and management (UNESCO, 2014).

### **2.17.2. External auditing**

This gives an independent report on the financial performance of the school in accordance with the terms of the contract agreed with the school. The focus of external auditing is on establishing the truth and fairness of the accounts. It gives added credibility to unaudited financial statements and records of the school's financial transactions and confirms their compliance to the statutes. The functions of internal auditing and external auditing may seem to overlap but it should be noted that the former is a management measure to ensure daily efficiency in managing school funds, while the latter evaluates the adherence to the accepted principles, practices and statutory provisions of management in financial transactions. However, internal auditing if properly done should cut down on the cost of external auditing and greatly enhance the process (UNESCO, 1990).

### **2.18. Strategies for Proper Utilization of School Grant**

School grants education systems around the world decentralize management to better serve and bring services closer to their beneficiaries: students, parents, and communities. School grants are an important tool that improves efficiency, quality, and equity of SIP. The guidelines for block grant (MoE, 2002) and the school grant (MoE 2009) specify how each grant should be used, but only define wide budget lines. As discussed, the school grant should be used to improve the implementation of SIP for the provision of quality education, with a focus on GEQIP items like: the teaching-learning process, the school environment, leadership and management, community empowerment, student achievement, and schools' capacity to manage change. Each school can use their grant for the priority areas that should have the greatest impact on the quality of education in their SIP. School level actors must have a good knowledge of those areas that should be covered by the school grant and those that should not.

According to the (MoE, 2009) Six items are excluded from the list of expenditures with the school grant: construction of new classrooms or buildings (construction of toilets is however permitted), purchase of televisions and DVD players, payment of salaries and per Diems, payments to individuals, and purchase of fuel or weapons. The majority of school principal

interviewed were aware of these restrictions but several complaints have emphasized the overly restrictive nature of the guidelines. Any expenses outside the school grant guidelines are never approved by the BOFED and never attempted by the school they cannot get the next payment released. They objected to some of these restrictions, such as the purchase of certain electronic materials and payments to individuals. In the case of the school grant, several actors are involved in its implementation. After the announcement is made by the school director on the amount, the school grant arrives at the school level, teachers usually meet with their respective departments to identify problems and set priorities.

The SIPC, found to be active in many schools, then collect these priorities and discuss them either with the SMC, these committees decide on a list of priorities for their respective schools (Abraham A, 2001). According to the School Grant Budget Guidelines (MoE, 2009), PSTAs should be key decision makers in deciding the use of the School grant. PSTAs are obliged to examine the context of their specific school, and have the authority to spend the school grant on the areas listed in the school grant as priorities. PSTAs play many roles, including involving parents in the school's decision-making, promoting communications, and contributing resources for the school. PSTAs work closely with the school principals and SMCs in managing both the funds contributed by parents and the school grant.

### **3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

This chapter includes, description of study area, the research design, the general methodology, types of data sources, sampling techniques, Procedure of data collection methods, data analysis and Ethical Consideration have been thoroughly discussed.

#### **3.1. Description of the Study Area**

This study was conducted in Dire Dewa Administration there are 10 government secondary schools from those 5 of them are selected with simple random sampling. Dire Dewa is the city administration which is located in eastern part of Ethiopia, at 515 km away from the capital city of Addis Ababa along the Addis Ababa-Djibouti rail way road. The administration geographically shares boundary with Oromiya regional state in south and southwestern and north and northeastern with Somali regional state. Dire Dewa Administration does not have zone and woreda, instead it was structured with 9 kebeles in urban and 4 clusters in rural areas were hierarchies next to the bureaus Most of peoples who living. in rural area are bearing chattels /nomads/ and moving from place to place for searching water and grass to their chattels but some of them are peasants. In another way most of peoples who living. in urban are merchants and some of them are employee in government and private sectors.

#### **3.2. Research Design**

It is intended to use descriptive survey research design. Because descriptive survey research design is devoted to the gathering of information about prevailing conditions or situations for the purpose of description and interpretation. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were employed on the basis of the data that would be gathered and analyzed. This was simply because, data obtained through interview, open ended questions, and document analysis were analyzed qualitatively whereas, responses of questionnaire was quantitatively analyzed. Descriptive survey was the specific method designed for the study so as to assess and describe the narrative details of contribution of school grant of secondary

schools as it exists. Because, descriptive survey provides rich descriptive details about the case under the study. Descriptive research describes the phenomena as it exists (status quo) at present. The researcher only reports what has happened or what is happening Key (1997), and (Kothari, 2004).

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

The researcher used both primary and secondary source of data to get adequate information.

#### **3.3.1. Primary source**

In order to gather important and valid information, the researcher collected data from teachers, principals, PSTA members, school grant committee, school improvement committee. School grant committee such as PSTA chair man, school vice principals, represented teachers, and school finance officer. Principals were not the school grant committee member but he/she approves the work of committees'. The school improvement program committee members were includes; school principals, vice principals, represented teachers, represented supportive staff and PSTA chair person.

#### **3.3.2. Secondary sources**

Secondary sources of data were also used to get supplementary information. Financial document such as allocated school grant, minutes, school reports, school grant guidelines, and reports were used and its contribution on secondary schools was served as secondary sources of data.

### **3.4. Target Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques**

The population of the study were considered as follow. In this study, 113 teachers, 5 principals, 30 PSTA members, 35 school grant committee members, 45 school improvement program committee members and 6 DDEB supervisors were the total population of the study.

From 10 secondary schools, the researcher conducted in five government secondary schools; namely: Sabiyan, Lege Hare, Medhanalem, Afatessa and Kalicha secondary schools.

The researcher selected five of them by simple random sampling technique. Availability sampling technique were employed to incorporate all PSTA members, all school grant committee members, all school improvement program committee members and all DDEB supervisors were manageable. So, all of principals, all PSTA members, all school grant committee members, all school improvement program committee members and all DDEB supervisors are manageable. The study is intended to use systematic simple random sampling technique within teachers' population group Out of these 50 % of teachers to ensure that a proportional numbers of respondents were obtained. This approach has been recommended by scholars in the field for such kind of research (Koul, 1996).

Table2. Target Population, samples and sampling techniques.

No	Secondary Schools	Sources of Data	Population	Sample size		Sampling Techniques
				No	%	
1	Sabiyan	Teachers	114	67	58.77	Systematic sampling
		PSTA members	6	6	100	Available
		SGC	7	7	100	Available
		SIPC	9	9	100	Available
2	Lege Hare	Teachers	30	16	53	Systematic sampling
		PSTA members	6	6	100	Available
		SGC	7	7	100	Available
		SIPC	9	9	100	Available
3	Medhanialm	Teachers	30	14	46	Systematic sampling
		PSTA members	6	6	100	Available
		SGC	7	7	100	Available
		SIPC	9	9	100	Available
4	Afatessa	Teachers	20	8	40	Systematic sampling
		PSTA-members	6	6	100	Available
		SGC	7	7	100	Available
		SIPC	9	9	100	Available
		Teachers	12	8	66	Systematic sampling
5	Kalicha	PSTA-members	6	6	100	Available
		SGC	7	7	100	Available
		SIPC	9	9	100	Available
6	DDEB	Supervisors	6	6	100	Available

Note: School committees include (SGC, SIPC and PSTA)

### **3.5. Instruments of Data Collection**

Gathering necessary data for the study was based on the basic research questions and in respect to the review of related literature. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected through close ended and open ended questionnaire, Semi structured interview and analyzing the documents that indicate financial utilization of school grant; progressive report about school grant and its contribution on secondary school education in the selected sample schools.

#### **3.5.1. Questionnaire**

The data was mainly collected using questionnaire which consist of both open and closed-ended items. There are about 41 closed and 3 open-ended questions prepared in English language for school teachers. These questionnaires were translated in to Amharic to be filled by school committee such as SIPC, SGC and PSTA members.

Questionnaire should be used because it is the most appropriate tool to obtain both qualitative and quantitative data relative to other type of instruments and it is easier to construct the question items and analyzed the responses. It is also better for respondents' used pilot test to reduce ambiguity and reduces effects of biased conclusion and interpretation (Kothari, 2004). The closed-ended items were framed in a five point liker scale which ranges from very high to very low or strongly agree to strongly disagree. The main contents of the questionnaires include the assessment of the utilization of school grant fund and its contribution on school improvement program in secondary school of Dire Dawa Administration.

#### **3.5.2. Interview guide**

Interview involves oral communication between the researcher and the interviewees. In order to counter check the relevance of the information already obtained as well as the data that are not included in the questionnaires were included in 4 semi- structured interview. Then together

relevant data, interview questions were prepared for all school principals. For this purpose, guiding interview questions were developed and employed. Therefore, the participants could be exploited in depth responses to answer their experiences and views in their own words.

### **3.5.3. Document analysis**

The third instrument employed in this study were documents to acquire adequate information, school of voucher and audited documents and which consists guideline and reports were reviewed to acquire the background information about the issue under study.

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

The questionnaires were distributed to the respondents by the researcher, of course with the help of some colleagues and principals of the schools. The researcher gives sufficient orientation on how to distribute and collect the questionnaire and other related issues for his assistances. Prior contacts were also making with the respondents to ensure their willingness to participate in the study and to maximize the return rate of the questionnaires. Then after, using time schedule for each school the questionnaire collected from the respondents of sample schools. The interview was carried out by the researcher as per the guide line of interview administration and procedures at the work places of the subjects. Finally, document checking and analysis was also undertaken in sample schools by the researcher using checklists.

All the questions were pilot tested by using Cronbach's alpha, and equivalency methods. This pilot study was conducted to check the reliability and validity of the data collecting instruments and thus, redundancy, ambiguity and unclear items were rectified. Pilot test was conducted before the questionnaires were administered. The main purpose of pilot test is to evaluate the clarity and the reliability of the questions. Hence, based on the result of the pilot test, avoiding ambiguities and making relevant amendments were carried out accordingly.

The pilot test was conducted at Addisu secondary school by selecting participants' such as 1 principal, 1 supervisor, 5 PSTA members, 7 school grant committee and 9 school improvement program committee by using purposive sampling and 20 teachers who teaches grade 9 and 10 by using available sampling methods. The awareness of school grant utilization and its contribution to SIP were tested for its reliability. The Concepts of School Grant and Utilization (0.75), Communication of school grant utilization (0.767), Management of school grant (0.784), The contribution of school grant to school improvement program (SIP) (0.853), The Factor that affects the utilization of school grant (0.768), Ways of monitoring and evaluating school grant utilization (0.732 which is reliable. According to the standard Cronbach Alpha value greater than 0.7 is taken as adequate for research purpose (Montee, 1990).

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

Both qualitative and quantitative means of data analysis has been used. After gathering the data through questionnaire, interview and document analysis based on the available data, the process of tabulation has been carried out. To analyse the quantitative data, using SPSS version 20 for statistical analysis and then result was described in frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation and grand mean. In addition, for testing utilization and contribution of school grant in responding questionnaires T-test was used significant level of 0.05 statically whether the mean difference between the views of teachers and supervisors and that of the school committees were significant or not.

The five responses of the questionnaires were made to categorize into three likert scales for the sake of clarity, convenience and for better comparison related scales were treated together. Hence, the data collected through interview and open-ended questionnaires has been presented, analysed, narrated, and organized in systematically form, by supplementing the data gathered through close ended questionnaires. In addition to this, the researcher used qualitative thematic written techniques and give attention to quotations from the respondents. Finally,

conclusion has been drawn from the major findings and based on those possible solutions and recommendation to the identified problems has been formulated.

### **3.8. Ethical Consideration**

The researcher was able to treat the participants morally and ethically when he had asked their permission to answer questions in the questionnaires or interview guide. He also informed the participants that the information they provided was only for the study purpose. For that matter, any communication with the concerned bodies were accomplished at their voluntarily consent without harming and threatening the personal and institutional wellbeing. Also the researcher ensured confidentiality by making the participants unnamed. Furthermore, all the materials used for this research have been acknowledged.

## **4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

This chapter deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered from respondents.. Hence, both the quantitative and qualitative analyses of data were incorporated in to this chapter. The quantitative data were supported by the qualitative data which include data gathered through, open ended questionnaires, interviews as well as documents review.

The chapter consists of two major parts. The respondent's characteristics, the analysis and interpretation of the main data, this section also incorporates seven sub parts. The first and the second part of this section present analysis of utilization and means of communication school grant. The third part is present the managing system of some major school grant. In part four, five and six respectively presents the contribution of school grant to SIP, factors that affect the utilization of school grant and ways of monitoring and evaluating school grant utilization.

Further, based on the sampling procedure described in chapter three of this study, among 229 respondents, 225 (98.3 %) of them filled the questionnaires properly and collected. The remaining 4 (1.7%) respondents were not returned the questionnaires, and rejected before the analysis due to not returned. However, interview that were interviewed to principals 5 (100%), were filled in, returned and analyzed. Finally, the research analysis was done based on the data obtained from the remaining 225 (98.3 %) of teachers ,supervisors, school committee members response through questionnaires, as well as interview results of all school principals and analysis of reports, minutes and other related documents of utilization of school grant and school improvement program.

### **4.1. Characteristics of Respondents**

All five groups of respondents were examined in terms of their sex, age, and level of education, experiences, educational specialization, and responsibility in committee members on utilization of school grant and its contribution to school improvement program in sample schools also reported. Therefore, the distribution would be regarded as unbiased, since



	Edpm	--	--	1	33.3	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	--
	Edlm	--	--	2	66.7	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	100
Education	Inorganic	2	18.2	-	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	--
al special	Optimization	4	36.4	-	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	--
zation	Genetics	3	27.3	-	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	--
	History	2	18.2	-	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	--
	Sub Total	11	100	3	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	100
	Members	--	--	-	--	20	57.1	29	65.9	15	50	-	--
Responsib	Secretary	--	--	-	--	5	14.3	5	11.4	5	16.7	-	--
ility in	Vice chair	--	--	-	--	5	14.3	5	11.4	5	16.7	-	--
committee	man												
member	Chair man	--	--	-	--	5	14.3	5	11.4	5	16.7	-	--
	Sub Total	--	--	-	--	35	100	44	100	30	100	-	--
	Grand Total	110	100	6	100	35	100	44	100	30	100	5	100

Note: School committees include (SGC, SIPC and PSTA)

As shown in table 3 above, teacher respondents 78(70.9%) of them were male and 32 (29.1%) were female, Supervisors respondents 5(83.4) of them were male and 1 (16.6%) were female, SGC respondents 25(71.4%) of them were male and 10 (28.6%) were female, SIPC respondents 32(72.72%) of them were male and 12 (27.27%) were female, and PSTA respondents 24(80%) of them were male and 6(20%) were female. Further, all principals 100 % of them were found to be males. This indicates that the number of male and female teachers, Supervisors, SGC, SIPC and PSTA were not proportional and very low share in number of females. This might have negative impacts on gender disparity in teaching learning process and utilization of school grant.

Age is the other characteristics of respondents under consideration. Accordingly, in table above, among the total supervisors, teachers and principals respondents, 4 (66.7%), 42(38.2 %) and 3(60%) fall in the category of 31-40 years. While, 23 (20.9%) of teachers between 20-30 years, 37(33.6%) of teachers and 1(20%) of principal between 41-50 years, the rest of 8 teachers (7.3 %) and principal 1(20%) with in 51 and above years respectively. With respect of supervisors 2 (33.7 %), SGC 15 (42.8 %), SIPC 16 (36.4 %), and PSTA 11(36.7 %) of them fall between ages 41-50 respectively, while from the total teachers, supervisors, SGC, SIPC and principals 0(0 %) of them below 20 years respectively as well as SGC, SIPC and principals 0 (0 %) of them between 20-30 years and 6(20%) of PSTA fall in the category of below 20 ages.

Further, 10(28.6 %) SGC, 11(25 %) SIPC and 9(30 %) with in 51 and above years respectively. The rest of supervisors 0(0%) were fall in 51 and above years. This shows that all respondents were mature enough to give relevant information for the purpose of the study enriched by their valuable experiences on the utilization of school grant and its contribution to SIP in schools.

In the same table 3 above regarding to respondents educational profile, the majority of teachers 99(90%), 3(50%) of supervisors and school principals 3(60 %) of them were first degree holders respectively. The other respondents 11(10%) of teachers and 3(50%) of supervisors and 2 (40 %) of school principals have second degrees. These shows, from the total respondents the majority have first degrees and above. This indicates that, the majority of respondents have enough skill to understanding and easy to give respond on the utilization of school grant and its contribution to SIP in schools.

Respondents were further asked how long they have used school grant in their schools. Regarding to this, as shown in table 2 above the majority of teachers 45 (40.9%), supervisors 6 (100%), principals 4(80%) and PSTAs 3(10.%) of them have 8-11 years were used or manage school grant for implementing SIP and teaching learning process. While SGC 17 (48.6 %), SIPC 21(46.7%), and PSTAs 14 (46.7%) of them give services between 4-7 years of them

utilizing and leading school grant in schools.

So that, relatively their experience was much with starting the program and would help them to have correct responses about the various issues raised by the researcher in relation to school grant utilization process, identifying its contribution to SIP and related problems. This indicates that respondents involved in this study had sufficient background experiences.. As shown in Table 2 above the majority of school grant committee 20 (57.1 %), school improvement program committee 29(65.9%), and parent student teacher associations 15 (50%) of them were members and directly involved in the utilization of school grant in the schools respectively.

Among many other educational inputs, school grant play major roles in terms of achieving the intended educational objectives. The above statements are true, that better school grant utilization practices could increase efficiency in operations and reduce overall school grant wastages. To minimize the wastages of school grant utilization, the schools should be aware the staff and different committees of the schools how they used school grant. With this understanding, respondents asked if they have awareness or not on the usage of school grant. The results obtained are depicted in table 3 below.

## 4.2. Linking Priority Need of School Improvement Program with the School Grant

Table 4 Respondents' linking of their school improvement program with the school grant plan.

No	Items	Respondents	f	M	St.dev	G. M	T-test
1.	Your school utilizing school grant for improving SIP.	Teachers and Supervisor School Committees	116 109	2.65 2.73	0.891 0.945	2.49	.000
2.	The stakeholder's have awareness on school grant management system in your school.	Teachers and Supervisor School Committees	116 109	1.85 1.78	0.700 0.844	1.82	.000
3.	Is SIP plans priority link with SG plan priority plan.	Teachers and Supervisor School Committees	116 109	1.94 2.27	0.972 0.993	2.1	.541
4.	To what level do you know the meaning of school grant means.	Teachers and Supervisor School Committees	116 109	1.89 2.66	0.936 0.491	2.27	.000
5.	The school giving attention to allocate school grant for teaching learning process.	Teachers and Supervisor School Committees	116 109	2.28 2.46	0.826 0.830	2.37	.000
Aggregate Mean = 2.19							

Note: School committees include (SGC, SIPC and PSTA)

As shown in table 4 of item 1, respondents were asked the utilizing of school grant to improve SIP. Most significant teachers and supervisors and school committees reported, with mean value of 2.65 and 2.73 were rated undecidedly respectively. This implies that the utilizing of school grant to improve SIP was undecided. Moreover the applied t-test showed there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value (0.000) < 0.05. Concerning item 2 of Table 4, the mean of the responses fall between 1-2.49. This indicates disagree.

This shows that the stakeholder's have awareness on school grant management system was not adequate. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on ideas. The test result showed that at 95 percent confidence level. The mean value was found to be disagreeing. This means the level of the stakeholder's have awareness on school grant management system was disagree. T-test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the three groups of respond as t value  $(0.000) < 0.05$ . This implies that the level of the stakeholder's have awareness on school grant management system was low.

As shown under item 3 of table 4, respondents asked about the school improvement program plans prioritizing link with school grant plan priority. As the respondents reported, the mean scores of all responses to this item indicate between 1-2.49. This implies that the SIP plans priority link with school grant plan priority plan was disagree. Moreover, the comparison of mean at t-test value showed there is no a statistically significance difference between the two groups as t value  $(0.541) > 0.05$ . This implies that the extent of school grants allocation as per the plan was low.

As table 4 item 4 respondents were asked the level of understanding about a school grant means. Accordingly, the mean of the responses fall between 1-2.49 indicating disagree on understanding about a school grant means. This means all two groups of responses not agree with the level of understanding about a school grant means. T-test result showed that the t value  $(0.000) < 0.05$  and value showed that there is a statistically significance difference among the two respondents groups'.

As table 4 item 5 indicates on the school giving attention to allocate school grant for teaching learning process. Most of teachers and supervisors and school committee responses showed that rated disagree with mean values of 2.28 and 2.46 respectively. T-test as applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion responses showed that mean value was found to be disagree on school giving attention to allocate school grant for teaching learning process. This means the schools were giving attention to allocate school grant for

teaching learning process were low/not. T-test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value  $(0.000) < 0.05$ . To further more, the interview made to principals, to strengthen the above fact, the question for interview posed.

Table5. Respondents' on the link their school improvement program with the school grants.

No	Items	Teachers and supervisors				SGC,SIPC and TSPA			
		Yes		No		Yes		No	
		F	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
1	Is your school linking priority of school grant with SIP?	40	34.8	76	65.5	49	45	60	55
2	If your answer is "yes", how can the school linking priority need of SIP to priority need of school grant plan?	28	70	12	30	52	86.6	8	13.4

Note: School committees includes (SGC, SIPC and TSPA)

As presented in Table 5 item 1, the majority of teachers and supervisors 76(65.5%) reported that, they do not link their school improvement program with the school grant. In addition to this, most of school committees 60(55%) took link their school improvement program with the school grant was low. This implies that the majority of respondents were not linking their priority need of school improvement program with priority need of school grant plan.

In item 2 of the same table, respondents also asked, if the linking was value added or not for whom those were took linking their priority need of school improvement program with priority need of school grant plan, the majority of teachers and supervisors 28 (70%) and school committees 52 (86.6%) were reported that, linking their priority need of school improvement program with priority need of school grant plan was supported them how they were properly used school grant. In the observation made for documents in sample schools, it was found that there is no any similarity of the two plans for the most of principals utilizing in

their schools.

The parts of interview made to school principals to strengthen the above fact, the question for interview posed. Is your school linking the two priority need plans during the utilization of school grant? According to the interview on July 10-20/2015, three of principals (1a, 1b, 1d) replied, *'linking priority need of school improvement program with the school grant was low and the authority was mainly the responsibility of principal with regard to school improvement, financial activities and administrative'*. On the same interview, two of principals (1d, 1e) stated that, *"they do not link priority need plan of SIP with the school grant plan."*

Hence, in order to increase the practice of linking their school improvement program plan with the school grant plan was short training is essential, to school principals and school committees on how to linking priority need plans and utilize school grant in the school.

#### 4.3. Views of Respondents about Communication of School Grant Utilization

Table 6: Communication of school grant utilization

No	Items	Respondents	F	M	St.dev	G.M	T-test
1	Displaying on the notices board	Teachers and Supervisor School Committees	116 109	3.65 3.73	0.891 0.945	3.69	0.063
2	Discussion meeting	Teachers and Supervisor School Committees	116 109	2.23 3.44	0.972 0.993	2.8	0.441
3	Quarterly reports	Teachers and Supervisor School Committees	116 109	1.75 2.47	0.753 0.914	2.11	0.000

Con't...

4	Using school min-media	Teachers and Supervisor	116	2.12	0.935	2.35	0.000
		School Committees	109	2.59	0.824		
		Teachers and Supervisor	116	1.48	0.826		
5.	Using pamphlets	School Committees	109	1.57	0.830	1.52	0.000
Aggregate Mean = 2.49							

Note: School committees include (SGC, SIPC and PSTA)

As shown in table 6 item 1 respondents were asked whether communicating the school grant utilization by displaying on the notes board. Majority both group responses have rated highly agree for items 1 with mean values of 3.65 and 3.73 respectively. It indicates that the schools properly communicating the school grant utilization displaying on the notice board. T-test as applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on displaying on the notes board school grant utilization. The mean value was found to be rated highly agree. This means displaying on the notes board was very high. T-test result shows there is no a statistically significance difference between the two groups respond as t value (0.063) > 0.05. This indicated that there were some improvements in the area.

As shown by table 6 item 2 states most of teachers and supervisors and school committees responses shows that moderately agree with mean values of 2.23 and 3.44 respectively on discussion meeting. T-test as applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion responses that shows that moderately agree on discussion meeting. The mean value was found to be on average. This means there is a few discussion meeting. T-test result shows there is no a statistically significance difference between the two groups respond as t value (0.441) > 0.05.

With regard to items 3 table 6 that most of teachers & supervisors and school committees' responses that moderately agree with mean values of 1.75 and 2.47 respectively on quarterly reports. Accordingly, the mean of the responses indicating most of the school's were not

quarterly reports of school grant utilization. T-test as applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion responses that shows that moderately agree on quarterly reports. The mean value was found to be on low. This means there is no quarterly reports. T-test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups respond as t value  $(0.000) < 0.05$

Table 6 item 4 respondents were asked on using school min media. Most of School leaders, teachers & supervisors and school committees were low on the idea with mean values of 2.12 and 2.59 respectively on using school min media. This means there is no using school min media to communicate school grant utilization. T-test as applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion responses that shows that moderately agree on using school min media. This means there is no using school min media to communicate school grant utilization. T-test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups respond as t value  $(0.000) < 0.05$ .

As shown by table 6 item 5 states that most of teachers & supervisors and school committees responses shows that were very low with mean values of 1.48 and 1.47 respectively on using pamphlet. T-test as applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion responses that shows that were very low using pamphlets. The mean value was found to be very low. This means there is no using pamphlet. T-test result shows there is no a statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value  $(0.000) < 0.05$ .

In general communication on school grant utilization such as on notes board, with discussion meeting, with quarterly reports, using school min-media and using pamphlet were moderately agreed with aggregated mean or AM= 2.49. This implies that the level of transparency and accountability utilization of school grant was low.

For all items the teachers and supervisors rated was less than that of the rating by the school committees. The reason is may be due to the school committees were more related position to the activities and responsibility they had occupied. As from the above information, it is

possible to say that the current frequently communication on school grant utilization were existed at moderate level. This implies that the current existing of communication on school grant utilization in the school were not satisfactory.

According to the researcher's personal observations most of the schools announce /communicate/ on school grant utilization to school stakeholders by simply displaying on school notes board without awareness and mostly they were not used the rest means of communication such as discussion meeting, quarterly reports, school min-media and pamphlet. Accordingly, this indicating there is a lack of transparency and accountability utilization of school grant.

#### 4.4. Management of school grant

Table 7: Management of school grant utilization

No	Items	Respondents	f	M	St.dev	G.M	T-test
1.	Your school prepare annual school grant plan in your school.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	3.39	0.648	3.31	0.000
		School Committees	109	3.23	0.757		
2.	Your school has annual school improvement program (SIP) plan.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	4.65	0.392	4.5	0.175
		School Committees	109	4.35	0.682		
3.	The school reports about utilization of school grant to school community.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	1.94	0.572	2.09	0.000
		School Committees	109	2.24	0.782		

Con't...

4.	The school management conducts need-assessment to plan school plan.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	2.38	0.757	2.44	0.000
		School Committees	109	2.49	0.726		
5.	School grant has own its focal person in your school.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	1.26	0.363	1.33	0.276
		School Committees	109	1.40	0.683		
6.	Supplied materials adequately support teaching learning process in your school.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	1.28	0.557	1.98	0.000
		School Committees	109	2.48	0.766		
7.	Stakeholders have experience to audit SG implementation.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	1.45	0.861	1.42	0.101
		School Committees	109	1.39	1.047		
8.	Supervisors following up and evaluate the utilization of SG in your school.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	2.19	1.090	2.13	0.00
		School Committees	109	2.06	0.939		

---

Aggregate Mean = 2.4

Note: School committees include (SGC, SIPC and PSTA)

---

As shown in table 7 item1 on school prepare annual school grant plan. The mean of the responses fall between 2.50-3.59 indicating the school prepare annual school grant plan was average. The mean value was found to be on the average. This means the school prepare annual school grant plan was medium. T-test result shows there is no statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value (0.000) < 0.05. There was improvement in the area.

As table 7 item 2 respondents were asked the school have annual school improvement program plan. Accordingly, the mean of the responses fall between 3.60-5.00 indicating always the school have annual school improvement program plan. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on ideas. The test result showed that at 95 percent confidence level. The mean value was found to be high. This means the school have annual school improvement program plan was always. T-test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value  $(.175) > 0.05$ .

As table 7 items 3 indicates on their reporting the utilization of school grant to school community. Most of teachers and supervisors and school committee's responses show that not agree with mean values of 1.94 and 2.24 respectively. T-test as applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion responses that shows that reporting the utilization of school grant to school community were low. The mean value was found to be low. This means the school was not reporting the utilization of school grant to school community. T-test result shows there is no a statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value  $(0.000) < 0.05$ . There was improvement in the area.

As indicated in table 7 item 4 respondents were asked the school management conducting need- assessment to planning school plan. Accordingly, the mean of the responses fall between 1-2.49 indicating some times the school management conducting need- assessment to planning school plan. This means most of the two groups of respondents agree with the school management conducting need- assessment to planning school plan some times. However, the t-test of t value = 0.000 was less than 0.05 level of significance. It should be concluded that there is no a statically significance difference among the mean responses of the two respondents.

Table 7 item 5, the respondents were requested to point out their view regarding the school grant have own focal person at school level. Most of teachers and supervisors and school committees of responses that show as the school grant have own focal person at school level

were very low. Accordingly, the mean of the responses fall between 1.-1.49 indicating that the schools had no school grant focal person at school level. The mean value was found to be null. T-test result shows there is no a statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value  $(.276) > 0.05$ .

Table 7 item 6 shows that respondents were asked on the supplied materials adequately to support teaching learning process. Most of teachers and supervisors, and school committee's responses showed that the supplied materials adequately to support teaching learning process were almost null. The average mean of the responses fall between 1-2.49. This showed that the supplied materials were not adequately support teaching learning process. The mean value was found to be low. This means most of the supplied materials were not adequately support teaching learning process. T-test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value  $(.000) < 0.05$ .

As indicated in table 7 item 7 respondents were asked about the stakeholders having experience the auditing on the school grant implementation Accordingly, the mean of the responses fall between 1-1.49 indicating there were no stakeholders having experience to audit on school grant implementation. This means all two groups of respondents not agree with the follow up and control the utilization of school grant. However, the t- tests of t value = 0.101 was greater than 0.05 level of significance. It should be concluded that there is no a statically significance difference among the mean responses of the two respondents.

With regard to item 8 table 7 the respondents were asked on the supervisors were follow up and evaluating the utilization of school grant. Accordingly, the mean of the responses fall between 1-2.49 indicating that the supervisors were not following up and evaluate the utilization of school grant. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on the supervisors were follow up and evaluating the utilization of school grant. The mean value was found to be below the average. This means that the supervisors were not follow up and evaluating the utilization of school grant. T-test result

shows there is a statistically significance difference between the three groups of respond as t value  $(0.000) < 0.05$ .

In another case the independence of parent student teacher associations is questionable as most of respondents stated that the school director plays a dominant role in their meetings in the decision-making process. According to the school grant budget guidelines parent student teacher associations should be key decision-makers in deciding the use of the grant. Parent student teacher associations are obliged to examine the context of their specific school, and have the authority to spend the grant on the areas listed in the school grant as priorities.

The parts of interview made to principals to strengthen the above fact, the question for interview posed. What is the responsibility and participation level of school committees to manage the utilization of school grant? Three of principals (1a, 1b, 1e) said,

*“The school committees play an integral role in assisting the school function well including involving parents in the school’s decision-making, promoting communications, and contributing resources for the school”. “Additionally parent student teacher associations chairpersons are signatories of the school grant cheques in their respective schools” “He involved in deciding on the activities to be funded by the school grant, setting priorities and controlling expenditures”.*

On the same interview two principals (1c, 1d) replied, *“Except the chairperson of the parent student teacher association other members of committees were not participated actively”.* *“But work closely with the chairperson of the parent student teacher association in managing funds contributed by parents and the school grant, we were not mostly working with the other committee rather than meeting twice a year to identify the priority needs”.*

Overall, in all the schools visited PSTA chairpersons have been actively involved in all school and they are signatories of the school grant cheques in their respective schools, he involved in

deciding on the activities to be funded by the school grant, setting priorities and controlling expenditures

#### 4.5. Contribution of School Grant to School Improvement Program

Table 8: The contribution of school grant to school improvement program

No.	Items	Respondents	f	M	St.dev	G.M	T- test
1.	For the achievement of SIP.	Teachers and Supervisor School Committees	116 109	4.44 4.21	0.660 0.735	4.3	0.098
2.	To improve students' learning out comes	Teachers and Supervisor School Committees	116 109	4.18 4.11	1.016 0.766	4.1	0.017
3.	It increases resources of school in terms of teaching materials. It makes conducive environment for learning and teaching process.	Teachers and Supervisor School Committees	116 109	4.39 4.13	0.648 0.757	4.2	0.000
4.	It strengthens the role and involvement of school community	Teachers and Supervisor School Committees	116	4.35 3.38	0.682 0.857	4.5	0.175
5.	It promotes the decentralization of decision making of the school	Teachers and Supervisor School Committees	116 109	3.54 3.69	0.857 0.826	3.6	0.276

Con't...

---

6.	It increases the enrollment of students in the school.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	4.85	0.900	4.92	0.000
			School Committees	109	4.98		
7.	It increases the enrollment of students in the school.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	4.28	0.757	4.48	0.000
			School Committees	109	4.68		
8.	It improve the equity of learning for all of student in the schools	Teachers and Supervisor	116	4.19	1.090	4.25	0.161
			School Committees	109	4.26		

Aggregate mean= 4.28

---

Note: School committees includes (SGC, SIPC and PSTA)

On table 8 item 1 Most of teachers and supervisors and school committees of responses show moderate for the achievement of school improvement Program. The average mean of the responses fall between 3.65-5.00 indicating the achievement of school improvement Program was high. The mean value was found to be above the average. This means the school grant used for the achievement of school improvement Program was high. T-test result shows there is no a statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value (.098) > 0.05.

As shown by table 8 item2 respondents were asked on to improve students' learning out comes. Accordingly, the mean of the responses fall between 3.60-5.00 indicating that school grant used to improve students' learning out comes. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on school grant used to improve students' learning out comes. The mean value was found to be very high. This means there is school grant used to improve students' learning out comes. T-test result shows there is statistically

significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value (.017) < 0.05. There was some improvement on the area.

Table 8 item 3 shows the teachers and supervisors and school committee school grant was increases resources of school in terms of teaching materials. Accordingly, the mean of the respondents fall between 3.60-5.00 indicating those teachers & supervisors and school committees' states school grant was increases resources of school in terms of teaching materials. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on school grant was increases resources of school in terms of teaching materials. The mean value was found to be very high. This means school grant was increases resources of school in terms of teaching materials highly. T-test result shows there is no statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value (0.000) < 0.05.

Table 8 items 4 the mean of the responses fall between 3.60-5.00 indicating those teachers and supervisors and school committee states school grant makes conducive environment for learning and teaching process. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on school grant makes conducive environment for learning and teaching process. This means school grant made conducive environment for learning and teaching process. T-test result shows there is no statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value (0.175) > 0.05.

As shown on table 8 item 5 respondents were asked on the school grant strengths the role and involvement of school community. The mean of the responses fall between 2.50-3.59 indicating there is an involvement of users in needs assessment of educational materials to be purchased by school grant fund. T-test as applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on school grant strengths the role and involvement of school community. The test result showed that at 95 percent confidence level. The mean value was found to be on average (moderate). This means school grant was strengths the role and involvement of school community. T-test result shows there is no statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value (0.276) > 0.05.

In table 8 item 6 respondents were asked on school grant promotes the decentralization of decision making of the school. Teachers and supervisors and school committees of responses rated very high on school grant was promotes the decentralization of decision making of the school. The average mean of the responses fall between 3.60-5.00 indicating that school grant was promotes the decentralization of decision making of the school. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on school grant was promotes the decentralization of decision making of the school. The mean value was found to be very high. This means the school grant was promotes the decentralization of decision making of the school. T-test result shows there is a statistical difference between the two groups of respond as t value  $(.000) < 0.05$ .

As shown on table 8 item 7 respondents were asked on the school grant increases the enrollment of students in the school. Majorities of responses show that very high rated on school grant increases the enrollment of students in the school. The average mean of the responses fall between 3.60-5.00 indicating that school grant was increases the enrollment of students in the school highly. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on school grant increases the enrollment of students in the school. The test result showed that at 95 percent confidence level. The mean value was found to be very high. This means school grant was increases the enrollment of students in the school highly. T-test result shows there is statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value  $(.000) < 0.05$ .

Table 8 items 8 indicate the majorities of the teachers and supervisors and school committees of responses rated very high on the school grant improve the equity of learning for all of students. Accordingly, the mean of the responses fall between 3.60-5.00 indicating that school grant was improve the equity of learning for all of students in the schools. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on school grant improve the equity of learning for all of students. The mean value was found to be very high. This means that school grant was highly improving the equity of learning for all students. T-test result shows there is no statistically significance difference between the two groups of

respond as  $t$  value (.161) > 0.05. To further more, the interview made to principals, to strengthen the above fact, the question for interview posed on:- what school grant contributes to school improvement program?

According to interview on July10-20/2017 four principals (1a, 1b, 1c, and 1d) said,

*“The school grant also used for all the expenses related to the improvement of the teaching and learning process through school improvement program such as: to purchase reference books for library use, laboratory equipment, chemicals, materials for the preparation of teaching aids, and also used to repair classrooms, desks, toilet etc for the provision of quality education to the schools.”*

One principal (1e) confirmed, *“The school grants contribution was some valued, evidently, the items purchased by the schools, from furniture to reference materials, have laid the foundations for the provision of quality education in the schools.”*

For instance, before the introduction of the school grant support, most of the schools would only administer blackboard-written tests and exams. At present, although this change was mainly noted in schools to school improvement program.

#### **4.6. Challenges that Hinders the Utilization of School Grant**

Table 9: The Factor that affects the utilization of school grant

No	Items	Respondents	F	M	St.dev	G.	T-test
						M	
1.	Does school timely receive the allocated school grant?	Teachers and Supervisor	116	4.39	0.648	4.26	0.000
		School Committees	109	4.13	0.757		
2.	Low participation of stake holder.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	4.65	0.392	4.50	0.175
		School Committees	109	4.35	0.682		Con't...

---

3.	Lack of preparing school grant utilization plan.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	4.16	0.672	4.10	0.000
		School Committees	109	4.04	0.782		
4.	Lack of managing the implementation of school grant.	Teachers and Supervisor				369	0.243
		School Committees	116	3.68	0.857		
			109	3.69	0.826		
5	Lack of matching school grant plan with SIP plan priority.	Teachers and Supervisor				3.62	0.136
		School Committees	116	3.62	0.883		
			109	3.61	0.980		
6	Lack of timely reporting school grant implementation.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	3.65	1.003	3.67	0.000
		School Committees	109	3.68	0.767		
7.	Lack of monitor and evaluate of school grant utilization.	Teachers and Supervisor	116	3.60	0.757	3.69	0.000
		School Committees	109	3.78	0.886		
8	Lack of implementing school grant according to guide line	Teachers and Supervisor	116	3.75	0.861	3.72	0.171
		School Committees	109	3.69	0.847		

Aggregate mean=4.3

---

Note: School committees includes (SGC, SIPC and PSTA)

Table 9 item 1 shows that teachers and supervisors as well as school committees of responses shows that the school does not receive the allocated school grant timely were strongly agree. The grand mean of the responses was 4.3 indicating the school does not receive the allocated school grant timely. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on the school does not receive the allocated school grant timely. The

mean value was rating agree. This means the schools do not receive the allocated school grant timely. T-test result (0.000) shows there is statistically significance difference between the two groups respond as t value (.000) < 0.05. This implies that the majorities of respondents agreed on the school does not receive the allocated school grant timely.

In table 9 item 2 shows those teachers and supervisors as well as school committees' responses show that low participation of stake holder were rated strongly agree. The grand mean of the responses were 4.5 indicating low participation of stake holder was agree. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on the low participation of stake holder. The mean value was rating strongly agree. This means that the schools stakeholders' participation were very low. T-test result shows there is no statistically significance difference between the two groups respond as t value (0.175) > 0.05. This implies that the majorities of responses agreed on the school had low participation of stake holder.

As table 9 item 3 shows that teachers and supervisors as well as school committees responses shows that, lack of preparing school grant utilization plan was strongly agree. The grand mean of the responses was 4.1 indicating lack of preparing school grant utilization plan was rating strongly agree. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on lack of preparing school grant utilization plan. The mean value was rating agree. This means there was lack of preparing school grant plan. T-test result shows there is statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value (.000) < 0.05. This implies that majorities of respondents were strongly agreed on the lack of preparing school grant utilization plan.

In table 9 item4 shows that, teachers and supervisors as well as school committees' responses show that lack of skill on how to managing school grants implementation was agree. The grand mean of the responses were 3.69 indicating lack of skill on how to managing school grants implementation was rating strongly agree. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on lack of auditing the balance of income and expense of school grant. The mean value was rating strongly agree. This means there is lack of

managing school grants implementation. T-test result shows there is statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value  $(.000) < 0.05$ . This implies that the majorities of respondents said that, there was lack of skill on how to utilize school grant.

Table 9 item 5 respondents were asked on the lack of giving priority of school grants fund with SIP priority plan. Most of teachers and supervisors as well as school committees responses that show there was lack of linking Priority of school grants fund with SIP priority plan. Accordingly, the grand mean of the responses were 3.6 indicating there was lack prioritizing of school grants fund plan with SIP priority plan. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on giving priority of school grants fund with SIP priority plan. The mean value was found to be rating strongly agree. This means there was lack of linking Priority of school grants fund with SIP priority plan. T-test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value  $(0.000) < 0.05$  The reason is may be due to the position to the activities and responsibility they had occupied.

Table 9 item 6 respondents were asked on the lack of timely reporting of school grant implementation. Most of teachers and supervisors as well as school committees of responses show that, there was lack of timely reporting the implementation of school grant. Accordingly, the grand mean of the responses were 3.76 indicating there was lack of timely reporting the implementation of school grant and rating agree. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on lack of timely reporting of school grant implementation. The mean value was found to be rating agree. This means there was lack of timely reporting of school grant implementation. T-test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value  $(0.000). < 0.05$ .

Table 9 item 7 respondents were asked on the lack of monitoring and evaluation of school grant utilization. Some of respondent's responses state that, there was lack of monitoring and evaluation of school grant utilization. But, most of teachers and supervisors as well as school committees' responses show that, there was lack of monitoring and evaluation school grant

utilization. Accordingly, the grand mean of the responses were 3.69 indicating there was lack of monitoring and evaluation school grant utilization. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on lack of monitoring and evaluation of school grant utilization. The mean value was found to be rating agree. This means there was lack of monitoring and evaluation of school grant utilization. T-test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value (.000) < 0.05. The reason is may be due to the position to the activities and responsibility they had occupied.

Table 9 item8 shows that some of respondents argued that, there was no the lack of implementing school grant fund according to guideline. Most of supervisors and teachers and school committees' school responses show that there was strongly agree the lack of implementing school grant fund according to guideline. Accordingly, the grand means of the responses were 3.72 indicating there was lack of implementing school grant fund according to guideline. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on the lack of implementing school grant fund according to guideline. The mean value was found to be rating strongly agree. This means there was lack of implementing school grant fund according to guideline. T- test result shows there is no statistically significance difference between the two groups of respondents' as t value(0.161) > 0.05.

Based on statistical data presented above, it is possible to say that, both groups of responses more confirmed that school does not receive the allocated school grant timely, low participation of stake holder, lack of preparing school grant utilization plan, lack of managing school grants implementation, lack of giving Priority of school grant fund with school improvement program priority, lack of timely reporting of school grant implementation, lack of monitoring and evaluation of school grant utilization and lack implementing school grant according to its guide line were the major problem that affecting utilization of school grant.

But the method of utilizing school grant and lack of announcing the allocated school grant to stokeholds was not the main problems in government secondary schools of DDA. The parts of interview made to principals to strengthen the above fact, the question for interview posed. Is there any problem related to the utilization, managing and evaluation of school grant in your

school? What are the challenges that affect the implementation of school grant properly? According to the interview on July10-20/2017 three principals (1b, 1c, 1e ) respectively replied,

*“There is no focal person at school level to properly utilizing.”*  
*Managing school grant, less commitment among the school committees to properly utilizing, managing and evaluation of school grant.”*  
*“There is lack of skilled school committee members for implementation of school grant.”*

Two principals (1a, 1d) confirmed, *“School grant committees were not participating equally for implementation.”* *“Supervisors never follow up school grant utilization and lack of up to date auditing system.”*

#### 4.7. Monitoring and Evaluating School Grant Utilization

Table 10: Ways of monitoring and evaluating school grant.

No	Items	Respondents	F	M	St.dev	G. M	T-test
1.	Checking the collection of documentary evidences (plan minutes and reports).	Teachers & Supervisor School Committees	116 109	2.16 2.48	0.853 0.834	2.32	0.041
2.	Measuring students learning out comes.	Teachers & Supervisor School Committees	116 109	1.76 1.48	0.662 0.736	2.62	0.080
3.	Availability of school facility.	Teachers & Supervisor School Committees	116 109	1.49 1.68	0.959 0.932	2.59	0.020
4.	Discussion meeting.	Teachers & Supervisor School Committees	116 109	1.98 2.46	0.891 0.945	2.22	0.000
5.	Checking the implementation of SIP by using checklist.	Teachers & Supervisor School Committees	116 109	2.21 2.43	0.972 0.993	2.32	0.541
							Con't...

6.	Balancing the allocated school grant and its expense.	Teachers & Supervisor School Committees	116 109	1.78 1.90	0.753 0.914	1.84	0.000
7.	Following up and evaluate by school supervisors.	Teachers & Supervisor School Committees	116 109	2.15 2.01	0.826 0.830	2.08	0.000

Aggregate Mean = 1.99

Note: School committees includes (SGC, SIPC and PSTA)

As shown by table 10 item 1 respondents were asked on whether they checking the collection of documentary evidences of plan, minutes and reports. The majority of supervisors and teachers as well as school committees of responses were low on the idea. The average means of the responses were 2.16 and 2.48 respectively. These indicating schools checking the collection of documentary evidences of plan, minutes and reports were low. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on schools checking the collection of documentary evidences of plan, minutes and reports. The test result showed that at 95 percent confidence level. The mean value was found to be below the average. This means checking the collection of documentary evidences of plan, minutes and reports was low. T-test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups respond as t value  $(0.014) < 0.05$ .

As shown by table 10 item 2 respondents were asked on whether they measuring students learning out comes. The majority of supervisors and teachers as well as school committees' responses were very low on the idea. The average means of the responses 1.76 and 1.48 respectively. These indicating schools measuring students learning out comes were very low. T-test was applied to test whether all groups respondents equally express their opinion on schools measuring students learning out comes. The test result showed that at 95 percent confidence level. The mean value was found to be below the average. This means measuring students learning out comes was very low. T- test result shows there is no a statistically significance difference between the two groups respond as t value  $(0.080) > 0.05$ .

As shown by table 10 item 3 respondents were asked on whether they availability of school facility. The majority of supervisors and teachers and school committees' responses were very low on the idea. The average means of the responses were 1.49 and 1.68 respectively. These indicating schools for the availability of school facility were very low. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on Schools availability of school facility. The test result showed that at 95 percent confidence level. The mean value was found to be below the average. This means availability of school facility was very low. T- test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups respond as  $t(0.020) \text{ value} < 0.05$ .

As shown by table 10 item 4 respondents were asked on whether they have discussion meeting. The majority of supervisors & teachers and school committees' responses were very low on the idea. The average means of the responses were 1.98 and 2.46 respectively. This indicating schools discussion meeting was very low. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on Schools discussion meeting. The test result showed that at 95 percent confidence level. The mean value was found to be below the average. This means discussion meeting was very low. T-test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups respond as  $t \text{ value} (0.000) < 0.05$ .

As shown by table 10 item 5 respondents were asked on whether they checking the implementation of school improvement program by using checklist. The majority of supervisors & teachers and school committees' responses were very low on the idea. The average means of the responses were 2.21 and 2.43 respectively. These indicating schools checking the implementation of school improvement program by using checklist were very low. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on Schools checking the implementation of school improvement program by using checklist. The test result showed that at 95 percent confidence level. The mean value was found to be below the average. This means checking the implementation of school improvement program by using checklist was very low. T-test result shows there is a

statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value (0.541)  $< 0.05$ .

As shown by table 10 item 6 respondents were asked on whether they balancing the allocated school grant and its expense. The majority of supervisors and teachers and school committees' responses were very low on the idea. The average means of the responses were 1.78 and 1.90 respectively. These indicating schools balancing the allocated school grant and its expense were very low. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on schools balancing the allocated school grant and its expense. The test result showed that at 95 percent confidence level. The mean value was found to be below the average. This means balancing the allocated school grant and its expense was very low. T-test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value (0.000)  $< 0.05$ .

As shown by table 10 item 7 respondents were asked on whether the school supervisors follow up and evaluation. The majority of supervisors & teachers and school committees' responses were very low on the idea. The average means of the responses were 2.15 and 2.01 respectively. These indicating schools the school supervisors follow up and evaluation were very low. T-test was applied to test whether all groups of respondents equally express their opinion on Schools the school supervisors follow up and evaluation. The test result showed that at 95 percent confidence level. The mean value was found to be below the average. This means the school supervisors follow up and evaluation was very low. T-test result shows there is a statistically significance difference between the two groups of respond as t value (0.000)  $< 0.05$ .

## 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final part of the study deals with summary of the major findings, conclusions and recommendations that are assumed to be essential in the utilization of school grant and its contribution to SIP in secondary schools of DDA. In this section first, summary of the major findings are made, second, conclusion of the fundamental findings are drawn. Finally, some possible recommendations are forwarded on the basis of findings of the study.

### 5.1. Summary of Findings

This study was carried out with the major purpose of assessing the utilization of school grant and its contribution to school improvement program in secondary schools of Dire Dawa Administration during 2016/2017 academic year. To meet the purpose of the study, the following basic questions were raised:

- 1) How do the schools link their school improvement program plan with the school grant plan in DDASS?
- 2) How do schools communicate utilization of school grant to school community in DDASS?
- 3) How do schools manage and evaluate the utilization of school grant in DDASS?
- 4) What are the contributions of school grant to school improvement program in secondary school of DDA?
- 5) What are the factors that affect the utilization of the school grant in DDASS?
- 6) What should be done to improve the utilization of school grant in DDASS?

The data were gathered mainly through questionnaire, interview and document analysis. The data that gathered through interview, and documents open ended were analyzed qualitatively using thematic written technique. Hence, based on the review of literature and analysis of the data, the study came up with the following findings:

- 1) Regarding the characteristics of respondents. The samples of the study were selected by using systematic sampling technique and available sampling techniques. From 10 secondary schools the researcher selects five of them by simple random sampling technique. Availability

sampling technique would be employed to incorporate all PSTA members, all school grant committee members, all SIP committee members and all DDEB supervisors of the five schools who could be easily available in the schools. The study was also intended to use systematic sampling technique within teachers' population group. Out of these 50 % of teachers to ensure that a proportional number was obtained and the respondents in this study.

2) Regarding on sex and educational qualification and field of specialization, the participation of females in the sample secondary schools was low and most principals and school committees had educational qualification below the required level of qualification for leading secondary schools. To this end, the contribution or role of women in school became low or insignificant compare to men. From this, it could be possible to conclude for school leaders in a position to hold M.A that empower them to lead the school, providing chance to all of the responsible body required level of qualification.

3) Improper utilization of SG in government secondary schools very affected SIP with grand mean of 2.49 was below average. Besides, the study also indicated that the stakeholder's have awareness on SG management system with grand mean of 1.82, linking SIP priority need with SG priority plan was grand mean of 2.1, understand the meaning and how to use SG with grand mean of 2.27 were below average. Similarly poor attention to allocate SG for the purpose teaching learning process with grand mean of 2.37 were also below average. More over the majority of teachers and supervisors 76(65.5%) and school committees 60(55%) reported that, they slightly link their priority need with SG priority plan due to lack of experience and skill of planning and identifying priority of school needs properly.

4) In the communication of SG utilization, most schools properly communicating the SG utilization well communicated to school community no notice board with the mean value of 3.69 without giving awareness to their stakeholders and all schools were not used the rest means of communication such as discussion meeting, quarterly reports, school min-media and pamphlet. Most of time there was less facilitation of different training for responsible body on

how to announce the utilization of SG. But there was a little expenditure and balances available were displayed on the notice board for transparency.

5) Overall poor SG management with aggregate mean value of 2.4. But preparing annual SG plan were moderate with grand mean value of 3.31 and school have annual SIP plan were high with grand mean value of 4.5 respectively. This means the schools were sometimes preparing SG plan but always having or preparing SIP plan. However, school management conducting need assessment before planning is made with grand mean value of 2.44, the school have own focal person with grand mean value of 1.33, supplied materials adequately support teaching learning process with grand mean value of 1.98, stakeholders having experience for auditing on the SG implementation with grand mean value of 1.42 and supervisors follow up and evaluating the utilization of SG with grand mean value of 2.13 were below average.

6) The other analysis shows that, utilization of SG with its limitation had positive contribution to SIP with aggregate mean value of 4.2 which was high. Besides, the study also indicated that; the SG for the implementation of SIP were high with grand mean value of 4.3, it has positive impact to improve students' learning out comes were high with grand mean value of 4.1, it increases resources of school in terms of teaching materials were high with grand mean value of 4.3, it makes conducive environment for learning and teaching process were high with grand mean value of 4.5, it strengths the role and involvement of school community were high with grand mean value of 3.6, it promotes the decentralization of decision making of the school were high with grand mean value of 4.92, it increases the enrollment of student in the school were high with grand mean value of 4.48 and it improve the equity of learning for all of student in the schools with grand mean of 3.4 were high from the document observation. The SG also used for all the expenses related to the improvement of the teaching and learning out comes. It is used to purchase reference materials, pens, and materials for the preparation of teaching aids, and establish laboratories and libraries equipped and the like.

7) The study also indicated that, some factors such as school did not receive the allocated SG timely with grand mean of 4.26, low participation of stake holder with grand mean of = 4.50, lack of preparing SG plan with grand mean of 4.10, lack of managing the implementation of

SG with grand mean of 3.69, lack of matching SG plan with SIP plan priority with grand mean of 3.62, lack of timely reporting SG implementation with grand mean of 3.67, Lack of monitoring and evaluation of SG utilization with grand mean of 3.69 and lack implementing SG according to guide line with grand mean of 3.72 were highly affected the effective utilization of SG management system, respectively and this also have negative impacts on its contribution of SIP at school level.

8) Finally the study also shows that, ways of monitoring and evaluation of SG ranged with the aggregated mean value of 1.99 which was low. In addition, the study also indicated that; checking the collection of documentary evidences of plan, minutes and reports with grand mean of 2.32, measuring students learning out comes with grand mean of 2.62, availability of school facility with grand mean of 2.59, discussion meeting with grand mean of 2.22, checking the implementation of SIP by using checklist with grand mean of 2.23, balancing the allocated SG and its expense with grand mean of 1.84, and supervisors follow up and evaluation with grand mean of 2.08) below average.

## **5.2. Conclusions**

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings of the study.

1. As the finding showed, improper utilization of SG was implemented by schools, management of SG according to guide line were poor. Besides, the stakeholders had less understanding about the uses of school grant and they were not have enough awareness how to linking SIP priority need with SG priority plan. Similarly less attention to allocate SG for the purpose teaching learning process. Hence, it can be concluded the practices to aware the users how to linking SIP priority need with SG priority plan and uses of SG were not properly undertaken at school level.

2. Among the other common problems with the school grant was its low communication of SG utilization. Most of the schools announce /communicate/ on school grant utilization to school stakeholders by simply attaching on school notes board without awareness and mostly they were not used the rest means of communication such as discussion meeting, quarterly reports,

school min-media and pamphlet. But they were display on notice board a little expenditure and balance available shall be displayed on the notice board for transparency. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that, principals and school committees' must announce to user's allocated SG, its expenditure balance and for what purposes the school use it by using the rest means of communication with awareness for transparency and accountability.

3. The finding indicated that, regard to preparing annual plan of SG was some times and SIP plan were prepared always respectively, the study showed that, some time conducting need assessment before planning is made. However all of the schools had no own its focal person. The same time supplied materials were not adequately support teaching learning process, there was no internal and external auditing system for evaluating the utilization of SG in all schools and they were not have enough experience to audit the implemented and supervisors never follow up and evaluating the SG utilization. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that, ensuring that effective managing system of SG utilization in the schools to protecting from any wastage, by implementing SG utilization according to guide line, preparing action plan and timely auditing was important in the school.

4. The study also indicated that, SG for the improvement of SIP, it improve students' learning out comes, it increases resources of school in terms of teaching materials, , it makes conducive environment for learning and teaching process, it strengths the role and involvement of school community, it promotes the decentralization of decision making of the school, it increases the enrollment of student in the school and it improve the equity of learning for all of student in the schools were have contribution in all schools. Therefore, it can conclude that, the school principals will be give more attention to identify, measure the contribution of school grant and improving their utilization of SG activities based on guide line that already sated by ministry of education.

5. The majority of responses were indicated that school did not receive the allocated SG timely, low participation of stake holder, lack of preparing school grant plan, lack of managing the implementation of SG, lack of matching SIP priority plan with SG plan, lack of timely

reporting SG implementation, and lack implementing SG according to guide line were highly existed. Therefore, highly affecting the effective utilization of SG management system and its contribution. Thus, it could be concluded that, all of the above activities improved to keep effective utilization of SG management system and positive contribution for SIP of the schools.

6. The majority of respondents were indicated that, checking the collection of documentary evidences of plan, minutes and reports were low. However measuring students learning out comes and availability of school facility were moderately using for the mechanism of improvement and evaluation. Responses also indicated that, discussion meeting, checking the implementation of SIP by using checklist; balancing the allocated SG and its expense, supervisors follow up and evaluation of SG utilization were low. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that, principals, school committees; and Dire Dawa education bureau were ensure to use all ways of improvement and evaluation mechanism to improve the utilization of school grant.

### **5.3. Recommendation**

Based on the above major findings and conclusions drawn, the following recommendation forwarded to improve the utilization school grant and its contribution to school improvement program in secondary schools.

1. According to the first finding it is recommended that dire dawa education bureau should conduct the assessment on schools, identifying the problems and provide chance of in service programme of training to principals for required level of qualification and short term training on work to all of the responsible body for the effective utilization of school grant.

2. It is recommended that dire dawa education bureau give opportunity of sufficient short term and refreshment training repeatedly at least two times a year for successful understanding the meaning of school grant, utilization of school grant and linking school improvement program

priority plan to school grant plan priority to school principals and school committees.

3. The schools communicate allocated school grant and its expenditure balance only displaying on the notice board. Therefore school principals and school committees' should be announce to user's the allocated school grant, its expenditure balance and for what purposes the school use it, in addition to displaying on the notice board like discussion meeting, quarterly reports, school min-media and pamphlet quarterly to school stakeholders for transparency and accountability.

4. It is recommended that school principals should be preparing annual plan of SIP and SG, always manage the implementation of school grant according the guide line and give emphasis and monitor supplied materials were adequately used for supporting teaching learning process according to guide line and annual plan. Additionally for the improvement of school grant management system dire dawa administration BOFED and education bureau follow up and give technical support to the school principals and committees twice a year and recruiting to schools professional worker for effective use and control of school grant.

5. It is recommended that the school principals and school committees should be give more attention to identify, measure and evaluate the contribution of school grant and improving their utilization activities yearly based on guide line that already stated by ministry of education.

6. It is recommended that dire dawa education bureau discussing with ministry of education and BOFED to release the allocated school grant on time to schools for intended educational objectives. It is also recommended that the school principals' and committees develop responsibility of timely/quarterly/ reporting school grant implementation according to guide line. Finally, it can be suggested that further studies needs to be conducted, on the practices and utilization of school grant in secondary schools of Dire Dawa Administration to ensure the implementation of SIP.

7. The school committees assimilates the culture of checking the collection of documentary evidences of plan, minutes and reports, conduct for checking the implementation of school improvement program by using checklist, develop the experience of auditing balancing the allocated school grant and its expense at least once a year. As well as supervisors should be follow up and evaluate the implementation of school grant during supervising the school. Additionally principals and school committees use all ways of improvement and evaluation mechanism to improve the utilization of school grant from time to time.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Abraham A, 2001. Preparation and Utilization of Instructional materials in Primary schools of Walayita zone. UN published MA thesis, AAU.
- Aghenta, J.A. 1984. Towards system approach to the planning of secondary education in Nigeria.
- Akintelure, H. 2007. The challenges and roles of parents in ensuring the success of the secondary education sector agenda of the national economic empowerment and development strategies (NEEDS). In P.N.C.
- Atou, S. 2007. "Schooling Resources, Educational Institutions and student performance; the International Evidence", *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 65, pp.117-147.
- Ayodele, J. B. 2002. The perception of secondary school teachers.
- Buckland, P. 2011. 'School grants, Economics and Financing of Education Approach 2<sup>nd</sup> edition Englewood, Cliff prentice Hall. Inc.
- Buckland, P. 2011. 'School grants and school-based management', Paper No.4, Current Issues in Education. Canberra: Aus AID Education Resource Facility. Retrieved on 12/07/2015 from: [http://www.auserf.com.au/wpcontent/files/1367535204erf\\_schoolgrants1.pdf](http://www.auserf.com.au/wpcontent/files/1367535204erf_schoolgrants1.pdf).
- Bud lender, D. And Woolard, I.2006. The Impact of the South African Child support and Old Age. Grant on Children's Schooling and work. Geneva.
- Chawla M. and Berman, P. 1996. Resource mobilization. Harvard School of Public Circular MKS/ED.A/86/A.
- Donald, R. 1995. Primary school financial management. London; Institute of Education.
- Education Research Centre, 2011. Issues A-School Finance. Education Week. Retrieved California.
- Egziabher, T. 2010. School Finance in Ethiopian secondary school. UNESCO; Paris.
- Forojalla, S. 1993. Educational Planning for Development. London the Macmillan press Ltd.

- Gertler, P. Patrinos, H.A. Rubio-Codina, and M. 2007. Methodological issues in evaluation of school based management reforms. Institute for Fiscal Studies. W.W.W.ifs.org.uk/edepo/rubio.
- Govinda, R. 1995. Capacity Building for Educational Governance at Local Levels Community in Participation and Empowerment in Primary Education. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Haig, W.1997.“School Finance and Equity in England. An Analysis of Strategies and Consequences”. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. Vol. 32, No. 4,pp 369-386
- Hussien K. Desalegn, Ch. and Derebssa, D. 2014. The Use and Usefulness of School Grants: Lessons from Ethiopia. Published by: International Institute for Educational Planning79 rue Eugene Delacroix,75116Paris,France [info@iiep.unesco.org](mailto:info@iiep.unesco.org)[www.iiep.unesco.org](http://www.iiep.unesco.org) iiep/web/doc/2014/01 © IIEP 2014
- John, R., Morphet, L., TAggarwal and J.C.1996. Theories and Principles of Education: Philosophical and Principles of Education: Philosophical and Sociological Bases of Education. Delhi: VIKAS publishing House, Pvt Ltd.
- Jordan, K. 1985. School Business Administration. Beverly Hills sage pub.
- JRM. 2006. The lack of resources has been aggravated by the presence of HIV/AIDS which has compromised the ability to support schools effectively with resources from 1998 to 1999.
- Key, J. 1997. Descriptive Research Module12. Oklahoma State University [www. Okstate /edu/ag/ agedcm4h /academic/aged5980a/newpage110.htm](http://www.okstate.edu/ag/agedcm4h/academic/aged5980a/newpage110.htm) retrieved on14/8/2014.
- Knight, B. 1993. Financial Management for Schools the Thinking Managers Guide London Athenaeum press Ltd.
- Kothari, C. 2004. Methodology Research Methods and Techniques.2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. New Age International Ltd. Publishers.[www.newagepublishers.com](http://www.newagepublishers.com) retrieved on 14/8/2014.
- Koul. 1996. The scholars recommended that use simple random sampling within each subgroup to ensure that an equal or a proportional number.
- Kuma Tirfe. 1996. Cost and Financing of Education: Ethiopian Social sector Report EMPDA. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

- Levacic, R.1995. Formula Funding of Public Services.Routledge. New York.
- Mbamba, A.1992. Book of Readings in Educational Management. Harare Mazongoro Rager Converts Ltd. UNESCO.
- MoE. 1994. Education and Training policy. Addis Ababa EMPDA Ethiopia
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. School Grant Budget Guideline,( Amharic Version)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. Educational Leadership, Organization, Community Participation, and Financial Guide line. Addis Ababa EMPDA, Ethiopia
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. General Quality Education Improvement Package Plan; GOE.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. National Learning Assessment. Addis Ababa: UP Printing Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. Improved School Grant Budget Guidelines. Addis Ababa.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. School Grant Budget Guidelines Addis Ababa Printing Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. School Grant Policy; Formulation and Implementation. Addis Ababa; AAU.
- Montee S. 1990. Applied social research tools for the human services. London, UK: printer publishers Sudman.
- Mukirae N, and John K .2014.International Institute for Educational Planning.Kenya Country Notes the use and usefulness of school grants.
- National Audit Office, (June 2010) Department for International Development bilateral support to primary education, London.
- Nelson, O. 2000. Budgeting and Financial Management in Education. National Open University [www. nou.edu.ng /.../U%20718%BUDGETING%20AND%20FINA](http://www.nou.edu.ng/.../U%20718%BUDGETING%20AND%20FINA) retrieved on Dec.21.2012.
- Pscharopoulos, G.1991. Education for Development an Analysis of Investment Choices. New York. Oxford University, UK.
- Shakiro. 1995. Scaling up Aids for Ethiopian Schools; UNESCO; Paris.
- TGE. 1994. Education Sector Strategy. Addis Ababa: Berhanena Salam Printing Enterprise.
- Tsang, M. 1988. Cost analysis for educational policymaking: a review of cost studies in education in developing countries, Review of Educational Research, 58, pp. 181-230.

- Tsang, M. 1993. Financial reform of basic education: the Chinese experience, paper presented at the Economics of Education Symposium, Manchester, England, 19-21 May 1993.
- UNESCO, 1990. Education for All: The Quality Imperative. EFA Global Monitoring Report 1991. Paris.
- UNESCO, 2009. IIEP. The Free primary Education challenges in Ethiopia. Paris.
- UNESCO, 2014. Education for All: The Quality Imperative. EFA Global Vol. I and II.
- Wadsley, G. 1993. Financial Management. Resource Material for School Heads. London Common Wealth Secretariat, UK.
- Winkler and Schelgel. 2005. Helping Children Left Behind; State Aid and the Pursuit of Educational Equity. MIT Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts
- World Bank Group, 1994. Findings, Education Quality: Definition what is Important: Public Disclosure Authorized: (<http://www.worldbank.org/afr/findings/english/find16.htm>). Retrieved on 23/11/2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1997. Ethiopian Public Expenditure Review, Main Report Resident Mission in Ethiopia Country Department 6 African Regions.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. "Empowerment in Ethiopia: Issues and Options." Draft. Part of the Ethiopia Report 29468-ET, Washington, D.C.
- \_\_\_\_\_. World Bank. 2008. Project Appraisal Document in Support of the First Phase of the General Education Quality Improvement Program.
- \_\_\_\_\_. World Bank, 2008. National Learning Assessment: Policies for adjustment, revitalization and expansion. Washington, DC.

## 7. APPENDICES

### 7.1. APPENDIX- I

#### HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

#### POST GRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORAT

#### DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

A Questionnaire to be filled in by **Secondary School Teachers and Supervisors**

#### **General Direction**

School grant has been serving as an input for the realization of educational objectives at schools. Now a day's quality education is a burning issue in the world. Accordingly, the Government strengthens the financial capacity of schools and benefits all school stakeholders by participating on school grant utilization and school improvement program in all primary and secondary schools of Ethiopia. Among the six component of general education quality improvement school grant is the pillar of school improvement program which is currently carried out by all government secondary schools with the aim of a positive contribution to access, quality, equity and the provision of additional resources to schools.

The aim of this study is to assess the contribution of school grant regarding to school improvement program as well as identify the challenges face during the utilization of school grant and to find out the positive contribution of school grant regarding to school improvement program.

**Dear respondent,** your cooperation in completing this questionnaire would be critical and much appreciated for the effectiveness of this study. Your responses and comments will be used only for the purpose of this study and will not be attributable to any individuals. Therefore you are kindly requested to honestly and responsibly complete this questionnaire with the right, factual, and relevant information with respect to each item.

**NOTE:** 1. don't write your name on any page.

2. Please, read the instruction and questions before completing each items under different headings.

3. For question write your answers, opinion and views on the spaces provided

with respect to each items.

**Thank you in advance for your valuable contribution.**

**Part 1. Background Information**

1.1. Name of the school \_\_\_\_\_ your position:  Teachers  
 Supervisors

**1.2. Respondents' Personal and Professional Background**

**Instruction1.** Please put the "X" mark on the spaces provided next to each variable correct to your background.

1. Sex		2. Age Group		3. Educational Qualification		4. Year of Services as Teachers/Supervisor		5. Educational Specialization	
Male		Below 20		Diploma		1 - 5 years			
		20-30 years		First Degree		6 - 10 years			
Female		31-40 years		MA/MSC		11- 15years			
		41-50 years				16 - 20 years			
		51and above years				21 and above years			

**Instruction2.** The following questions are related to the overall activities needed to be undertaken to practices of school committee (SGC, SIP and PSTA) linking priority need of SIP to priority need of school grant.

**Part two:** practices of school committees linking priority need of SIP to priority need of school grant.

2.1. From the following in which methods do you agree the level linking priority need of SIP to priority need of school grant.

No.	Linking priority need of SIP to priority need of school grant	Range of Utilization				
		Strongly agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly disagree (1)
1	Is your school utilizing school grant to improve school improvement program					
2	The stakeholder's have awareness on school grant management system in your school.					
3	Is SIP plans priority link with SG plan priority plan?					
4	To what level do you know the meaning of school grant means?					
5	The school giving attention to allocate school grant for teaching learning process.					

8. Is your school committee (SGC, SIP and PSTA) linking priority need of SIP to priority need of school grant plan?

Yes  No

9. If your answer is 'Yes', how can the school linking priority need of SIP to priority need of school grant plan ?-----

-----

-----

### Part three: Communication of school grant utilization

3.1. In which methods do you agree to communication of school grant utilization to school community in your school?

No.	Means of communicating school grant	Range of Communication				
		Strongly agree (5)	Agree (4)	Don't know (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
1	On the notice board					
2	Discussion meeting					
3	Quarterly reports					
4	Using school min-media					
5	Using pamphlet					

#### Part four: Management of school grant

4.1. From the following in which methods do you agree the level of managing of school grant in your school?

No.	Management of school grant utilization	Range of Management				
		Always (5)	usually (4)	some time(3)	rare (2)	Null (1)
1	Your school prepare annual school grant plan in your school.					
2	Your school has annual school improvement program (SIP) plan.					
3	The school reports about utilization of school grant to school community.					
4	The school management conducts need assessment to plan school plan.					
5	School grant has own its focal person in your school.					
6	Supplied materials adequately support teaching learning process in your school.					
7	Stakeholders have experience to audit school grant (SG) implementation in your school.					
8	Supervisors following up and evaluate the utilization of school grant in your school.					

**Part five: The contribution of school grant to school improvement program**

5.1. From the following in which methods do you agree the level of contribution of school grant to school improvement program in your school?

No	Contribution of school grant	Range of Contribution				
		Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)
1	For the achievement of school improvement Program (SIP).					
2	To improve students' learning out comes.					
3	It increases resources of school in terms of teaching materials.					
4	It makes conducive environment for learning and teaching process.					
5	It strengthens the role and involvement of school community.					
6	It promotes the decentralization of decision making of the school.					
7	It increases the enrollment of students in the school.					
8	It improve the equity of learning for all of student in the schools					

**Part six: The Factor that affect the utilization of school grant**

6.1. From the following in which methods do you agree the factor that affect the utilization of school grant in your school?

No.	Factor that affect the utilization of school Grant	Range of Affecting				
		Strongly agree(5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly disagree(1)
1	Does the school timely receive the allocated school grant?					
2	Low participation of stake holder.					
3	Lack of preparing school grant utilization plan.					
4	Lack managing school grants implementation.					
5	Lack of matching SG plan with SIP plan priority.					
6	Lack of timely reporting SG implementation.					
7	Lack of monitor and evaluate of SG utilization.					
8	Lack of implementing school grant according to guide line.					

**Part Seven: Ways of monitoring and evaluating school grant utilization**

7.1. From the following in which methods do you monitor and evaluate the school grant utilization?

No.	Ways of monitoring and evaluating school grant utilization	Range of Monitoring and Evaluation				
		Strongly agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly agree (1)
1	Checking the collection of documentary evidences (plan, minutes and reports).					
2	Measuring students learning out comes. .					
3	Availability of school facility.					
4	Discussion meeting.					
5	Checking the implementation of school improvement program by using checklist.					
6	Balancing the allocated school grant and its expense.					
7	Following up and evaluate by school supervisors.					

**Part eight: Write your comments on the following question**

8.1. What challenge have you seen on the proper use of school grant in your school?

-----  
-----  
-----

8.2. What possible solution you suggest to solve the problem in using and managing school grant for the school improvement program? -----

-----  
-----  
-----

8.3. If you have extra comments on the utilization and contribution of school grant to school improvement program in your school please describe it-----

-----  
-----  
-----

Thank you once again for spending time and completing this questionnaire

## 7.2. APPENDIX- II

### HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

#### POST GRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORAT

#### DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

A Questionnaire to be filled in by: - School Grant Committee, school Improvement Program Committee and parent Student Teacher Association

#### **General Direction**

School grant has been serving as an input for the realization of educational objectives at schools. Now a day's quality education is a burning issue in the world. Accordingly, the Government strengthens the financial capacity of schools and benefits all school stakeholders by participating on school grant utilization and school improvement program in all primary and secondary schools of Ethiopia. Among the six component of general education quality improvement school grant is the pillar of school improvement program which is currently carried out by all government secondary schools with the aim of a positive contribution to access, quality, equity and the provision of additional resources to schools.

The aim of this study is to assess the contribution of school grant regarding to school improvement program as well as identify the challenges face during the utilization of school grant and to find out the positive contribution of school grant regarding to school improvement program.

**Dear respondent,** your cooperation in completing this questionnaire would be critical and much appreciated for the effectiveness of this study. Your responses and comments will be used only for the purpose of this study and will not be attributable to any individuals. Therefore you are kindly requested to honestly and responsibly complete this questionnaire with the right, factual, and relevant information with respect to each item.

**NOTE:** 1. don't write your name on any page.

2. Please, read the instruction and questions before completing each items under different headings.
3. For question write your answers, opinion and views on the spaces provided with respect to each items.

**Thank you in advance for your valuable contribution.**

**Part1. Background Information**

1.1. Name of the school \_\_\_\_\_ your position: School grant commi   
 School improvement program committee  Parent student teacher association

**1.2. Respondents' Personal and Professional Background**

**Instruction1.** Please put the "X" mark on the spaces provided next to each variable correct to your background

1. Sex		2. Age Group		3. Responsibility in Committee		4. Year of Services As Committee Members	
Male		Below 20		Chair man		1 - 3 years	
		20-30 years		Vice Chair man		4- 6 years	
Female		31-40 years		Secretary		7 - 9 years	
		41-50 years		Members		10 and above years	
		51and above years					

**Instruction2.** The following questions are related to the overall activities needed to be undertaken to practices of school committee (SGC, SIP and PSTA) linking priority need of SIP to priority need of school grant.

**Part two:** practices of school committees linking priority need of SIP to priority need of school grant.

2.1. From the following in which methods do you agree the level linking priority need of SIP to priority need of school grant.

No.	Linking priority need of SIP to priority need of school grant	Range of Utilization				
		Strongly agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly disagree (1)
1	Is your school utilizing school grant to improve school improvement program					
2	The stakeholder's have awareness on school grant management system in your school.					
3	Is SIP plans priority link with SG plan priority plan?					
4	To what level do you know the meaning of school grant means?					
5	The school giving attention to allocate school grant for teaching learning process.					

8. Is your school committee (SGC, SIP and PSTA) linking priority need of SIP to priority need of school grant plan?

Yes  No

9. If your answer is 'Yes', how can the school linking priority need of SIP to priority need of school grant plan ?-----  
 -----  
 -----  
 -----

**Part three: Communication of school grant utilization**

3.1. In which methods do you agree to communication of school grant utilization to school community in your school?

No.	Means of communicating school grant	Range of Communication				
		Strongly agree (5)	Agree (4)	Don't know (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
1	On the notice board					
2	Discussion meeting					
3	Quarterly reports					
4	Using school min-media					
5	Using pamphlet					

### Part four: Management of school grant

4.1. From the following in which methods do you agree the level of managing of school grant in your school?

No.	Management of school grant utilization	Range of Management				
		Always (5)	usually (4)	some time(3)	rare (2)	Null (1)
1	Your school prepare annual school grant plan in your school.					
2	Your school has annual school improvement program (SIP) plan.					
3	The school reports about utilization of school grant to school community.					
4	The school management conducts need assessment to plan school plan.					
5	School grant has own its focal person in your school.					
6	Supplied materials adequately support teaching learning process in your school.					
7	Stakeholders have experience to audit school grant (SG) implementation in your school.					
8	Supervisors following up and evaluate the utilization of school grant in your school.					

**Part five: The contribution of school grant to school improvement program**

5.1. From the following in which methods do you agree the level of contribution of school grant to school improvement program in your school?

No	Contribution of school grant	Range of Contribution				
		Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)
1	For the achievement of school improvement Program (SIP).					
2	To improve students' learning out comes.					
3	It increases resources of school in terms of teaching materials.					
4	It makes conducive environment for learning and teaching process.					
5	It strengthens the role and involvement of school community.					
6	It promotes the decentralization of decision making of the school.					
7	It increases the enrollment of students in the school.					
8	It improve the equity of learning for all of student in the schools					

**Part six: The Factor that affect the utilization of school grant**

6.1. From the following in which methods do you agree the factor that affect the utilization of school grant in your school?

No.	Factor that affect the utilization of school Grant	Range of Affecting				
		Strongly agree(5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly disagree(1)
1	Does the school timely receive the allocated school grant?					
2	Low participation of stake holder.					
3	Lack of preparing school grant utilization plan.					
4	Lack managing school grants implementation.					
5	Lack of matching SG plan with SIP plan priority.					
6	Lack of timely reporting SG implementation.					
7	Lack of monitor and evaluate of SG utilization.					
8	Lack of implementing school grant according to guide line.					

**Part Seven: Ways of monitoring and evaluating school grant utilization**

7.1. From the following in which methods do you monitor and evaluate the school grant utilization?

No.	Ways of monitoring and evaluating school grant utilization	Range of Monitoring and Evaluation				
		Strongly agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly agree (1)
1	Checking the collection of documentary evidences (plan, minutes and reports).					
2	Measuring students learning outcomes. .					
3	Availability of school facility.					
4	Discussion meeting.					
5	Checking the implementation of school improvement program by using checklist.					
6	Balancing the allocated school grant and its expense.					
7	Following up and evaluate by school supervisors.					

**Part eight: Write your comments on the following question**

8.1. What challenge have you seen on the proper use of school grant in your school?

-----

-----

-----

8.2. What possible solution you suggest to solve the problem in using and managing school grant for the school improvement program? -----

-----  
-----  
-----

8.3. If you have extra comments on the utilization and contribution of school grant to school improvement program in your school please describe it-----

-----  
-----  
-----

Thank you once again for spending time and completing this questionnaire

7.3. አባሪ III

በሐረማያ ዩኒቨርሲቲ

የድህረ-ምረቃ ፕሮግራም ዳይሬክቶሬት

የትምህርት ዕቅድና አስተዳደር ዲፓርትሜንት

በት/ቱ በስኩል ግራንት ኮሚቴ የት/ቤት መሻሻያ ኮሚቴ እና ወ.ተ.መ.ሀ የሚሞላ የፅሁፍ መጠይቅ

አጠቃላይ መመሪያ

የት/ቤት የድጎማ በጀት የትምህርት ዓላማዎችን ለማሳካት የሚረዳ ነው። በአሁኑ ጊዜ የትምህርት ጥራት ጉዳይ የዓለም ዋነኛ አጀንዳ ከመሆኑም ባሻገር የኢትዮጵያ መንግስት በሀገሪቱ ውስጥ የሚገኙ የመንግስት 1ኛና 2ኛ ደረጃ የትምህርት ቤቶችን የትምህርት ቤት ማሻሻያ ፕሮግራም የሚደግፍ የፋይናንስ አቅምን ለማጠናከር የትምህርት ባለድርሻ አካላትን በማሳተፍ የትምህርት ቤት የድጎማ በጀት እንድትገቡ እያደረገ ይገኛል። ከስድስቱ የአጠቃላይ ትምህርት ጥራት ማረጋገጫ መርሃ ግብሮች ውስጥ የትምህርት ቤት መሻሻያ ፕሮግራም የትምህርቱን ጥራት፣ ብቃት፣ ተሳትፎና ፍትሐዊነትን ማረጋገጥ በሚያስችል መልኩ የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት ድጋፍ በሁሉም ት/ቤቶች ላይ እየተተገበረ ይገኛል።

የዚህ ጥናት ዋና ዓላማም ለት/ቤቶች የሚደረገው የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት ድጋፍ ለት/ቤት ማሻሻያ ፕሮግራም ያለው ሚናና በአፈፃፀም ሂደት ያጋጠሙ ችግሮችን ለመለየትና የበጀት ድጋፍ ለፕሮግራሙ ያለው አዎንታዊ ሚና ለመጠቀምም ጭምር ነው።

ውድ መላሼ ሆይ፡ ይህንን መጠይቅ ሲሞሉ ለጥናቱ ስኬት ከፍተኛ አስተዋፅኦ ይኖረዎል፤ የሚሰጡት መልስና አስተያየትም ለዚህ ጥናት ዓላማ ብቻ የሚውል ሲሆን ለቀረቡት መጠይቆች ትክክለኛውንና ተገቢውን መረጃ በመስጠት እንድትመልሱ ስጠይቅ ለአደረጉልኝ ትብብር በቅድሚያ አመሰግናለሁ።

ማስታወሻ፡

1. ስምዎትን መፃፍ አያስፈልግም፤
2. እባክዎትን ከመመለስዎ በፊት በእያንዳንዱ ርዕስ ሥር የተሰጡትን መመሪያዎች ያንብቡ፤
3. በተሰጡት ባዶ ቦታዎች ላይ ለጥያቄዎቹ መልስና አስተያየትዎትን ይፃፉ።

ስለተባበሩኝ በድጋሚ ከልብ አመሰግናለሁ

**ክፍል አንድ:- መሠረታዊ መረጃ**

1.1. የት/ቤት ስም-----የሥራ ድርሻ :- በስኩል ግራንት ኮሚቴ   
 የት/ቤት መሻሻያ ኮሚቴ  ወ.ተ.መ.ሀ

**1.2. የመላሽ የግል ሁኔታ:-**

መመሪያ አንድ:- እባክዎትን ከዚህ በታች በሳጥን ውስጥ ለተዘረዘሩት ስለ ራስዎ ሁኔታ በተስማሚው ቦታ የ “X” ምልክት በማድረግ ይመልሱ።

**ክፍል አንድ:- መሠረታዊ መረጃ**

1.3. የት/ቤት ስም-----የሥራ ድርሻ :- በስኩል ግራንት ኮሚቴ  የት/ቤት መሻሻያ ኮሚቴ  ወ.ተ.መ.ሀ

**1.4. የመላሽ የግል ሁኔታ:-**

መመሪያ አንድ:- እባክዎትን ከዚህ በታች በሳጥን ውስጥ ለተዘረዘሩት ስለ ራስዎ ሁኔታ በተስማሚው ቦታ

የ “X” ምልክት በማድረግ ይመልሱ።

1. ያታ	2. ዕድሜ ክልል በዓመት	3. በኮሚቴ ውስጥ ያሉት ኃላፊነት	4. በኮሚቴ አባልነት ያሉት አገልግሎት
ወንድ	ከ20 በታች	ሊቀመንበር	1 - 3 ዓመት
	ከ20-30	ም/ ሊቀመንበር	4 - 6 ዓመት
ሴት	ከ31-40	አሐፊ	7- 9 ዓመት
	41-50	አባል	10 ዓመትና በላይ
	51 እና በላይ		

**መመሪያ ሁለት:-** የሚከተሉት ጥያቄዎች በት/ቤቶች ውስጥ ስለአጠቃላይ የድጎማ በጀት አተገባበርን ግንዛቤ በተመለከተ ሲሆን በተስማሚው ቦታ ላይ ይመልሱ

**ክፍል ሁለት:-** ስለ ት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት አተገባበር ከት/ቤት መሻሻያ ፕሮግራም የተቀናጀ መሆኑ

ለት/ቤት መሻሻያ ፕሮግራም ማስፈጸሚያ የሆነው የድጎማ በጀት በት/ቤትዎ ከሚተገበርባቸው ዘዴዎ ውስጥ እርስዎ በየትኛው እንደሚስማሙ የ “X” ምልክት በማድረግ ይመልሱ።

ተ. ቁ	የድጎማ በጀት አተገባበር ከት/ቤት መሻሻያ ፕሮግራም የተቀናጀ መሆኑን	የአተገባበር ደረጃው				
		በጣም እስማማለሁ (5)	አስማ ማለሁ (4)	አላውቀውም (3)	አልስማ ማም (2)	በጣም አልስማ ማም (1)
1	ለት/ቤቱ የት/ቤት መሻሻያ ፕሮግራምን ለማስፀም በጀቱን ይጠቀምበታል					
2	የትምህርት ባለድርሻ አካላት ስለ በጀቱ ግንዛቤ አላቸው ምን ይመስላል					
3	የት/ቤት መሻሻያ እቅድና የበጀት እቅዱ አጣጥም የመጠቀም ሁኔታ እንዴት ይታል					
4	የት/ቤቱ ድጎማ በጀት ምንነትና አፈፃፀም በተመለከተ ያለዎት የግንዛቤ ደረጃ ምን ይመስላል					
5	ት/ቤቱ ለመማር ማስተማር ሂደት ትኩረት ሰጥቶ የድጎማ በጀቱን ይመድባል					

8. በት/ቤቱ የድጎማ በጀት አተገባበር ዙሪያ የግንዛቤ ሥልጠና ወስዷል ? አዎ  አይደለም

9. መልስዎ አዎ ከሆነ ት/ቤቱ በጀቱን እንዴት እየተገበረው ይገኛል ?-----

-----

-----

**ክፍል ሦስት፡- የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀትን ማስተዋወቅን በተመለከተ**

**3.1. ት/ቤቱ የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት አፈፃፀምን ለት/ቤት ማህበረሰብ በሚከተሉት ዘዴዎች**

ተ. ቁ	የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት ማሳወቂያ ዘዴዎች	የማሳወቂያ ዘዴዎች ደረጃ				
		በጣም እስማማለሁ (5)	እስማማለሁ (4)	አላውቀውም (3)	አልስማማም (2)	በጣም አልስማማም (1)
1	በማስታወቂያ ቦርድ					
2	በስብሰባ ውይይት					
3	በኑብ ዓመት ሪፖርት					
4	በት/ቤት ሚኒ-ሚዲያ በመጠቀም					
5	በራሪ ፅሁፍ በመጠቀም					

**ክፍል አራት፡- የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀትን ማስተዳደር**

**4.1. ከሚከተሉት ውስጥ የድጎማ በጀት የሚመራበት ዘዴዎች ውስጥ በየትኛው ደረጃ ይስማማሉ**

ተ ቁ	የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት ማስተዳደር	የማስተዳደር ደረጃ				
		ሁልጊዜ (5)	አብዛኛውን ጊዜ (4)	አልፎ አልፎ (3)	በጥቂቱ (2)	ምንም (1)
1	በት/ቤትዎ የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት ዕቅድ ይዘጋጃል					
2	ት/ቤትዎ የትምህርት ቤት መሻሻያ ዓመታዊ ዕቅድ አለው					
3	ት/ቤቱ የድጎማ በጀት አፈፃፀምን ለት/ቤቱ ማህበረሰብ ሪፖርት ያቀርባል.					
4	ት/ቤቱ የድጎማ በጀትና የት/ቤት ዕቅድ ስያዘጋጅ ግለ-ግምገማ ያደርጋል ት/ቤቱ የድጎማ በጀት አፈፃፀምን ለት/ቤቱ ማህበረሰብ ሪፖርት ያቀርባል.					
5	የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት በት/ቤት ውስጥ የራሱ ተጠሪ አለው					
6	ተጨማሪ የትምህርት መሳሪያዎች ለመማር ማስተማሩ ሥራ ላይ ይውላል					
7	የትምህርት ባለድርሻ አካላት የድጎማ በጀቱ በት/ቤት ውስጥ አዲት /የማድረግልምድ/አንደሚደረግ ያውቁታል					
8	የት/ቤቱ ሱፐርቫይር የድጎማ በጀት አፈፃፀሙን ይከታተላል፣ ይገመግማል					

**ክፍል አምስት፡- የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት ለት/ቤት መሻሻያ ፕሮግራም የሚሰጠው አስተዋፅኦ /ፋይዳ/ በተመለከተ**

ከሚከተሉት ውስጥ የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት ለት/ቤት መሻሻያ ፕሮግራም የሚሰጠው አስተዋፅኦ/ፋይዳ/ ዙሪያ በየትኛው ደረጃ ይስማማሉ?

ተ.ቁ.	የድጎማ በጀት አስተዋጽኦ/ፋይዳ/	የአስተዋጽኦው /የፋይዳው/ ደረጃ				
		በጣም ከፍተኛ	ከፍተኛ	መካከለኛ	ዝቅተኛ	በጣም ዝቅተኛ
		(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
1	ለት/ቤት መሻሻያ ፕሮግራምን ያሳካል					
2	የተማሪዎች መማር ውጤትን ያሳካል					
3	ተጨማሪ የትምህርት ግብዓትን ያሟላል					
4	የመማር ማስተማር አካባቢን ምቹ ሁኔታን ይፈጥራል					
5	የትምህርት ቤቱን ማህበረሰብ ሚናና ተሳትፎን ያጎለብታል					
6	ማዕከላዊነትን ያልጠበቀ የት/ቤት ውሳኔ ሰጪነትን ያጎለብታል					
7	የተማሪዎች የትምህርት ተሳትፎን ያሳድጋል					
8	የተማሪዎች በእኩል የመማርን ሂደት ያጎለብታል					

**ክፍል ስድስት፡- በት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት አተገባበር ላይ ተፅእኖ የሚያደርጉ ሁኔታዎች**

ከሚከተሉት ውስጥ በት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት አተገባበር ላይ ተፅእኖ ከሚያሳድሩት ውስጥ እርስዎ በየትኛው ደረጃ ይስማማሉ?

ተ ቁ.	በት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት አተገባበር ላይ ተፅእኖ የሚያደርጉ	የተፅእኖ አስተዋጽኦው ደረጃ				
		በጣም እስማማለሁ (5)	እስማማለሁ (4)	አላውቀውም (3)	አልሰማም (2)	በጣም አልሰማም (1)
1	የድጎማ በጀቱ በወቅቱ ት/ቤት ይደርሳል ወይ					
2	የት/ት ባለድርሻ ተሳትፎ ዝቅተኛ መሆን ነው ወይ					
3	የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት እቅድ አለመኖር					
4	የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት በትክክል ያለመሟራት ሁኔታ					
5	የት/ቤት መሻሻያ እቅድና የበጀት እቅዱ አጣጥም ያለመጠቀም ሁኔታ					
6	ወቅታዊ የበጀት አፈፃፀም ሪፖርት አለመኖር					
7	የበጀት አፈፃፀሙን ክትትልና ግምገማ ያለማድረግ					
8	በጀቱን በመመሪያው መሠረት አለመጠቀም					

**ክፍል ሰባት :- የት/ቤት ድጎማ በጀት ክትትልና ግምገማ መንገዶችን በተመለከተ**

**7.1. ከሚከተሉት የክትትልና ግምገማ ዘዴዎች ውስጥ ት/ ቤቱ የሚከተላቸው ደረጃ**

ተ.ቁ.	የክትትልና ግምገማ ዘዴዎች	የክትትልና ግምገማ ደረጃ				
		በጣም ክፍተኛ (5)	ክፍተኛ (4)	መካከለኛ (3)	ዝቅተኛ (2)	በጣም ዝቅተኛ (1)
1	የዶክሜንት መረጃዎችን በመመልከት (ቃለጉባኤ፣ ሪፖርት ወዘተ)					
2	የተማሪዎችን ውጤት በመገምገም					
3	ለት/ቤቱ የተሟሉ ግብዓቶች በመጠቀም					
4	ካለድርሻ ጋር በስብሰባ ውይይት በማድረግ					
5	የት/ቤት መሻሻያ እቅድ አፈፃፀምን በቼክ ሊስት በመገምገም					
6	የተመደበውን በጀትና የወጣውን ወጪ በማመሳከር በመገምገም					
7	በት/ቤቱ ሱፐርቫይዘር ክትትልና ግምገማ በማረጋገጥ					

**ክፍል ስምንት:- ለሚከተሉት ጥያቄዎች ላይ ያለዎት አስተያየት**

8.1. በድጎማ በጀት አተገባበር ወቅት የተመለከቱት ተግዳሮቶች ምንድናቸው?

-----  
 -----  
 -----

8.2. ከላይ ለተዘረዘሩት ችግሮች መፍትሔ ብሎ የሚሰጡት አስተያየት?-----

-----  
 -----

8.3. የትምህርት ቤት ድጎማ በጀት ለትምህርት ቤት መሻሻያ ፕሮግራም ላይ የሚያበረክተው አስተጻኝ በተመለከተ ተጨማሪ አስተያየትና ሐሳብ ካለዎት?-----

-----  
 -----

ውድ ጊዜዎትን ሰውተው ስለተባበሩኝ በድጋሚ አመሰግናለሁ

### 7.4 አባሪ IV

#### ለ2ኛ ደረጃ ት/ቤት ር/መ/ራን የተዘጋጀ ቃለ መጠይቅ

##### ሐረማያ ዩኒቨርሲቲ

##### የድህረ ምረቃ ዳሬክትሬት

##### የሥነ-ባህርይ ሳይንስ ትምህርት ኮሌጅ

ውድ መላሼ ሆይ፡-በድሬደዋ አስተዳደር የመንግስት 2ኛ ደረጃ ት/ቤቶች ላይ የስኩል ግራንት አጠቃቀም እና ለት/ቤት ማሻሻያ ፕሮግራም ያለው አዎንታዊ አስተዋጾ ያለበት ደረጃ፣ የአጠቃቀሙ አፈፃፀም፣ ያጋጠሙ ተግዳሮቶችን ለመለየት የሚከተሉት ቃለ መጠይቅ ቀርቧል። መጠይቁ የሚቀርበው ለ2ኛ ደረጃ ት/ቤት ርዕሰ መምህራን ስሆን ከዚህ በታች በቀረቡት በ4ቱ መጠይቆች መሠረት በማድረግ የሚስተዋሉትን ችግሮችን ለመለየትና የመፍትሄ ሐሳብ ለማመላከት ይረዳል።

መላሼ ሆይ፡-በዚህ ቃለ መጠይቅ የሚሰጡኝ መረጃ ለትምህርት ዓላማ ብቻ መሆኑን እያረጋገጥኩኝ ውድ ጊዜዎትን ሰውተው ለሰጡኝ አስተያየት፣ ሐሳብና መረጃ በቅድሚያ አመሰግናለሁ።

በድጋሚ ከልብ አመሰግናለሁ !!

1. በት/ቤቶ የድጎማ በጀት እና የት/ቤት ማሻሻያ ፕሮግራም ዕቅድ በተቀናጀ ሁኔታ ሥራ ላይ ይውላል ወይ?
2. በት/ቤቶ የድጎማ በጀት አጠቃቀምን ለመምራትና ለማስተዳደር የት/ቤቱ ኮሚቴዎች ተግትፎና ሃላፊነት ምን ይመስላል?
3. በት/ቤቶ የጎማ በጀት ለት/ቤት ማሻሻያ ፕሮግራም ያበረከተው አስተዋጾ ምን ምንድነው?
4. በት/ቤቶ የድጎማ በጀት አጠቃቀም በውጤታማነት እንዳይተገበር የሚያደርገው ዋና ዋና ችግሮች ምንድናቸው?

ስለ ሰጡኝ ምላሽ በድጋሚ አመሰግናለሁ !!

### 7.5 አባሪ V

#### ለ2ኛ ደረጃ ት/ቤቶች ለምልከታ የተዘጋጀ ቼክ ሊስት

##### ሐረማያ ዩኒቨርሲቲ

##### የድህረ ምረቃ ዳሬክትሬት

##### የሥነ-ባህርይ ሳይንስ ትምህርት ኮሌጅ

ውድ መላሼ ሆይ:-በድሬደዋ የመንግስት 2ኛ ደረጃ ት/ቤቶች ላይ የስኩል ግራንት አጠቃቀም እና ለት/ቤት ማሻሻያ ፕሮግራም ያለው አዎንታዊ አስተዋጾ በሚል ርዕስ በጀቱ ከተለቀቀበት ጊዜ ጀምሮ ያሉትን መረጃዎች በመዳሰስ ያለበት ደረጃ፣የአጠቃቀሙ አፈፃፀም፣የጋጠሙ ተግዳሮቶችን ለመለየት የሚከተሉት ቼክ ሊስት ቀርቧል።ቼክ ሊስቱን የሚሞሉ የ2ኛ ደረጃ ት/ቤት ርዕስ መምህራን ስሆን ከዚህ በታች በቀረቡት ቼክ ሊስት መሠረት በማድረግ የሚስተዋሉትን ችግሮችን ለመለየትና የመፍትሄ ሐሳብ ለማመልከት ይረዳል።

መላሼ ሆይ:-በዚህ ቼክ ሊስት የሚሰጡኝ መረጃ ለትምህርት ዓላማ ብቻ መሆኑን እያረጋገጥኩኝ ውድ ጊዜዎትን ሰውተው ለሰጡኝ አስተያየት፣ ሐሳብና ስላሳዩኝ መረጃ በቅድሚያ አመሰግናለሁ።

በድጋሚ ከልብ አመሰግናለሁ !!

1. በት/ቤቶ የስኩል ግራንት ከመንግስት ስለቀቅላቹ የሚደርሳቹ ደብዳቤ አለ?
2. በት/ቤቶ የስኩል ግራንት ሥራ ላይ ለማዋል የተዘጋጀ ዕቅድ እና የተያዘ ቃለ ጉባዔ አለ ? ካለ ቢያሳዩኝ
3. በት/ቤቶ ስኩል ግራንት አጠቃቀም እና የት/ቤት ማሻሻያ ፕሮግራም አፈጻጸምን በተመለከተ በየጊዜው ተዘጋጅተው ለሚመለከተው አካል የመሚቀርበው ሪፖርት አለ ወይ? ካለ ቢያሳዩኝ
4. በት/ቤቶ የስኩል ግራንት በየጊዜው ኦዲት ይደረጋል ወይ ? ከተደረገበት በምን ይህል ጊዜ ነው?

ስለ ሰጡኝ ሐሳብና ስላሳዩኝ መረጃ በድጋሚ አመሰግናለሁ !!

**7.6 APPENDIX- VI**

Approval sheet for data collected from sample schools

Approval sheet for sample of data collected, questionnaires distributed and collected from the respondents. School name ----- School location (urban or rural) -----

Type of Respondents	Population Size (9-10 <sup>th</sup> ) level	Sample Size	Remark
Teachers	114	67	
Supervisors	1	1	
School grant committee	7	7	
School improvement program committee	9	9	
Parent, Student and Teacher association	6	6	
Principals	1	1	
Total	138	91	

Collected by -----

Approved by -----

Signature-----

Signature-----

Date-----

Date-----



## 7.6 APPENDIX- VI

Approval sheet for data collected from sample schools

Approval sheet for sample of data collected, questionnaires distributed and collected from the respondents. School name Kalicha Secondary School location (urban or rural) -----

Type of Respondents	Population Size (9-10 <sup>th</sup> ) level	Sample Size	Remark
Teachers	12	8	
Supervisor	1	1	
School grant committee	7	7	
School improvement program committee	9	9	
Parent, Student and Teacher association	6	6	
Principal	1	1	
Total	36	32	

Collected by -----

Approved by -----

Signature-----

Signature-----

Date-----

Date-----

**School seal**

**7.6 APPENDIX- VI**

Approval sheet for data collected from sample schools

Approval sheet for sample of data collected, questionnaires distributed and collected from the respondents. School name Afatessa secondary School location (urban or rural) -----

Type of Respondents	Population Size (9-10 <sup>th</sup> ) level	Sample Size	Remark
Teachers	20	8	
Supervisor	1	1	
School grant committee	7	7	
School improvement program committee	9	9	
Parent, Student and Teacher association	6	6	
Principal	1	1	
Total	44	32	

Collected by -----

Approved by -----

Signature-----

Signature-----

Date-----

Date-----



## 7.6 APPENDIX- VI

Approval sheet for data collected from sample schools

Approval sheet for sample of data collected, questionnaires distributed and collected from the respondents. School name Medhanialem Secondary School location (urban or rural) -----

Type of Respondents	Population Size (9-10 <sup>th</sup> ) level	Sample Size	Remark
Teachers	30	14	
Supervisor	1	1	
School grant committee	7	7	
School improvement program committee	9	9	
Parent, Student and Teacher association	6	6	
Principal	1	1	
Total	54	38	

Collected by -----

Approved by -----

Signature-----

Signature-----

Date-----

Date-----

**School seal**

### 7.6 APPENDIX- VI

Approval sheet for data collected from sample schools

Approval sheet for sample of data collected, questionnaires distributed and collected from the respondents. School name Lege Hare Secondary School location (urban or rural) -----

Type of Respondents	Population Size (9-10 <sup>th</sup> ) level	Sample Size	Remark
Teachers	30	16	
Supervisor	1	1	
School grant committee	7	7	
School improvement program committee	9	9	
Parent, Student and Teacher association	6	6	
Principal	1	1	
Total	54	40	

Collected by -----

Approved by -----

Signature-----

Signature-----

Date-----

Date-----

