

**IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF HARARI REGIONAL STATE**

M.A Thesis

Abera Mengistu

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA
August, 2017**

**IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF HARARI REGIONAL STATE**

**A Thesis Submitted to the School of Post graduate studies, College of
Education and Behavioral Sciences, Department of Educational Planning
and Management**

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts
in Educational Leadership**

By

Abera Mengistu

August, 2017

Haramaya University

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY

STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR

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

This Thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a M.A. degree in Educational Leadership at the Haramaya University. The Thesis is deposited in Haramaya University Library and is made available to borrowers under the rule of the library. I solemnly declare that this Thesis has not been submitted to any other institution anywhere for the award of any academic degree, diploma or certificate.

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

Name: Abera Mengistu _____

Signature_____

Date: August 2017

College: Education and Behavioral Sciences

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR

The author was born in 1960 EC in Western Hararghe in a Place called Hardim near the town of Gelemso. After completing his primary education in Gelemso Primary School No II, he went to Gelemso Secondary School in the town of Gelemso in 1975 EC.

He joined Kotebe College of Teachers Education in 1978 EC and graduated with Diploma in Teaching History in 1979 EC. After serving for about four years as a high school teacher, he joined Addis Ababa University in 1983 EC from where he got B.A Degree in history. Currently, he is teaching history, Civics and Ethical education and serving as department head of Social Sciences in Harar College of Teachers Education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Primarily, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my major advisor, Ato Tadese Hailu (Asst Professor) for his unreserved guidance, critical comments and constructive suggestions throughout the course of my thesis work.

In addition, I would like to thank my-co advisor, Bahar Adam (PhD) for his encouraging spirit and logical comments that helped me a great deal to shape the paper in its present form.

My thanks also goes to the four sampled secondary school teachers, SIC members principals, and supervisors as they cooperated with me in filling questionnaire and attending the interview during the data collection process.

Similar, profound gratitude goes to Ato Salhadin Abdurehman and Abiy Abebe who have done their best for creating an access to SIP related documents.

Finally, but by no means least, thanks go to my wife, Etenesh Eshetu and my daughters Titay and Teman, and my son Mikiyas Abera for their kindness and moral supports during the entire period of my study. They are the most important people in my world and I dedicate this thesis to them.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CPD	Continuous Professional Development
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
ETP	Education and Training policy
GEQIP	General Education Quality Improvement Package
HEB	Harari Education Bureau
IQEA	Improving the Quality of Education for All
LEAs	Local Education Agencies
MSIP	Manitoba School Improvement Program
MoE	Ministry of Education
NGOs	Nongovernmental Organizations
PTA	Parent-Teachers Association
REB	Regional Education Bureau
SAES	Social Assessment for the Education Sector
SAF	Self-Assessment Form
SIC	School Improvement Committee
SIP	School Improvement Program
UNESCO	United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organization
WEO	Woreda Education Office

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR	iii
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	x
ABSTRACTS	xi
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Research Questions	5
1.4. Objectives of the Study	5
1.4.1. General objective	5
1.4.2. Specific objectives	6
1.5. Significance of the Study.	6
1.6. Delimitation of the Study	6
1.7. Limitation of the Study	7
1.8. Operational Definition of Key Terms.	7
1.9. Organization of the Study	7
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
2.1. The Concept of School Improvement	9
2.2. Historical Development of School Improvement	10

Continues - - -

2.3. Planning and Implementation of School Improvement Program	13
2.3.1. School self assessment	13
2.3.2. School improvement planning	14
2.3.3. School improvement plan implementation	15
2.3.4. Monitoring and evaluation of school improvement implementation	17
2.4. Challenges of Implementing School Improvement Program	18
2.5. School Improvement Program in Ethiopia	19
2.6. Objectives of School Improvement Program	21
2.7. Domains of School Improvement Program	22
2.7.1. Teaching and learning	23
2.7.2. Learning environment	25
2.7.3. School leadership and management	26
2.7.4. Community involvement	27
2.8. School Improvement Leadership and Organizations in Ethiopia	27
2.9. Experiences of Selected Countries in Implementing School Improvement	29
2.9.1. School improvement in the United State of America (USA)	30
2.9.2. School improvement in the United Kingdom	31
2.9.3. School improvement in Canada	32
2.9.4. School improvement in South Africa	33
2.9.5. School improvement in Nigeria	34
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	35
3.1. Research Design	35
3.2. Sources of Data	35

Continues - - -

3.2.1. Primary sources	35
3.2.2. Secondary sources	35
3.3. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	36
3.3.1. Target population	36
3.3.2. Sample size and sampling techniques	36
3.4. Instruments of Data Collection	38
3.4.1. Questionnaires	38
3.4.2. Interview guides	38
3.4.3 Document analysis	38
3.4.4 Observation	39
3.5. Data Collection Procedures	39
3.6. Validity and Reliability of Data Gathering	39
3.7. Methods of Data Analysis	40
3.8. Ethical Considerations	40
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	41
4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents	41
4.2. The Extent of Secondary Schools in Implementing the Four Domains of SIP	44
4.2.1. Implementation of the domain of teaching and learning	44
4.2.2. Implementation of the domain of learning environment	47
4.2.3. Implementation of the domain of school leadership and management	50
4.2.4. Implementation of the domain of community involvement	52
4.3. The Extent of SIP Implementation in Meeting the Intended Objectives	55
4.4. Challenges Affecting the Implementation of School Improvement Program.	57

Continues - - -

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	62
5.1. Summary	62
5.2. Conclusions	64
5.3. Recommendations	66
6. REFERENCES	67
7. APPENDICES	73
7.1. Appendix 1	73
7.2. Appendix 2	77
7.3. Appendix 3	78

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Distribution of populations (N) & sample size (n) & sampling techniques	37
Table 2. Distribution of respondents by sex and age	41
Table 3. Description of respondents by qualifications, years of experiences and working load	43
Table 4. Responses of teachers and SIC on the teaching and learning domain	45
Table 5. Responses of teachers and SIC on the learning environment domain	48
Table 6. Responses of teachers and SIC on the school leadership and management domain	51
Table 7. Responses of teachers and SIC on the community involvement domain	53
Table 8. Responses of teachers and SIC on the extent of SIP meeting the desired objectives	55
Table 9. Responses of teachers and SIC on the factors that affect the implementation of SIP	58

IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF HARARI REGIONAL STATE

Abera Mengistu

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the implementation of SIP in secondary schools of Harari Regional State and to identify the challenges that encountered during the implementation process. In conducting the study, a descriptive survey design was employed. The study involved 163 subject teachers and 27 SIC members, 9 school principals and vice principals, and 4 supervisors selected from the four sample secondary schools through available sampling technique. Questionnaires, interview guides and document analysis were used as data gathering instruments. Analysis of data was made using the descriptive statistical tools such as, mean and standard deviation for quantitative data. With regard to the implementation of the four domains of SIP, the result of this study revealed that: teachers' use of active learning methods and a range of continuous assessment methods in the class, the schools' ability in mobilizing the community to provide resources to support the implementation of SIP and the habit of taking responsibilities and leading a disciplined life among students the practices were low. Moreover, provision of quality school facilities for all staffs and children and carrying out schools' decisions and administrative processes, the practices were unsatisfactory. Although the implementation of SIP was intended to achieve three objectives, the result of the study revealed that one of the intended objectives of enabling schools to become effective by ensuring good governance and democratic practices was unsatisfactory and low. The findings of the study also showed that: the problem of obtaining sufficient funds and the use of financial resources for activities that do not support improvement of students learning achievement, inability of the school principals to coordinate efforts of all stake holders for SIP implementation, inability of SIC members to play their role in the planning and implementation of SIP, lack of thorough self assessment of schools before preparing SIP plan and developing the plan without involving all stakeholders and lack of effective follow up, monitoring and supervision of school activities are the challenges that encountered the implementation of SIP. It was recommended that: subject teachers should regularly use various active learning and implement continuous assessments methods in the classroom to support underperforming students. The school principals together with SIC and WEO should work together to mobilize the community to obtain resources for SIP implementation. .Quality school facilities like standardized laboratory, library, teaching materials and other services should be provided to schools. It is advisable to conduct a regular evaluation and reviewing of SIP implementation by supervisors to take appropriate and timely measures. The HREB and WEO should reward teachers, principals and SIC members who effectively improve students' learning and learning achievement to high standards. Schools should develop SIP plan after conducting effective self evaluation to identify their strength and weaknesses.

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an over view of the research on evaluating the implementation of school improvement program in the first cycle secondary schools of Harari Regional State. It outlines the statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation, limitation and organization of the research.

1.1. Background of the Study

Ethiopia has embarked on a new Education and Training policy (ETP) since 1994 to improve the quality, access, relevance and equity of the educational sector. The MoE (2008a) document described that the general objectives of the new policy focus on the development of physical and mental potential and the problem solving capacity of individuals, bringing up citizens who can take care of and utilize resources wisely, trained in various skills, respect human rights etc. Moreover, the country adopted a program of action, Education Sector Development Program (ESDP) since 1997 for the realization of ETP goals. ESDP is a five year plan within twenty years education sector indicative plan. Ethiopia has gone through the implementation of ESDPI-Iv from 1997 to 2015.

The MoE (2005a) document also indicated that a substantial expansion of primary and secondary education took place under ESDP I and II. The document also revealed that a rapid expansion of technical and vocational education and higher education has been under taken during the implementation of ESDP I and II. Despite rapid expansion of the education system, Ethiopia's education sector faces some key challenges. As described by Asmaru (2006), one of these challenges is the problem of providing adequate improvement in quality. Achievement in access has not been accompanied by adequate improvement in quality. In some areas, quality has deteriorated at least partly as a result of rapid expansion. The problem of quality in education has, therefore, become a serious concern of government, educators and other stakeholders.

It is in response to the problem of quality that the Federal Government of Ethiopia has launched the ESDP-III (2005/06-10/11). As summarized by MoE (2006a) document, ESDP III has been developed by giving high priority to quality improvement of education at all levels. Within the framework of ESDP III, the MoE has developed and launched the General Education Quality

Improvement Package (GEQIP). As illustrated by MoE (2008b), the overall purpose of GEQIP is to improve the quality of general education throughout the country. GEQIP comprises of six components namely: Teacher Development Program, Curriculum, Management and Administration Program, Civic and Ethical Education, School Improvement Program and Information Communication Technology. School improvement program is one of the components of GEQIP.

School improvement is defined as a theory that focuses in increasing the academic performance of students by conducting self-evaluation on various school domains regarding the current situation of schools and by improving learning inputs and process (MoE, 2007a). As described by MoE (2007b) document, school improvement focuses on the process of altering educational practices and policies in order to improve teaching and learning. Thus school improvement is a process by which schools carry out self assessment to know their status and improve educational inputs and process in order to improve students' achievement to high standards. In Ethiopia, the main concern of school improvement is to improve students' learning and their learning achievement to high standards by implementing the various standards of practices under the four domains of school improvement programs such as: teaching and learning, school leadership and management, safe and healthy school environment and parent-community partnership.

At school level the responsible bodies for leading, facilitating and coordinating the implementation of SIP are the school leadership and school improvement committee (SIC). School improvement committee is an organ established at school level having 5-10 members from principals, teachers, students, parents and the community. They perform various activities which include: identifying problem areas of school, setting and prioritizing goals and prepare three years plan for SIP, developing action plan for implementation of SIP and monitor the implementation of the plan. Thus, in implementing SIP, schools are expected to perform the following activities regularly in every three years. They carry out self evaluation to identify the main problems of their schools, develop a three year strategic plan for SIP and implement the plan. Moreover, schools follow-up and monitor the implementation of the plan.

Then at the end of the first three years (first phase), they assess and review the implementation of the plan and finally the performance of schools in implementing SIP will be evaluated by external body that provides feedback on their strengths and weakness.

In Ethiopia, SIP has been implemented since 2007, the first and second phases of its implementation has already been completed. In Harari region, SIP has been implemented by organizing the school improvement committee (SIC) and providing training to school principals, teachers and supervisors on how to develop and implement a plan of SIP. As the Harari Education Bureau Annual Reports indicated, currently almost all primary and secondary schools identified problem areas of their schools, prioritized and set goals, developed three years school improvement plan, and they have been implementing the plan. Accordingly, all government secondary schools in the region have completed implementing the first and second phases of implementing SIP. Therefore, the study is designed to assess how far the implementation of SIP in Secondary Schools of Harari Region is successful, to recognize how far the implementation of SIP is meeting the desired objectives and identifying the challenges that affect the proper implementation of SIP.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Concern to improve the quality of education has started receiving the highest priority in almost all countries throughout the world. As revealed by UNESCO (2015), since the 2000 Dakar Frame Work of Action, international attention has focused on universal primary education and greater emphasis was being placed on ensuring access to free primary education for all children. Now, concern has shifted in many countries towards education quality. Thus, priority is now being given for a higher quality of schooling both in the developed as well as in the developing countries (UNESCO, 2004). Therefore, as stated by Tiongson (2005), over the last decades, many developing countries have embarked on large education reforms aimed at improving the quality of education.

The concept of school improvement came into prominence in the United States in the 1960s and has subsequently extended to other countries, such as Australia, Canada, Japan and many countries in Europe (Wijesundera, 2002). Over the last 20 years, the school improvement has

matured through generating a wide range of successful projects, interventions and innovations across many countries in Europe, North America, South Africa and Asia.

One of the manifestations for school improvement initiative was the one conducted in Uganda. As described by Odada et al. (1997), the Kampala School Improvement Project which lasted from 1994 to 1997 was implemented with the purpose of improving the quality of teaching and learning in primary schools in Kampala Uganda by promoting and then institutionalizing the adoption of child-centered teaching methods and resources in project schools.

As described by MoE (2008b) document, in recent years, Ethiopia has made significant progress in expanding education at all levels. However, the continuous decline in quality and standards remained one of the challenges of the sector. It is to improve the quality of education that the Government of Ethiopia has developed the General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) in 2007. The School Improvement Program (SIP) is one of the components of GEQIP developed by the Ministry of Education to improve student results in primary and secondary schools. For effective implementation of SIP, all stakeholders mainly, school principals, subject-teachers, supervisors, parents, members of school improvement committee and other stakeholders should participate and work together to deliver high quality education to students (MoE, 2007c).

Different research studies were conducted on SIP implementation in Oromia and Other Regional States of the country. For example Seyoum (2014) studied School Leadership Effectiveness in Implementing SIP in Secondary Schools of Ilubabor Zone. Habtamu (2014) also conducted his study on assessment of Implementation of School Improvement Program in Selected Secondary Schools of West Wollega Zone. These research studies investigated only on one aspect of SIP. However, this study followed a holistic approach and focused on all the four domains of SIP, and on the factors that hinder its implementation.

In Harari Regional State all government secondary schools have been implementing the program since 2007. However, most of the feedback from secondary schools was unsatisfactory and its implementation has not fully achieved the desired objectives due to a number of factors (HEB, 2010, 2011). Some of the identified factors were: lack of meaningful parents and community participation in SIP implementation, inability of the school leadership to coordinate efforts of all

stakeholders for SIP implementation, failures of schools to carry out adequate self evaluation before developing SIP plan and others.

However, the problems identified were based on feedback from secondary schools and annual reports, not based on a research conducted to assess the effectiveness of SIP. In addition, as a recent program being implemented in the country, studying the success and challenges of SIP is very important so as to help the implementation process in the region. Moreover, as far as the knowledge of the researcher no study has been conducted on the implementation of SIP mainly in Secondary Schools of Harari Region.

Therefore, this research is intended to explore the extent of secondary schools in implementing the four domains of SIP, assess how far the implementation of SIP achieved its desired objectives and to identify the factors that affect the implementation of SIP in the Secondary Schools of Harari Region.

1.3. Research Questions

In order to assess the implementation of SIP and to identify the challenges that encountered during the implementation process in the Secondary Schools of Harari Region, the following leading questions were formulated

1. To what extent secondary schools of Harari Regional State have implemented the four domains of SIP?
2. To what extent the implementation of SIP achieved its desired objectives in the Secondary Schools of Harari Regional State?
3. What were the challenges encountered in implementing SIP in the Secondary Schools of Harari Regional State?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

1.4.1 General objective

The general objective of the study was to assess the implementation of SIP and identify the challenges encountered in the implementation process in Secondary Schools of Harari Region.

1.4.2 Specific objectives

More specifically the objectives of the study were to:

1. To investigate the extent of secondary schools in implementing the four domains of SIP
2. To assess how far the implementation of SIP in Secondary Schools of Harari Region achieved the desired objectives
3. To identify the factors that affect the proper implementation of SIP in the Secondary Schools of the Region

1.5. Significance of the Study

This study attempted to assess SIP implementation of Secondary Schools in meeting the desired objectives and identify the factors that affect the proper implementation of the program in the Secondary Schools of the Harari Region and finally to suggest possible solutions for improving the implementation of the program.

To this end, the study would help to differentiate the domain (s) of SIP that lacked proper implementation and serves as a feedback for school principals, teachers and other stakeholders to exert more efforts for effective implementation of all the domains. Moreover, the study may help to identify the factors that affect the proper implementation of SIP and help school leadership and management to make early intervention to tackle the problems. In addition, it may give pertinent and timely information whether the desired objectives of SIP was achieved or not and help to take corrective measures for its effectiveness. It would help to understand to what extent that all stake holders are taking part in SIP implementation and encourage them to improve their participation and performance. Finally, the study helps as a basis for further research in this area.

1.6. Delimitation of the Study

The scope of the study was delimited to four government secondary schools with regard to the implementation of the four domains of SIP, the extent of SIP implementation in achieving the desired objectives and the factors that affect the proper implementation of SIP in the Secondary Schools of Harari Region. The analysis and the consequent discussion are hence delimited to these areas.

1.7. Limitation of the Study

In conducting this study, the researcher encountered the following limitations. The first was that some teacher and SIC member respondents were reluctant to fill the questionnaires and rerun on time. Moreover, meeting with school principals became a very difficult task, because, some school principals were busy in engaging in various meetings and workshops. Getting Secondary school supervisors in their office for interview was also difficult due to meeting and field works. However, the researcher resolved the encountered problems by visiting the schools repeatedly.

1.8. Operational Definitions of Key Terms

Performance indicators: are discrete descriptions of best practices that measures to what extent standard of practice has been achieved.

School improvement: a systematic process that focuses on increasing student achievement: a dynamic, ongoing, cyclical, process that incorporates leadership, curriculum and instruction, culture and climate and assessment.

School improvement domains: are broad elements of school operations or activities that influence the effectiveness of teaching and learning and that schools have some control. They are essentials that affect the learning process and outcome of students in schools

School improvement framework: is a system consists various tools and processes to gauge the efficiency of schools based on the defined standards, which enables schools to identify their current position based on various reliable indicators.

Standard of practices: are accepted and achievable school practices that help to measure actual school performance against each school domain towards achieving actual school improvement.

1.9. Organization of the Study

This thesis is organized in five chapters. The first chapter deals with the introduction which consists of the background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, and objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation and limitation of the study, definition of key terms and organization of the study. A comprehensive review of the literature is

presented in chapter two. It consists of the basic concepts, explanations and research findings on school improvement contributed by various authors and researchers. Chapter three consists of the research design and methodology used, source and type of data, sample size and sampling techniques, instruments of data collection as well as methods of data analysis. An analysis of the results of the data collected during this study is presented in chapter four. Chapter five provides the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study. Finally, a list of references used in this study and relevant appendices are attached.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter deals with conceptual and empirical issues of school improvement. In recent years, school improvement is an area that has been widely explored from various perspectives, because it has been considered as a powerful instrument to improve student learning outcomes. To provide background for better understanding of school improvement, this chapter provides the various definitions of school improvement based on the available literature. The chapter then presents briefly the historical development of school improvement since the 1970s and the experience of selected countries in implementing school improvement program is summarized briefly. Finally, the chapter examines the various aspects of school improvement and its implementation in Ethiopia.

2.1. The Concept of School Improvement

As a recent phenomenon, the concept of “school improvement” has been defined differently by individuals within and outside school organizations. The most frequently quoted definition of school improvement as stated by Reynolds et al. (1993) is a systematic, sustained effort aimed at change in learning conditions and other related internal conditions in one or more schools, with the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively.

A more recent definition by Creemers (2001) described that school improvement is a set of processes, managed from within the school targeted both at pupil achievement and the school’s ability to manage change -a simultaneous focus on process and outcome. As anyone can realize, most of the authors defined school improvement by stressing on the self-managing nature of the improving school and they considered schools as self-managing and self-improving organizations. A more comprehensive definition is provided by Thompson (2007) who stated that school improvement as a collaborative process through which the staff identifies strength and weakness of school program and uses that information as a basis for making positive changes in observable and measurable student outcomes. For Mac Gregor (2005) school improvement is a continuous process schools use to ensure that all students are achieving at high levels. All schools, in collaboration with families, students and communities can create better environments so that all students are successful. He also underlines the importance of continuous improvement of public schools to ensure increased students performance and quality results.

According to U.S. Department of Education (2006) document, school improvement is a process of comprehensive interventions of State Education Agencies (SEAs) and Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in school that allows the school to access assistance in identifying and addressing the problems that prevent students' academic success. More importantly, Rolheiser (2009) revealed that school improvement is ultimately about the enhancement of student progress, development and achievements

From among the various definitions of school improvement provided by different authors the ones by Creemers (2001), Thompson (2007) and Mac Gregor (2005) are the most comprehensive and more appropriate for this paper for the fact that these definitions stress up on seeing changes that are powerful enough to affect pupils out comes. There has been an enhanced focus upon the importance of pupil outcomes. Thus, most approaches of school improvement focused on how schools improve student achievement

Studies on school improvement revealed that instead of a single cause explanation of improvement, the importance of applying variety of changes in schools which interact with student characteristics to produce differences in student learning outcomes (Wijesundera, 2002). Essentially, therefore, the meaning of school improvement has come to stand for how schools are able to improve their effectiveness over a period of time and is particularly concerned with activities that bring about this change. In general, the central idea of school improvement is a process of sustained activity intended to improve students' learning achievement through different strategies and capacity building efforts.

2.2. Historical Development of School Improvement

The notion of school improvement has evolved more or less from the tradition of research into school effectiveness where attempts have been made to isolate critical inputs and processes that are likely to produce the best outcomes in terms of achievement results Akyeamong (2004). With regard to its origin, both Glatter et al. (1988) and Wijesundera (2002), revealed that the concept of school improvement had its origin in the United States in the 1960s, and the concept has subsequently extended to other countries, such as Australia, Canada, Japan and many countries in Europe. However, as stated by Hopkins and Reynolds (2001), it was only in the late 1970's and early 1980s that the field took shape as a distinct body of approaches. Moreover,

Harris and Chris peels (2006) indicated that gradually, over the last decades, school improvement has matured through generating a wide range of successful projects, interventions and innovations across many countries in Europe, North America, South Africa and Asia. Thus, the various literatures revealed that, school improvement has a relatively recent history but has already passed through three distinct phases. Regarding its historical development, Hopkins and Reynolds (2001) have provided a powerful analysis of the field and have identified three phases of school improvement.

In its early phase, as revealed by Earl et al. (2003) during the 1980s, school improvement was dominated by curriculum development and mainly practitioner-oriented, located in the work of those involved mainly teachers as researcher. Researchers, at the time were suggesting that schools were the key unit of change and the focus of school improvement was on helping individual schools to change themselves. In several countries, especially the United States and Australia, it was driven by federal funding to address the needs of schools serving disadvantaged students, which mandated the establishment of school-based improvement councils.

During this early phase, an emphasis was upon organizational change, school self evaluation and the 'ownership of change' by individual schools and teachers, but these initiatives were loosely connected to student learning outcomes provided by Hopkins and Reynolds (2001). As a consequence, these improvement practices struggled to impact significantly upon classroom practice and Reynolds et al. (2001) enumerated that the overall result of this early phase of school improvement activities was disappointing. Research studies in many countries attested the failure of school reform efforts at this early phase to produce widespread or sustainable change.

As it was indicated by Hopkins and Reynolds (2001), the second phase of school improvement began in the early 1990s and resulted from the interaction between the school improvement and the school effectiveness communities. Creemers and Kyrlakids (2010) revealed that during this phase, new ways of merging school effectiveness and school improvement have been attempted and productive co-operation between the two have been created. In the 1990s, the focus of school improvement was providing schools with guidelines and strategies for implementation that were sufficiently powerful to take educational change into classrooms. The main goal of school improvement during this phase was linking school improvement to student learning

outcomes, which was pursued with varying degrees of intensity (Earl et al., 2003). During this second phase, there was the growth, especially in the United States, of comprehensive models of school reform that could be adopted by individual schools.

It was during this phase that a comprehensive approach to the study of leadership was linked to student learning. This represented a movement towards the notion of leadership as transformational, having the potential to alter the cultural context in which people work. So it became clear that in this second phase the school improvement has moved towards maturity by adopting a more fundamental approach to educational reform by transforming the organization of the school through managing change and the exercise of leadership in the quest for enhanced student achievement Hopkins et al (2010). However, many of the existing school improvement approaches were not able to secure long-term, widespread system and school improvement.

Many of the literatures on the second phase of school improvement revealed that the evidence supporting the relationship between school improvement and increased student achievement remained weak and contestable. The form of school improvement has largely been unable to yield the increases in school performance.

The third phase of school improvement that has been in existence probably from the mid to late 1990's developed from the somewhat uncomfortable evidence that the wide range of national educational reforms produced in various countries, and the contributions of the school improvement communities of many countries additionally, may not have been particularly successful. The third phase of school improvement has arisen because of the relative failure of existing school improvement approaches to make a difference to school on a large scale. In response to previous limitations, the third phase of school improvement attempted to draw upon its most strong evidence and to produce interventions that were solidly based on tried and tested practices. As it was described by Harris and Chris peels (2006), it was in evidence in a number of improvement programs in the United Kingdom such as Improving the Quality of Education for All (IQEA), the High Reliability Schools (HRS) Project, and in the Netherlands, the Dutch National School Improvement Project.

If one were to compare the various programs of the third phase of school improvement as a group with the groups of programs in evidence in phases one and two of the school improvement enterprise, it is clear that: there has been an enhanced focus upon the importance of pupil outcomes, the learning level and the instructional behaviors of teachers have been increasingly targeted for explicit attention, rather than the school level. Hopkins and Reynolds (2001) revealed that there has been an increasing consciousness of the importance of ‘capacity building: there has been the creation of an infrastructure to enable the knowledge base, both ‘best practice’ and research findings, to be utilized and there has been an adoption of a ‘mixed’ methodological orientation, in which bodies of quantitative data plus qualitative data are used to measure quality, and variation in that quality.

2.3. Planning and Implementation of School Improvement Program

School improvement by its nature is continuous process that can systematically put in to reality. The MoE (2007c) document outlined the different stages that schools should pass through to realize the improvement effort. There are different activities that schools should perform in each stage. The MoE (2010) document summarized the process in to four main implementation stages of school improvement program cycle. The four stages of the SIP cycle are implemented each year. The four implementation stages of SIP cycle includes: self-assessment, planning, implementation and monitoring. Each stage of the SIP implementation cycle is discussed below.

2.3.1. School self assessment

To plan and execute the school improvement programs, schools need to assess and evaluate their current condition. Self assessment is the first stage in the SIP implementation cycle. MoE (2007b) document explained that the overall aim of the first stage of the SIP cycle is to collect information on the situation of the 15 Standards of the SIP framework. This information will then be used at stage 2 to develop a three-year School Improvement Strategic Plan and one-year School Improvement Action Plans. Schools can plan and implement their school improvement programs only when they are aware of their current status in respect to the four domains based on reliable and accurate information and when they design and execute their improvement plan accordingly. Self-assessment involves collecting and studying data/evidence to help determine where the school appears to be effective and where improvements are needed. This exercise

establishes the school's strengths, challenges, needs, and wants. They also need a rating scale to know their position

As stated by Bergeson (2005) in School Improvement Planning Process Guide school improvement is a continuous process schools use to ensure that all students are achieving at high levels. The first stage in this continuous process is to assess readiness of stake holders to benefit. The MoE (2007b) document also clearly indicates that, the team members assigned to oversee and execute this program, should analyze the readiness of stakeholders that participate in continuous plan preparation and implementation, and outline strategies to increase their participation. They should also commence the implementation without wasting time.

At this stage, the leadership team will gather current data on achievement, demographics, staff/student/parent perceptions, and school programs. It is described by MoE (2007a) document that by collecting and utilizing information about the school and the school community, it is possible to convey accurate an unbiased message. This is collecting accurate information from various sources to know the strengths and weakness of the school. Building and analyzing the school portfolio is part of the school's self assessment stage that helps all stakeholders understand the school's story. Displaying achievement and other data types in ways that are understandable to all audiences stimulates shared responsibility for education among teachers, parents, community members, and the students themselves

2.3.2. School improvement planning

Planning is the second stage in the SIP implementation cycle. As described by Australian Capital Territory (2009), the school improvement plan is a blueprint that outlines how the school will achieve improved levels of performance. The school improvement plan should incorporate the following key components: a statement of school context, purpose and profile, identified priorities, improvement targets, major actions (particularly whole school strategies), a timeframe and expected outcomes. As stated by Hanover Research (2014) a school improvement plan is a "road map that sets out the changes a school needs to make to improve the level of student achievement, and shows how and when these changes will be made.

As stated by Tracy (2013), school improvement plan (SIP) is intended to help schools increase academic performance by identifying instructional weaknesses, selecting new educational strategies, setting achievement goals, and assessing results. In the United States, as stated by the State Board of Education (2009) school improvement planning provides a mechanism for identifying needs and establishing a common approach to meeting those needs at the school level.

The MoE (2010) document described that the overall aim of the second stage of the SIP cycle is to: analyze the information collected during the stage 1 of self-assessment; identify the priority areas for improvement in the school each year for the next three years, and then to list this information in a three-year School Improvement Strategic Plan and the one-year Annual Action Plan. These two activities will be undertaken by the School Improvement Committee

As described by both the MoE (2007c) and Education Improvement Commission (2000) documents, the first stages of the school improvement planning process is creating a school improvement planning team. The school improvement planning team has the task of analyzing data and information about the level of student achievement in the school, the effectiveness of the school environment, and the level of involvement of parents in their children's education. Based on their analysis, team members make decisions about areas that need to be improved (priorities). The next stage in the planning process is setting and prioritizing goals. At this stage, goal statements that are student centered, clear, measurable, and time bound are written and prioritized.

As both Bergeson (2005) and MoE (2007) documents illustrated, creation of specific action plans, focused on each goal area that describe the specific activities, timelines, persons responsible, and outcome measures for each strategy. The action plan will be prepared according to school improvement goals/objectives that are outlined based on the gathered information. Action plan enables to implement the plan prepared by the school improvement committee.

2.3.3. School improvement plan implementation

Implementation of school improvement plan is the third stage in the SIP implementation cycle. The MoE (2010) document also realized that the overall aim of the third stage of the SIP cycle is

to successfully implement the Strategic Plan and Annual Action Plans. The SIC will be responsible for ensuring that the Annual Action Plan is implemented successfully. Once the school improvement plan has been developed, it is the responsibility of all stakeholders: teachers, parents, children and adolescents—to ensure that it is properly implemented. As the MoE (2007) clearly stated after the school improvement plan is outlined school principals should carefully analyze how it should be implemented. The implementation of school improvement program needs applicable a strategy. The MoE (2007) document listed important strategies that all members of the education sector and schools should apply in implementing the school improvement program. These strategies include: providing training to teachers, students, parents and the community as well as administrative personnel about the program, its objective and benefit and should enlist and coordinate the participation of all; conducting self-evaluation in schools to identify strengths and weakness and outline mutual plan; assigning priorities by identifying problems and outlining action plan. The other important strategies are establishing implementation committee (team) at each level and starting implementation; looking for additional budget source for implementation and utilizing the resource; outlining supervision and evaluation timetable to realize the program; making efforts to achieve better success by sharing experiences between schools; creating motivation and healthy competitive spirit, by arranging competitions between schools and rewarding those that demonstrate superior performance.

As Leithwood (2004) summarized that in schools, the implementation phase began with dissemination of information about the plan to staff members, parents, and others who had not been involved in the early planning phases. During the implementation stage, plans are carried out at the classroom and/or school level. Responsibility for implementation may be shared by the principal, teachers, and school based decision-making groups (or improvement teams) and other stakeholders. Concerning the bodies who are involved in the implementation process, principals, individual teachers, groups of teachers, parents, school council members, social workers, board level personnel, student representatives on the school council, and other community members were involved in implementation.

2.3.4. Monitoring and evaluation of school improvement implementation

Monitoring and evaluation of school Improvement plan implementation is the next stage in the SIP implementation cycle. As defined by Shapiro (2007), monitoring is the systematic collection and analysis of information as a project progresses. It is aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of a project or organization. It is based on targets set and activities planned during the planning phases of work. It helps to keep the work on track, and can let management know when things are going wrong. If done properly, it is a valuable tool for good management, and it provides a useful base for evaluation. It enables you to determine whether the resources you have available are sufficient and are being well used, whether the capacity you have is sufficient and appropriate, and whether you are doing what you planned to do.

The MoE (2007a) document also revealed that the SIC should conduct monitoring and supervision on the implementation process of the outlined action plan and on the improvement observed on student's result, and whether the specific plans is moving ahead to their target according to their timetable. It enables to know whether the required progress is being attained through a continuous assessment and evaluation performed on students' activity. In this process the SIC has the responsibility of monitoring and supervising the programs implementation. And the school community should be notified about the activities being undertaken. Supervision and monitoring should be performed from the start until the completion of the school improvement program. It should even be a part of the school's culture. It is not a process undertaken one time only at the end of the year. Rather it is a process that continuous, smooth, requiring attention and that need adjustments when necessary.

The MoE (2007a) document also clearly revealed that evaluating the progress achieved in student's result by the school improvement plan makes the process complete. However this stage of plan implementation is not the end of the school improvement program, rather it is a course through which the effectiveness of the plan implementation is measured, and whether the school improvement concept has developed as part of the school's culture. It is a process through which problems observed in the implementation are corrected and restarted. In the improvement program it is necessary to analyze the result information obtained in class exams, other

evaluation methods and national exams with the outlined assessment standards and final evaluation scales at the end of the plan year.

The Catholic Relief Services (2009) document also revealed that the execution of the school improvement plan must be monitored and evaluated, not only to verify that activities have been accomplished but also to identify successes, difficulties, and necessary adjustments. Most important, regular monitoring and evaluation can help to identify whether the plan is moving the school to where all children and adolescents have quality educational opportunities that will improve their lives.

2.4. Factors Affecting Implementation of School Improvement Program

The school improvement is complex process which can be challenged by different factors during its implementation and challenges to school improvement efforts may vary from school to school. As described by OECD (2015) document, the challenges to effective implementation of school improvement reforms in the OECD countries are the governance structures i.e. whether the system is decentralized or centralized, the number of levels of governance and the number of actors; the political context in which the policy is being implemented; and the historical and cultural traditions of the system. A high degree of student mobility can also represent a difficulty when implementing school improvement programs. The level of readiness for change of teachers and school leaders can affect the implementation of school improvement programs. There are also external factors that can hamper the implementation of school improvement programs, such as: external pressure and support mechanisms, ensuring alignment to other policies that may be implemented at the same time, and ensuring long-term sustainability.

In reviewing the factors that determine the success of school improvement processes, Fullan (2008) summarized the following factors are significant : (1) instructionally focused leadership at the school level, (2) district support, (3) emphasis on curriculum and instruction (4) clear goals and high expectations for students, (5) a system for monitoring performance and achievement, (6) ongoing staff development, (7) parental involvement and support, and (8) orderly and secure climate.

As described by Reddy (2007) document, factors which were regarded as important for the success of effective school improvement included: strong educational leadership; focus on learning central skills; orderly and secure climate; high expectations of pupil attainment and achievement orientation; and frequent evaluation of pupil progress. Although the emphasis has varied, most of the literature reviews on the challenges of school improvement revealed that there is a large scale census on the major factors that affect negatively or positively the success of school improvement efforts.

As the MoE (2010) document described, since the launch of the SIP in 2007, all schools have developed and implemented three-year strategic plans to improve student results and over the last three years many important lessons have been learnt through implementation of the SIP in schools across Ethiopia. However, there are challenges that affect the implementation of SIP. As described by Solomon (2016) effective implementation of SIP has been mainly affected by lack of financial and material resources, low follow up and support of education officials, lack of commitment of the school community to support learners, and poor cooperation and support of parents and partner organizations.

In considering Ethiopian secondary schools, several educational practitioners have made an effort to identify factors that hamper the success of school improvement efforts. For instance Kifle and Tariku (2014) concluded that lack of teachers' awareness of their pivotal role for the success of the school, in ability of school management to encourage the involvement of different stakeholders, inability to create strong community school relationship and the absence of clean, quiet, safe, comfortable and healthy learning environment are major factors that affect the implementation of school improvement program. Abera (2013) on his study pointed out that lack of commitment of school leaders, lack of stakeholders participation, lack of conducive environment in school and lack of educational input made implementation of school improvement program a challenging one.

2.5. School Improvement Program in Ethiopia

After the overthrow of the military government in 1991, Ethiopia has developed a new Education and Training policy (ETP) in 1994 (Transitional Government of Ethiopia, 1994). As described by Lasonen et al. (2005) the ETP has focused on expanding access to educational opportunities

and intended to achieve universal primary enrolment by 2015. The MoE (2005) document also stated that within the framework of the 1994 ETP the Government launched the first five year ESDP I in 1997/98 followed by ESDP II in 2002/03 and ESDP III in 2005/06.

As stated by MoE (2008), ESDP is a five year plan within twenty years education sector indicative plan and the country has gone through the implementation of ESDP I, ESDP II, ESDP III and ESDP IV is under implementation. The main focuses of ESDPs are to improve educational quality, relevance, efficiency, equity and expand access to education. As the MoE (2008) document underlines, despite rapid expansion of the education system for the last few decades, Ethiopia's education sector faces problems of quality. Achievements in access have not been accompanied by adequate improvements in quality; student achievement has not sufficiently improved.

As the MoE (2010) document revealed the failure of schools in addressing children's right to quality education has become manifested by the scores of the National Learning Assessments conducted in 2000, 2004 and 2008. When compared to the 2000 baseline, academic achievement of students in Grade 4 shows a slight improvement, from 47.9 per cent in 2000 to 48.5 per cent in 2004, whereas achievement scores for Grade 8 deteriorated, from 41.1 per cent in 2000 to 39.7 per cent in 2004. The 2008 assessment report also gave a rather bleak picture compared to the previous two assessment results. Only 13.9 per cent of students scored more than 51 per cent – the standard to pass the national examination 24 per cent of students scored 51 per cent, and the majority, 62.1 per cent, scored below 51 per cent.

The UNICEF (2010) document enumerated that the key factors attributed to low student achievement included: poor school organization and management, inadequate teacher training on subject mastery and pedagogic skills, inadequate school facilities, and insufficient curricular and instructional materials. The following factors could be added to the problems plaguing the quality of education in Ethiopia: large average class size, at a 1:64 class-student ratio; high average number of students per teacher, at 1:59, in contrast to the national standard of 1:51; low motivation of teachers and students; lack of and/or non-use of teaching-learning aids; insufficient provision of reference materials; weak capacity to correctly interpret, plan, implement and monitor policies and programs; and inadequate resources for operations

It is in response to the problem of quality that the MoE has developed GEQIP in 2007 which comprise six pillars: Teacher Development, Curriculum, Management and Leadership, School Improvement, Civics and Ethical Education and Information Communications Technology.

The MoE (2008) document showed that the SIP was established in 2006 by the Federal Government of Ethiopia as a pilot activity to improve quality of education. Then under GEQIP, the program was expected to expand and build on the lessons learned during the pilot phase. Therefore is to achieve quality of education that the MoE has developed the GEQIP in 2007 and under GEQIP MoE has developed the school improvement program by organizing best practices of local schools in Ethiopia and by adapting school improvement experiences and standards of practices from abroad mainly from United States, Australia and other

In Ethiopian context as stated by both MoE (2007a) and MoE (2010) documents, SIP is a national program, developed by MoE in 2007, to improve student results in primary and secondary schools. In Ethiopia, SIP focuses on assessing and self evaluation of schools to know their status and to improve educational inputs and process aimed at improving students' achievement to a high level. Thus school improvement program is concerned with improving students' learning and their learning outcomes. The MoE (2007b) document also stated that school improvement approach starts with schools and their stakeholders undertaking a self-assessment to identify their goals, followed by development and implementation of a School Improvement Plan..

2.6. Objectives of School Improvement Program in Ethiopia

According to MoE (2007b) document, SIP is designed in Ethiopia in the assumption that it enables to improve teaching and learning processes by improving: the efficiency and performances of teachers, school leadership and management. According to the MoE (2006), the major focus areas of SIP are school leadership and management, parent and community partnership, student-centered learning, professional development and quality instructional program. Moreover, SIP enables to provide high quality education to all students by involving the participation of the community and nongovernmental organization (NGOs) like charity organizations and religious organizations and others on the provision of educational inputs to schools. According MoE (2007c) document, in Ethiopia, SIP has the following objectives:

- Improving students' learning and their learning outcomes (achievement) to a high standard,
- Enabling schools to become effective by realizing good governance, democratic practices, transparency, engaging and accountable school system
- Enabling schools to enjoy extensive administrative freedom by structuring the management and administration in decentralized manner.

The main focus area of school improvement program is students learning and learning outcome. In order to meet this objective schools need to identify their strengths weak points and all school community members and other stakeholders should work together to increase the learning outcome of students by setting goals and priorities regarding the school domains that affect the learning process and student achievement.

2.7. Domains of School Improvement Program

School improvement domains are key areas of concern for improvement activities in which its main focus is enhancing students learning outcome. The Australian Capital Territory (2009) described that school improvement domains are school practice as priorities for ongoing improvement and they form a structure with which schools can review, question and analyze their systems and processes. The SIP domains represent the four key areas in which school improvement takes place. They describe the essential characteristics of an effective school

As enumerated by both MoE (2007a) and the Australian Capital Territory (2009) documents, the domains of SIP vary from country to country based on their priorities. For instance, in Ethiopia and Australia, SIP domains are divided into four categories namely: student environment domain; leading and managing domain; learning and teaching domain and community involvement domain.

Throughout 2006-2007 the MoE developed a School Self-Assessment Form (SAF) to review where the school is currently and to identify the area's most in need of development. To achieve the desired objectives, schools focus on the four domains, eleven elements and fifteen standards. According to MoE (2007b) document, the four domains that affect the learning process and outcome of students in Ethiopian schools are: learning and teaching; school leadership and

management; suitable environment for learning and community participation. Each of these domains contains various elements which are the core components of each domain and are designed to guide the schools on what they must address in order to achieve sustained success within each domain. Therefore, according to MoE (2010) document, there are four domains, eleven elements and fifteen standards. Within each domain, focus areas are highlighted and standards of performance indicated. Indicators of practice are provided for the school to evaluate its performance in relation to each standard. Standards are level of excellences that are measurable and should be met by schools all over the country in order to improve student results. These Standards are important as they will be what our school will focus on in order to improve student results. Schools should decide what standards are a priority to improve based on the information they gathered on the situation of each standard during the Self-Assessment.

2.7.1. Teaching and learning

Teaching and learning as one of the domains of SIP focuses on the roles of teachers in providing quality instruction, assessment and evaluation of students' learning. The Education Improvement Commission (2000) also revealed that in relation to learning and teaching, schools should set high expectations for learning which describe the knowledge and skills that students are expected to develop and demonstrate in their class work, on tests, and in various other activities on which their achievement is assessed.

As indicated by MoE (2010) document, under this domain there are three elements and five standards. Since the learning-teaching process greatly contributes to the school's success, considerable emphasis is given to this domain. Teaching, the first element under this domain focuses on teachers' mastery of subject content and methodology. Teachers shall have the academic know-how that enables them to teach competently the subjects given in schools, and they will outline a plan for the teaching process and execute their plan accordingly. They are expected to utilize engaging and modern techniques in the learning-teaching process. Under this element, there are two standards that all schools attempt to achieve in order to improve student results. According to MoE (2010) the first standard is that teachers have professional competency, and participate in continuous professional development (CPD), in order to learn new knowledge to apply in the classroom. All teachers should participate in some form of

professional development during a 12 month period. The second standard is that teachers use active learning methods in the classroom to realize improved learning results. The emphasis on this standard is based upon research within Ethiopia, as well as in countries internationally, that has found that students are able to learn more when active learning methods are used in the classroom. Therefore, the MoE is encouraging teachers in all primary and secondary schools to use a range of active learning methods in the classroom

According to MoE (2007a) the element of learning and evaluation focuses on performing regular and up-to-date evaluation and assessment to check if the students have acquired sufficient knowledge and skills regarding their lesson. Therefore, teachers are expected to give exercises, homework, short tests and individual and group experiments that integrate all three educational characteristics (knowledge, skills, and perspective) and appropriate to the subject content, and providing feedback by keeping record of their results. Assessment and evaluation of students' progress is also another important focus area of teaching and learning. This fact is supported by Sadker and Sadker (2003) emphasizing that effective schools carefully monitor and assess students' progress in a variety of ways. Potter and Powell (1992) also stated that subject teachers should mark students' work regularly and provide summery comments to encourage and guide future work.

Regarding the element curriculum, although it is mutually agreed that all types of subjects are basically necessary, some subjects can serve as a foundation for other subject types and thus need special attention. According to MoE (2007a) document, special focus is given to subjects like: Mother tongue, English, Math, Science and Civic and ethical education. The fifth standard under curriculum is that teachers understand the curriculum (in terms of age, relevance, and integration) and develop and use supplementary materials in the classroom to improve student learning. Curriculum materials such as syllabus, student texts and teachers' guide should be available in school in sufficient amount and they should be evaluated by the subject teachers for their relevancy, efficiency and for their participatory approach. As described by Wudu (2007), the decision on curriculum issues requires the participation of all members of the society since the product of the curriculum will affect all .He also underlines the importance of local control of the curriculum for effective curriculum improvement and implementation through participation of the local people at school level.

2.7.2. Conducive learning environment

This domain emphasizes that school communities that see and welcome every one impartially endorse relationships based on mutual respect. According to MoE (2007b) there should be an environment suitable and comfortable for each student. If students feel secure within the school community they follow their education with interest. Students should be allowed to participate in making decisions about their education and to make their own contribution, to build their confidence and have influence. Learning environment consists of three elements namely: student empowerment, student support and student facilities

The sixth standard under the element of student empowerment is that students have developed a habit of taking responsibilities and leading a disciplined life. The two standards under the element of student support are: students are motivated to learn and actively participate in lessons and there is collaborative work at the school and community levels to support inclusive education for children and teachers with special needs. As the MoE (2010) document revealed, under the element of student facilities, schools provide quality school facilities that enable all staff to work well and all children to learn. Quality school facilities are a school with: a teachers room with desks and storage; a playing area for students; adequate teaching materials; reference materials; a fence around the school grounds; tea rooms; one desk and chair per child; a library; a pedagogical centre; sufficient, number of toilets for teachers, girl students and boy students; clean safe water for drinking and hand washing; soap and water at all toilets; hygiene education for all students; daily cleaning of toilets; good management and maintenance of water and sanitation facilities; and, for high schools a laboratory and ICT centre.

Creating safe and healthy school environment can play significant role to improve students' learning and to increase student's achievement. As the MoE (2007) document indicates the Government will make efforts to create safe, secure and disciplined learning environment which is conducive to students learning. Schools should be a secure and peaceful place where students can learn without fear and tension, free from abduction and raping. Sadker and Sadker (2003) also explained that safe schools focus on academic achievements, the school mission involving families and communities in school activities and creating an environment where teachers, students and staff are treated with respect.

2.7.3. School leadership and management

To implement SIP at school level, the school leadership and management plays vital roles in coordinating and facilitating the program. The school leadership and management in Ethiopia consists of school principals and vice principals, the various management committees including parent-teachers association (PTA), supervisors and other professionals. Moreover, to ensure continuous school improvement in schools, the school leadership and management should engage in the change process by developing school vision, mission, and by developing strategic plan for SIP together with SIC.

According to MoE (2007a), under this domain, school leadership and management are expected to play a leading role in realizing school improvement. The role of school leadership and management is given special emphasis by OECD (2008), which describes that school leadership has become a priority in education policy agendas internationally. It plays key roles in improving school outcomes by influencing the motivations and capacities of subject teachers' as well as the school climate and environment. Three key elements are given priority under this domain which includes: strategic vision, leadership behavior and school management.

According to MoE (2010), for effective implementation of SIP school leadership and management should exercise collective decision making, create collegial and friendly relationship with in school community, mobilize and use resources effectively, create close ties and communicate with all stake holders. And all stake holders should be accountable for the improvement of students' achievement. The school leadership and management comprises of two elements namely: school management and leadership behavior

The two standards under the element of school management require: structures and processes for schools to support shared leadership in which everyone has collective responsibility for student learning and effective communication and implementation of school policies, regulations and procedures. The standard under the element of leadership behavior states that the schools decision-making and administrative processes (including data collection and analysis, and communicating with parents) are carried out effectively.

2.7.4. Community involvement

Another important domain in the school improvement program is the involvement of parents and community in various activities of school that enhance quality of education by improving students' achievement. According to MoE (2007b) and MoE (2010), the domain of community participation focuses on creating quality partnership and communication network with parents and the community enables schools to bond their students with the community. The three key elements that are given priority under community involvement domain are: working with parents, society participation and promoting education. The standard under the element of working with parents states that teachers meet with parents when necessary, and at a minimum twice per semester, to provide quality reports and to discuss their child's learning achievement. The standard under the element of society participation requires that schools successfully mobilize the community to provide resources to support implementation of the School Improvement Plan. The element of promoting education has a standard for schools to be active in communicating and promoting the importance of education in the community

The contribution of parents and community to improve students' achievement can be observed from the research work of Potter and Powell (1992) conducted on Abbey Down School that states students achieve their best when school and family work together. Moreover the findings of Pollard and Bourne (1994) show that parental involvement in the life of the school has a positive influence upon pupils progress and development.

2.8. School Improvement Leadership and Organizations

To implement SIP successfully all over the country the government executives at different levels should play their own roles and discharge their responsibilities. The MoE (2007) document, the various government executives responsible for the implementation of SIP are: Ministry of Education at federal level, Regional Education Bureaus, Zonal and woreda Education Offices, and Kebele Education and Training Board. They perform various activities beginning from setting targets for SIP at national level to follow-up and monitor the proper implementation of SIP in the primary and secondary schools.

According to MoE (2010), at federal level, the responsibility of the Ministry of Education includes: translating and distributing the SIP Guidelines to all Regions, Zones, Woredas, and schools based on the allocations; train REB staff on the SIP Guidelines and monitor the implementation of the SIP Guidelines.

Both the MoE (2007a) and MoE (2010) revealed that the responsibility of regional education bureaus include: coordinate the activity of governmental and non governmental agencies and institutes that can substantially contribute for the school improvement process; implement self-evaluation procedures in schools under the region; They also provide the appropriate assistance and support to enable schools meet this task effectively; annually reward schools that demonstrate exemplary progress in connection with the school improvement process among elementary and secondary schools in the region, including teachers, principals and PTA members that made considerable contribution etc. Moreover, they translate the SIP Guidelines into local regional languages. This is vital to ensure that stakeholders at the school and community level, such as parents and community leaders can actively participate in the SIP; organize Zonal and Woreda Training Workshop on the SIP Guidelines and monitor the SIPs Program.

The WEO is responsible for the success of the School Improvement Program in each Woreda. The responsibility of wereda educational bureaus include: select three representatives from each school to attend the woreda School Improvement Program training workshop, organize woreda School Improvement Program training workshop, provide support to schools, and monitor the School Grants Program etc.

Accordingly, the responsibility of kebele education and training boards in connection with the school improvement process include: supervise whether schools have implemented the program in accordance with school improvement program implementation guideline, and they provide the necessary assistance; help schools in getting the necessary assistance and support from governmental and non governmental agencies and organizations, to effectively implement the school improvement process; supervise whether schools are properly undertaking their responsibility in connection with school improvement process, and they provide the necessary assistance; coordinate the support and assistance provided by student parents and local community in the school improvement process etc

The MoE (2007a) document also described that the school improvement process is carried out through activities undertaken in the school. Therefore schools form school improvement committees for this specific purpose. Each school principal will work as the chairman of the committee. To implement the school improvement program schools undertake the following activities through the established school improvement committees. At school level the responsible bodies to facilitate, coordinate and lead the implementation of SIP are the school leadership and management and school improvement committee. The school leadership and management consist of school principals and vice principals, the various educational management committees at different level of schools such as parent-teacher association (PTA), supervisors and other professionals.

The School Improvement Committee is a body of stake holders group established at school level to implement SIP. As indicated by World Bank (2008) SIC is a stake holders group (5-10 members) established at school level that takes the lead to develop a 3 year school improvement plan. SIC is accountable to school's principals and their life span shall be three years. According to MoE (2007) the committee members are comprised of teachers, management personnel, students, parents, and the community and the principal of each teacher works as the committee chairman.

The responsibilities of school improvement committee include: prepare school improvement plan, outline strategies through which the school community contributes substantially to the school improvement, organize a system with which the school community participates in the school improvement program, supervises school improvement plan and provide the necessary assistance and support and at the end of the year they present a report to the school community on the improvement activity carried out by the school. Based on the evaluation report they inform the school's status to the local community.

2.9. Experiences of Selected Countries in Implementing School Improvement Program

Numerous school improvement projects, programs and interventions have been implemented in the last two decades. As indicated by Chi-shing (2006), they have had objectives of different kinds; some were shown to be effective in terms of students' achievement in a particular subject or domain, others were reported bringing changes and innovations in the schools in areas like the

internal capacity of teachers, leadership, school cultures and others. From the existing literatures on the field, five school improvement projects that have been shown to have a positive effect upon teaching and learning are reviewed.

2.9.1. School improvement in the United State of America

The United States of America was a pioneer in introducing school improvement to the rest of the world in the 1960s. Wijesundera (2002) also described that the concept has subsequently extended to other countries, such as Australia, Canada, Japan and many countries in Europe. As revealed by Reynolds et al. (1993), in the United States, there exists perhaps the closest of the international relationships between school effectiveness and school improvement. Moreover, there are programs which involve the utilization of school effectiveness knowledge within school improvement programs

Since 1978 three types of school improvement programs resulted from school effectiveness research have been implemented in the United States. These programs include: (1) Programs organized and administered within the schools and school districts in New York City, Milwaukee, Chicago, New-Haven, and St. Louis. (2) Programs administered by the state education agencies, which provide incentives and technical assistance to local schools and districts in Connecticut and New Jersey; and (3), Programs of research, development and technical assistance at Kent State University, the University of Michigan and Michigan State University.

From the local district programs, attempts are made to illustrate the New York City and the New Haven School Improvement Project. As stated by Edmonds (1982), the New York City School Improvement Project (SIP) was implemented in New York City as part of a larger attempt to improve the school system's basic approach to teaching and learning from 1978 – 1981. In the project, typical intervention, included teaching principals the elements of instructional leadership; seminars to improve teachers' use of achievement data as a basis for program evaluation; and developing and disseminating written descriptions of the school's major focus. The New York City School Improvement Project is annually evaluated on measures of organizational and institutional change and measures of pupil performance on standardized tests achievement.

As illustrated by Edmonds (1983), the New Haven School Improvement Project illustrates a design focused on all schools within the district and under the direct supervision of the superintendent. New Haven approach to school improvement focused on the mental health skills of educators and seeks qualitative improvement in the interaction between teachers and students, school and family, adults and children. Another example of school improvement program implemented in the United States is the Chicago school improvement program which focuses on five school domains in contrast to that of Ethiopia and Australia which have four domains.

2.9.2. School improvement in the United Kingdom

In the 1960s and 1970s school improvement in the United Kingdom, was linked to a technological view in which innovations were brought to schools from outside and then introduced 'top down' approach, described by Reynolds et al. (1993). However, in the 1980s, a new improvement paradigm a 'bottom up' approach to school improvement began in which the improvement attempts are 'owned' by those at the school level. Moreover, in the last decade of the 20th century several school improvement projects were introduced. Hopkins and Reynolds (2001) stated that in the 1990s, a range of school improvement projects were conducted in the United Kingdom, such as Lewis ham School Improvement Project, the Improving the Quality of Education for All (IQEA) Project and the High Reliability Schools (HRS) Project.

Additional explanation was given by Stoll and Thomson (1996) stating that in the United Kingdom, the Lewis ham School Improvement Project commenced in the spring of 1993. It aims to enhance pupil progress, achievement and development; to develop the internal capacity of schools for managing change and evaluating its impact at whole school, classroom and student levels; to develop the LEA's capacity to provide useful data to schools; and to integrate the above with the system's ongoing in-service and support services to form a coherent approach to professional development

Another school improvement project in the United Kingdom was the (IQEA) Project. Harris (2000) indicated that the (IQEA) Project was established in 1990 initially based at Cambridge University. The project was currently led by staff at two universities in the United Kingdom, Cambridge and Nottingham. The IQEA model of school improvement is based upon a fundamental belief in the relationship between teachers' professional growth and school

development. It was the project's view that schools are more likely to strengthen their ability to provide enhanced outcomes for all pupils when they adopt ways of working that are consistent both with their own aspirations as a school community with the demands of external change.

Harris (2000) also added that much of the IQEA work is taken up in enhancing schools' "capacity for development". It has been shown that where this is ignored the opportunity for school development is greatly impeded. Essentially IQEA is a model of school change that is premised upon facilitating cultural change within schools. It provides an over-arching model for school improvement which schools subsequently adapt for their own purposes and to fit their particular growth state', or context. In addition, the model is research driven and encourages schools not only to engage in their own internal enquiry but also to utilize the external research base concerning effective teaching and learning.

2.9.3. School improvement in Canada

In Canada, the Manitoba School Improvement began in 1991. As illustrated by Earl et al. (2003), it was conceived as a pilot project to develop and test a Canadian school improvement model, with an emphasis on improving secondary Schooling for students at risk. The project chose Manitoba as the pilot site for a Canadian high school improvement project based upon a number of considerations: they were interested in enhancing education for "students at risk"; they were looking for a province with an educational community that would welcome and support their involvement; and they wanted to start in a location that was manageable within the constraints of its budget allocation. Over the years since its inception, this program has grown into the Manitoba School Improvement Program (MSIP) and changed in a number of ways.

In supporting MSIP Moyle (2016) argued that the fundamental purpose of school improvement plans is to improve students' learning outcomes through the development of an explicit improvement agenda, an analysis and discussion of data, a culture that promotes learning, targeted use of school resources, an expert teaching team, systematic curriculum delivery, differentiated teaching and learning, effective pedagogical practices, and school-community partnerships.

Regarding the positive aspect of MSIP Earl et al. (2003) enumerated that one of the major contributions of MSIP has been connecting people, schools and organizations into coherent networks with a focus on school improvement. These networks are both formal and informal and involve schools, divisions, government, other educational organizations and other groups with an interest in school performance. MSIP has accelerated the pace of change in Manitoba not only by making school improvement a high priority but also by providing support "just in time" for schools to make changes.

2.9.4. School improvement in South Africa

After 1994, a multiplicity of school improvement projects were initiated and implemented by the government mainly by the Department of Education. For example: as stated by Chinsamy (2002) and Makoelle (2014), the Imbewu Project (1998–2001) in the Eastern Cape at 523 rural schools; the District Development and Support Project (DDSP) from 2000–2002 at 453 primary schools in rural areas and the Quality Learning Project (QLP) initiated to improve the conditions at secondary schools across the nine provinces and the Khanyisa Education Support Program from 2003 to 2009. The focus of the Khanyisa Education Support Program was to improve the efficiency of the educational system in the province. The program ran for seven years, from 2003 to 2009. The program has brought about positive results.

Moreover, as Khosa, (2010) illustrated, JET Education Services has developed a highly successful school improvement model, based on a dynamic partnership between the state, the private, sector, and civil society, which is currently being implemented in 63 schools in North West and the Eastern Cape. In addition, Khosa (2013) revealed that in the last two decades, JET has been directly involved in over 13 school improvement projects that took the form of comprehensive school or systemic improvement projects, or component-specific projects such as teacher development projects. Comprehensive school improvement projects included support to a range of school functions such as teaching and learning, management and resourcing, while component-specific projects focused on one of these functions

As it was proved by Makoelle (2014), from the above school improvement projects, under JET's school improvement model: the (QLP) improvement strategy was based on a systemic model, which involved intervention at district, school and classroom level to improve the conditions at

schools with less capacity to promote effective teaching and learning. QLP activities were geared towards the improvement of the following: teaching of mathematics, reading and writing skills at 524 schools; governance and management of schools and management in 17 districts.

2.9.5. School improvement in Nigeria

In Nigeria, school improvement project was introduced under the Education Sector Support Program in Nigeria (ESSPIN) in 2008 to help address some of the problems of quality in education. Education Sector Support Program in Nigeria (2010) described that ESSPIN was aimed to improve learning outcomes for children of basic education age in six states of Nigeria. Funded by the UK and Nigerian governments, ESSPIN worked through a range of activities at the national, state, local and school levels. At the school level, it provided and supported the use of structured training materials for teachers, works with head teachers to improve academic leadership and school improvement planning, and involves communities through the establishment of well-functioning school-based management committees.

ESSPIN worked from 2008 to 2014. Based on increased evidence of state reform, ESSPIN was further extended until January 2017. Its specific approach puts the transformation of the school at the centre of the change process. School improvement approaches include a wide range of interconnected interventions which are all directed towards raising the levels of pupil achievement. Much of this work involves strengthening school-level capacity through training workshops, in-school support and follow up. This process has been led by the State School Improvement Teams (SSIT); small teams of carefully selected, committed education professionals who 'belong' to the individual states and work full time to address the many challenges of improving Nigeria's schools.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with the research design adopted to realize the objectives of the study. The sources of data, sample size and techniques and instruments of data collection were presented. Finally, the procedures for data collection and the methods employed for data analysis were outlined.

3.1. Research Design

The purpose of this study was to assess the implementation of SIP in secondary schools of Harari Regional State and to identify the challenges that encountered during the implementation process.

This study used a descriptive survey design as it enables to make investigation of the data obtained from relatively large and representative samples of the target population. As pointed out by Parkash (2005) a survey research is important to collect detailed descriptions of existing phenomena; with the intent of employing the data to justify current conditions and practices or to make more intelligent plans for improving social, economic, or educational conditions and process.

3.2. Sources of Data

The researcher used both primary and secondary sources of data for this study.

3.2.1. Primary sources

Teachers, principals; SIC members and supervisors drawn from the four sample secondary schools of Harari Regional State have served as primary sources of data in the study.

3.2.2. Secondary sources

The various minutes of meeting in the secondary schools, annual reports and policy guidelines of MoE and the Harari Regional Education Bureau have served as secondary sources of data. This is because these documents are the bases for the decision making and they are indicators of decision making in the school.

3.3. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

3.3.1. Target population

The target population of the study were secondary school teachers, principals, SIC members and supervisors. The researcher believes that they are the right source of information on the implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Harari Regional State. The rationale for selecting these subjects as a source of data was that, they are responsible to lead, facilitate and coordinate the implementation of SIP and directly or indirectly they are involved in the implementation of SIP at school level.

3.3.2. Sample size and sampling techniques

As statistical information obtained from Harari Education Bureau, currently there are a total of six public secondary schools. From the six public secondary schools, the researcher selected four secondary schools by simple random sampling technique. Therefore, from the four sample schools, the following sample size of research subjects were selected for the study. Accordingly, 163 subject teachers, 9 school principals, and 27 SIC members and 4 supervisors from the four sample secondary schools were selected by available sampling technique. This technique was employed since it enables to obtain important and detailed information by involving all principals, deputy principals, subject teachers, supervisors and SIC members of sample secondary schools.

Table 1 Distribution of Populations (N) & Sample size (n) & Sampling Techniques

No	Name of School	Populations	(N) Size	Sample Size(n)	%	Sampling Techniques
1	Harar S.S.S	Subject-Teachers	89	89	100	Availability technique
		Members of SIC	6	6	100	Availability technique
		principals	3	3	100	Availability technique
		Supervisor	1	1	100	Availability technique
2	Hamera S.S	Subject-Teachers	23	23	100	Availability technique
		Members of SIC	7	7	100	Availability technique
		principals	2	2	100	Availability technique
		Supervisor	1	1	100	Availability technique
3	Abadir S.S	Subject-Teachers	26	26	100	Availability technique
		Members of SIC	7	7	100	Availability technique
		principals	2	2	100	Availability technique
		Supervisor	1	1	100	Availability technique
4	Shekib Abdulahi S.S	Subject-Teachers	25	25	100	Availability technique
		Members of SIC	7	7	100	Availability technique
		principals	2	2	100	Availability technique
		Supervisor	1	1	100	Availability technique
Total			203	203	100	

3.4. Instruments of Data Collection

The following instruments of data collection were employed for conducting the study.

3.4.1. Questionnaire

Close ended questionnaires were employed to collect data from subject teachers and SIC members. As stated by Best and Kahn (1989) and Sharma (2000) questionnaires enable to collect data from large group of individuals within a short period of time, and are also easy to administer to a number of subjects in one place at a time. A set of questionnaire consisting 26 items were prepared both in English and Amharic to be filled by subject teachers and SIC members respectively. It was developed from School Improvement Program Implementation Guide Line developed by MoE. From the questionnaire, 15 items are about the implementation of the four domains of SIP, 3 items are about the extent of SIP implementation in meeting the desired objectives and 8 items are related to the factors affecting the implementation of SIP in secondary schools. Questionnaires were preferred to collect data from the above research subjects, because of the applicability and efficiency of the method to obtain relevant and reliable data. Moreover questionnaires are relatively less expensive and affordable in terms of resources, time, and other facilities.

3.4.2. Interview guide

Interview guides were used to collect data from 9 school principals and 4 supervisors on the extent of schools in implementing the four domains of SIP, how far the implementation of SIP meeting the desired objectives and the challenges that have been encountered in implementing SIP. Since the number of school principals and supervisors was limited, it was manageable and affordable to use interview guides to collect necessary data from them.

3.4.3 Document analysis

The researcher had consulted documents such as Education Sector Development Program, School Improvement Program Guideline, and School Improvement Program Implementation Manual to obtain additional data and to assess the implementation of SIP in secondary schools of Harari Regional State. The researcher had made attempts to make a review of the relevant

written documents such as schools' SIP action plan, the meeting minutes for school improvement program and annual reports of Harari Education Bureau about the school improvement program.

3.4.4 Observations- of school documents (records) and school compound through the use of check lists in order to see the extent of secondary schools in creating conducive learning environment for the implementation of SIP and to see how far schools are successful in achieving the targets set in their plan of SIP.

3.5. Data Collection Procedures

In order to collect data, first permission was obtained from the University. Then the copy of official letter from the University was distributed to the four sample secondary schools to access primary and secondary data. Third, principals of each participating schools were contacted to arrange a date for the administration of data collection through questionnaires and interviews among teachers, SIC members, principals and supervisors. On the arranged dates, first the questionnaires were disseminated to teachers and SIC members and retrieved with the assistance of school principals and their management teams at each school. Then, interview was conducted first with school principals and then with supervisors.

3.6. Validity and Reliability of Data Gathering

Credibility for this study was achieved using the validation strategies of triangulation, since the use of triangulation is for the purpose of reducing bias that may be inherent in a particular data source or method of construction. As a triangulation approach, both quantitative and qualitative designs were used interchangeably. The sample size and study population are also carefully set to ensure utmost representation of the variables under the study there by increasing the validity and reliability of the constructs studied. Moreover, in order to enhance the validity and trustworthiness of the study various instruments of data collection were used. The data were collected through questionnaire, interview guide, files and documents analysis and observation.

Pilot Testing, before administrating data collection, it was very necessary to test the reliability of the instruments. Accordingly, after some colleagues and the advisor reviewed the instruments, the designed questionnaires were tried out at Erer Secondary School. The testing was conducted with 10 teachers, 1 principal and 3SIC members. The teachers were selected by simple random

sampling, while the other respondents were selected purposively due to the same reason explained for the final study.

Based on the pilot test, the reliability of the instruments was calculated by using cronbach alpha & the results were 0.87, 0.91 and 0.78 for teachers, principals and SIC members respectively. Therefore, the instrument was found to be reliable as statistical literatures usually recommended a test result of 0.70 and above is reliable .As results of the feedback from the pilot test, few items were modified and some long sentences were shortened.

3.7. Methods of Data Analysis

To analyze the collected data descriptive data analysis method was employed. The reason for choosing this method of data analysis was that it allowed describing, summarizing and presenting the analyzed quantitative and qualitative data. Thus the data gathered from subject-teachers and SIC members through questionnaires was organized and analyzed quantitatively by using appropriate statistical techniques such as descriptive statistics; mean and standard deviation. On the other hand the data obtained through interview guide from principals and supervisors were classified and organized in to specific patterns and narrated in words. Then the analyzed data were interpreted in terms of objectives formulated for the study. Finally, the result of the study was summarized and final report was written.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

In conducting this research, all ethical issues of research were considered. Accordingly, supportive letter from the department of educational planning and management was obtained. Then the researcher distributed the letter to sample secondary schools and made contact with principals, teachers, SIC members and supervisors to get their consent to be involved in the study. In every data gathering occasions, the researcher informed participants about the purpose of the study and the information they give is used only for educational purposes. Participants were assured of confidentiality of all data collected. Hence, the name of participants remained unidentified and all data were confidential to the researcher. In addition, all participants were informed that they have the right to withdraw from the study. The researcher also tried his best to make them feel at ease and believe that no psychological or physical harm will come to them as a result of participating in this research.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

As indicated in chapter one, the purpose of this study was to assess the implementation of SIP in secondary schools of Harari Regional State and to identify the factors that affect the implementation process. Therefore, this chapter deals with the data presentation, analysis and interpretation to search for appropriate answers to the basic questions described in the first chapter. It consists of two parts. The first section deals with the demographic characteristics of respondents. In the second section the results and analysis of the study and the discussions made on the major findings of the study are presented.

4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Descriptive characteristics of respondents give some basic information about the sample population. Thus the following tables show the general characteristics respondents in their sex, age, qualification, work experiences and their loads

Table 2 Distribution of respondents by sex and age

No	Variables	Categories	Teachers		SIC Members		Principals		Supervisors	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Sex	M	130	79.75	21	77.78	8	88.89	4	100
		F	33	20.25	6	22.22	1	11.11	-	-
		Total	163	100	27	100	9	100	4	100
2	Age	21-25	24	14.72	-	-	-	-	-	-
		26-30	38	23.31	6	22.22	3	33.33	2	50
		31-35	22	13.50	9	33.33	4	44.44	1	25
		36-40	21	12.88	4	14.81	2	22.22	1	25
		41-45	19	11.66	3	11.11	-	-	-	-
		Above 45	39	23.93	5	18.52	-	-	-	-
		Total	163	100	27	100	9	100	4	100

As can be seen from table 2 in relation to sex distribution of teachers, 130 (79.75%) of them were males and 33 (20.25%) of them were females. Moreover, from 27 SIC members; 21 (77.78%) of them are male and 6 (22.22%) of them are female and from the 9 principals; 8 (88.89%) of them are male and 1 (11.11%) of them is female; and all the 4 (100%) supervisors were males.

This clearly showed that females' participation in managerial and leadership positions in general and in school improvement program decision making process in particular was very low. Furthermore, such imbalance could be one factor that affected effective implementation of school improvement program. Because according to (MoE, 2010) SIP implementation guideline, it was stated that the proportion of female with male in SIC should be one third.

Looking at age structures of teachers, 24 (14.72%) of teachers were in the age category of 21-25 years old, 38 (23.31%) of teachers were between 26-30 years old, 22 (13.50%) of teachers were between 31-36 years old, 21 (13.80%) of them were between 36 and 40 years old, 19 (11.66%) of them were between 40 and 45 years old and 39 (23.93%) of them were above 45 years old. This indicates that the majority 112 (58.94%) of teachers teaching in the selected first cycle secondary schools of Harari Region were in adult age group.

Table 3 Description of respondents by educational qualifications, years of experiences and work load

No	Variables	Categories	Teachers		SIC		Principals		Supervisors	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Education al Backgrou nd	10 th Grade	-	-	1	3.70	-	-	-	-
		Diploma	10	6.13	1	3.70	-	-	-	-
		First Degree	151	92.64	25	92.59	8	88.89	-	-
		Second Degree	2	1.23	-	-	1	11.11	4	100
2	Work Experienc es	0-5	31	19.02	11	40.74	5	55.56	3	75
		6-10	33	20.25	8	29.63	3	33.33	1	25
		11-15	26	15.95	9	33.33	1	11.11	-	-
		16-20	22	13.50	-	-	-	-	-	-
		21 or more	51	31.28	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Work load (periods per/week)	8-12	118	72.39						
		13-16	31	19.02						
		17-20	12	7.36						
		>20	2	1.23						
		Total	163	100	27	100	9	100	4	100

As to educational background of respondents, 10 (6.13%), 151 (92.64%) and 2 (1.23%) of subject teachers teaching in the selected first cycle secondary schools of Harari Region were diploma, first degree and second degree holders respectively, whereas, 8 (88.89%) and 1 (11.11%) of principals were first degree and second degree holders respectively. All the 4 (100%) of supervisors were second degree holders. Moreover, 1(3.70%), 1(3.70%) and 25(92.59%) of SIC members were grade 10, diploma and first degree holders respectively. Therefore the study confirmed that minimum requirement to be secondary school teacher, principal and supervisor is almost satisfactory.

Regarding work experience of respondents, 31 (19.02%), 11 (40.74%), 5 (55.56%) and 3 (75%) of teacher, SIC member, principal and supervisor respondents have served 5 years and below, 33(20.25%), 8 (29.63%), 3 (33.33%) and 1(25%) of teacher, SIC member, principal and supervisor respondents have served 6-10 years, 26 (15.95%), 9 (33.33%), 1 (11.11%) of teacher, SIC member, principal respondents have 11-15 years ; 22 13.50%) of teachers have served 16-20 years and 51 (31.28%) of teachers have more than 20 years of teaching experiences.

The majority of the subject teachers 99(60.74%) of them have at least more than ten years of teaching experiences. Thus it is reasonable to take in to account that the respondents have sufficient knowledge about the implementation of the four domains of schools under SIP

As far as the work load is concerned, the majority of respondents of the subject teachers, i.e. 118 (72.39%) of them have 8-12 periods per/week, 31 (19.02%) of them have 13-16 periods per week; and 12 (7.36%) of them have work load that ranged from 17-20: and 2 (1.23%) of them have more than 20 periods work load per week, which showed that the work load of teachers was fair.

4.2. Extent of Secondary Schools in Implementing the Four Domains of SIP

In this study, respondents were given questionnaire to indicate the extent of secondary schools in implementing the four domains of SIP. The table below presents and summarizes the results. In addition to this, interview guides was conducted for school principals and supervisors to mention some points regarding the implementation of the four domains of SIP.

4.2.1. Implementation of teaching and learning domain

As described by MoE (2007), teaching and learning as one of the domains of SIP focuses on the roles of teachers in participating in continuous professional development (CPD), and providing quality instruction, carrying out timely assessment and evaluation of students' learning in order to improve the learning and learning outcome of students. The domain of teaching and learning is categorized in five standards.

The responses of teachers and SIC members for five (5) items on the implementation of teaching and learning domain are shown in table 4.

Table 4 Responses of teachers and SIC on the implementation of teaching and learning domain

No	Items	Teachers (N=163)		SIC (N=27)		AV. Mean
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	
1	Teachers have participated in continuous professional development in order to learn new knowledge to apply in the classroom	3.47	0.04	3.52	0.10	3.50
2	Teachers use active learning methods in the classroom to realize improved learning results	2.33	0.05	2.44	0.11	2.39
3	Teachers achieved measurable improvements in student results	3.51	0.04	3.59	0.12	3.55
4	A range of assessment methods are used in each grade and teachers provide extra teaching support to underperforming students.	2.45	0.04	2.48	0.10	2.47
5	Teachers understand the curriculum and develop and use supplementary materials in the classroom to improve student learning.	3.62	0.05	3.74	0.14	3.68
Aggregate Mean		3.08	0.04	3.15	0.11	3.12

Level of agreement: 1.49 = Very Low, 1.5 – 2.49 =Low, 2.5 – 3.49 = Moderate, 3.5 – 4.49 = High, 4.5 = Very High

As shown in table 4, concerning implementation of teaching learning domain, both teachers and SIC member respondents rated items 3 and 5 as high with mean value of 3.51 and 3.62 and (S.D=0.04 and S.D=0.05) for teachers and with mean value of 3.59 and 3.74 and (S.D=0.12 and S.D=0.14) for SIC members respectively. For item 1, teacher respondents rated as moderate with mean score of 3.47 and (S.D =0.04) and SIC members rated as high with mean score of 3.52 and (S.D =0.10). The averages mean of both teachers and SIC members on this item 3.50 showed that the majority of respondents rated as high. Besides, item 2 and 4 were rated as low with mean scores of 2.33 and 2.45 and (S.D=0.05 and S.D=0.05) by teachers and with mean score of 2.44

and 2.48 and (S.D=0.11 and S.D=0.10) by SIC members. However, the overall mean scores of the teachers and SIC respondents fell at moderate level with aggregate mean of 3.08 and 3.15 respectively. Therefore, it is likely to say that the teaching and learning domain had been implemented at moderate level in secondary schools understudy.

In addition, data collected from school principals and supervisors through interview regarding item 1, indicated that teachers' participation on continuous professional development was satisfactory. In addition to this the reviewed documents confirmed the existence of the practice of teachers' participation on continuous professional development. Thus, from the given responses and document analysis, it can be inferred that in secondary schools understudy, the practice of teachers' participation on continuous professional development was encouraging and this on-going continuous professional development undertaken by teachers have a positive impact on student results.

As shown in Table 4, regarding item 2, both the rating of teachers and SIC members showed that the practice of teachers' employing active learning in the classroom was low. Moreover, data collected from school principals and supervisors through interview regarding this item confirmed that most teachers were reluctant to use active learning in the classroom. This was mainly due to lack of teachers' interest and motivation to implement a range of active learning methods in the classroom. Therefore, from the data collected from teachers, SIC members, principals and supervisors, it can be inferred that in secondary schools understudy the practice of using a range of active learning methods in the secondary schools understudy was at low level. This can negatively affect the learning outcomes of students.

Regarding item 3 in Table 4, both teachers and SIC members expressed their agreement with the statement that teachers have achieved measurable improvement in student results. Data obtained through interview from principals and supervisors regarding item 3 confirmed that teachers in the secondary schools understudy achieved measurable improvement in student results though the level of improvement is not sufficient. Information obtained from document analysis in the schools under study showed that the learning outcomes of students was improving, but it was very gradual and it was not that much satisfactory.

The reason for gradual and slow process of improvement of students' learning outcome was lack of providing extra teaching support to underperforming students. Therefore, from the data obtained through questionnaire, interviews and document analysis it can be deduced that the schools understudy have improved student results, though; the level of improvement was very gradual.

Regarding item 4 in Table 4, both the rating of teachers and SIC members showed the practice of teachers' employing a range of assessment methods and providing extra teaching support to underperforming students was low. In addition, the data gathered from principals and supervisors through interview confirmed that teachers' practice of conducting continuous assessment to support underperforming students was not satisfactory. Moreover, principals realized that some teachers have a misconception of continuous assessment as if giving weekly tests to students. As stated on MoE (2010), though, there is a common understanding among teachers and learning experts that a range of assessment methods should be used to fully understand what students are learning in the classroom, its practice was low. Therefore, result obtained through questionnaire and interviews indicated that the practice of conducting continuous assessment to support underperforming students was not encouraging.

Concerning item 5, the rating of teachers and SIC members showed that the practice of developing and using supplementary materials in the classroom was satisfactory. However, the data gathered from principals through interview regarding item 5 showed that teachers' practice of developing and using supplementary materials in the classroom to improve student learning was low. Moreover, data obtained from document analysis revealed that teachers in the secondary schools understudy had no much interest in developing and using supplementary materials in the classroom to improve student learning. Therefore, the data gathered from principals and obtained from document analysis confirmed that the practice of developing and using supplementary materials in the classroom to improve student learning was low.

4.2.2. Implementation of learning environment domain

As described by MoE (2007), suitable learning environment as one of the domains of SIP focuses on creating an environment suitable and comfortable for each student and students should be allowed to participate in making decisions about their education. This domain consists

of four standards of practices. In the following table, the responses of the subject teachers and SIC members related to the four standards of practices were analyzed as follows.

Table 5 Responses of teachers and SIC on the implementation of learning environment domain

No	Items	Teachers (N=163)		SIC (N=27)		AV. Mean
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	
1	Students have developed a habit of taking responsibilities and leading a disciplined life	2.40	0.05	2.26	0.14	2.33
2	Students are motivated to learn and actively participate in lessons	3.41	0.03	3.74	0.14	3.58
3	There is collaborative work at the school and community levels to support inclusive education for children and teachers with special needs	3.53	0.04	3.78	0.15	3.66
4	Schools provide quality school facilities that enable all staff to work well and all children to learn.	2.34	0.05	2.41	0.01	2.38
Aggregate Mean		2.92	0.61	3.05	0.62	2.99

As shown in table 5, concerning implementation of learning environment domain, both teachers and SIC member respondents rated items 3 as high with mean value of 3.53 and (S.D=0.04) for teachers and mean score of 3.78 and (S.D=0.15) for SIC members respectively. For item 2, teacher respondents rated as moderate with mean score of 3.41 and (S.D =0.03) and SIC members rated as high with mean score of 3.74 and (S.D =0.14). However, the averages mean of both teachers and SIC members on this item 3.58 showed that the majority of respondents rated as high.

However, items 1 and 4 were rated as low by respondents with mean scores of 2.40 and 2.34 and (S.D=0.05 and S.D=0.05) by teachers and 2.26 and 2.41and (S.D=0.14 and S.D=0.01) by SIC members respectively.

Regarding item 1 of Table 5, both the rating of teachers and SIC members showed that students' habit of taking responsibility and leading a disciplined life in the secondary schools understudy was low. This was mainly caused by inefficiency of the school leadership to make every members of school community to be responsible for his/her actions and every one to accomplish his/her responsibility in accordance with law. Moreover, data collected from school principals and supervisors through interview regarding this item indicated that students' habit of taking responsibility and leading a disciplined life was not satisfactory. The average means of both teachers and SIC members on this item 2.33 are the lowest mean scores of the four standards under learning environment domain. Therefore, the practice of students' habit of taking responsibility and leading a disciplined life was not satisfactory.

Concerning item 2 of Table 5, about the extent to which students are motivated to learn and actively participated in lessons was rated as moderate by teachers. On the other hand, the same item was rated as high by SIC members with the mean value of 3.74 and (S.D=0.14). However, the overall mean of teachers and SIC members 3.61 revealed that the practice of motivating students to learn and students' participation in the lesson was high. Moreover, data collected from school principals through interview regarding this item confirmed students' motivation and participation in the lesson. Therefore, the overall score value confirmed that the practice of students' motivation and participation in the lesson was high.

Regarding the presence of collaborative work at the school and community levels to support inclusive education for children and teachers with special needs, both teachers and SIC members rated as high. On the other hand, the data gathered from principals and supervisors through interview showed that the practice of collaborative work at the school and community levels to support inclusive education for children and teachers with special needs was low. Moreover, data obtained from document analysis confirmed that the practice of collaborative work at the school and community levels to support inclusive education for children and teachers with special needs was low. This was mainly because of the little attention that schools and community given to inclusive education. Therefore, based on the data gathered from principals and obtained from document analysis, it can be inferred that the practice of collaborative work at the school and community levels to support inclusive education for children and teachers with special needs was low and not satisfactory.

Regarding item 4 of Table 5 respondents were asked to indicate their agreement level on the extent to which schools provide quality facilities that enable all staff to work well and all children to learn. Accordingly, both teachers and SIC members rated this item as low. Moreover, data collected from school principals and supervisors through interview and observations regarding this item confirmed that secondary schools understudy did not fully provide quality school facilities like laboratory materials, chemicals; teaching aids and library services and reference books were insufficient.

The MoE (2010) document indicated that quality school facilities are school with: a teachers room with desks and storage; a playing area for students; adequate teaching materials; reference materials; a fence around the school grounds; tea rooms; one desk and chair per child; a library; a pedagogical centre; sufficient, number of toilets for teachers, girl students and boy students; clean safe water for drinking and hand washing; soap and water at all toilets; hygiene education for all students; daily cleaning of toilets; good management and maintenance of water and sanitation facilities; and, for high schools a laboratory and IT centre. Therefore, based on the criterion provided by MoE and the overall score value the provision of quality school facilities that enable all staff to work well and all children to learn was low and not encouraging.

4.2.3. Implementation of school leadership and management domain

The school leadership and management have a key role in the implementation of (SIP). As MoE (2007) document indicated, school leadership and management should outline a clear vision for the school and achieve the realization of this vision by preparing guidelines in association with the school community. In the following table, the responses of the subject teachers and SIC members related to the three standards of practices under school leadership and management domain were analyzed and discussed as follows

Table 6 Responses of teachers and SIC on the implementation of school leadership and management domain

No	Items	Teachers (N=163)		SIC (N=27)		AV. Mean
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	
1	Structures and processes exist to support shared leadership in which everyone has collective responsibility for student learning	3.55	0.04	3.89	0.17	3.72
2	School polices, regulations and procedures are effectively communicated and followed	3.53	0.04	3.81	0.16	3.67
3	The schools decision-making and administrative processes are carried out effectively	2.42	0.04	2.26	0.06	2.34
Aggregate Mean		3.17	0.07	3.32	0.24	3.24

With regard to item 1 of Table 6, the existence of structures and processes that support shared leadership and collective responsibility for student learning was rated as high by both teachers and SIC respondents as positive with the mean value of 3.55 and (S.D=0.04) and 3.89 and (S.D=0.17) respectively.

Accordingly, both the rating of teachers and SIC members showed their agreement and rate as high on the presence of structures and processes that support shared leadership in which everyone has collective responsibility for student learning. In addition, the data gathered from principals and supervisors through interview confirmed that there are structures and processes that support shared leadership in which everyone has collective responsibility for student learning. Moreover, data obtained from document analysis confirmed that structures and processes that support shared leadership are in place including the PTA, SIC in which everyone has collective responsibility for student learning. Therefore, structures and processes that support shared leadership are available in secondary schools understudy.

Concerning item 2 of Table 6, both teachers and SIC respondents rated the practice of effectively communicating and following school polices, regulations and procedures, as better implemented. Thus, both the rating of teachers and SIC members with the mean value of 3.53 and 3.81 and

(S.D=0.04) and (S.D= 0.16) respectively showed their agreement with the statement that school polices, regulations and procedures are effectively communicated and followed. Moreover, the data obtained from principals and supervisors through interview realized that school polices, regulations and procedures are effectively communicated and followed by every member of the school community.

Regarding school's effectiveness in carrying out schools decision-making and administrative processes, both the rating of teachers and SIC members with the mean value of 2.42 and 2.26 and (S.D=0.04) and (S.D= 0.06) respectively showed that the practice of effectively carrying out school's decision-making and administrative processes was low. The average means of both teachers and SIC members on this item 2.34 is the lowest mean score of the three standards under leadership and management domain confirmed that the practices of carrying out school's decision-making and administrative processes is not as expected. This was mainly because of inability and lack of commitment of the school leadership to coordinate efforts of all stake holders to carry out school's decision-making and administrative processes and lack of effective follow up, monitoring and supervision of school activities.

Moreover, the data obtained from principals and supervisors through interview confirmed that school's effectiveness in carrying out school decision-making and administrative processes was low. Thus, it can be said that school's decision-making and administrative processes were not carried out effectively.

4.2.4. Implementation of community involvement domain

Community involvement is one of the four domains of schools in SIP. As it is described by MoE (2010) document, this domain is organized from three standards. In the following table, the responses of the subject teachers and SIC members related to the three standards of practices under community involvement domain were analyzed and discussed as follows

.Table 7 Responses of teachers and SIC on the implementation of community involvement domain

No	Items	Teachers (N=163)		SIC (N=27)		AV. Mean
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	
1	Teachers meet with parents when necessary, to provide quality reports and to discuss their child's learning achievement	3.62	0.05	3.52	0.10	3.57
2	Schools successfully mobilize the community to provide resources to support implementation of the School Improvement Plan	2.47	0.04	2.33	0.13	2.4
3	Schools are active in communicating and promoting the importance of education in the community	2.5	0.04	2.77	0.04	2.64
Aggregate Mean		2.86	0.07	2.87	0.17	2.87

Schools should promote active participation of parents in the affairs of their children's education. To this effect, in response to item 1 of Table 7, both teachers and SIC members expressed their agreement and rated as high with the item with the mean value of 3.62 and 3.52 and (S.D=0.05) and (S.D=0.10) respectively. The response of teachers and SIC members for this item with average mean of 3.57 indicates that teachers' practices of meeting with parents to provide quality reports and discuss about their children's learning achievement was high. In addition, data obtained from school principals and supervisors through interview confirmed that the practice of teachers' meeting with parents to provide quality reports and discuss about their children's learning achievement was satisfactory. Therefore, all the data obtained through questionnaire and interviews confirmed that the practice of teachers' meeting with parents to provide quality reports and discuss about their children's learning achievement was encouraging. That means secondary schools understudy have ensured active involvement of parents with the school in their children's learning.

With regard to item 2 of Table 7 both majority of teachers and SIC members expressed their disagreement and rated as low with the statement that schools successfully mobilize the community to provide resources to support implementation of the school improvement plan with the mean value of 2.47 and 2.33 and of (S.D=0.04) and (S.D=0.13) respectively. The response of teachers and SIC members for this item with average mean of 2.4 indicates that schools' practices of mobilizing the community to provide resources to support implementation of school improvement plan was low.

Moreover, data obtained from school principals and supervisors through interview confirmed the success of secondary schools understudy in mobilizing the community to obtain resources for the implementation of school improvement plan was low. Therefore, the success of secondary schools understudy in mobilizing the community to obtain resources for the implementation of school improvement plan was not encouraging. Though, the MoE (2007) document indicated that the community has a responsibility of providing material and financial support to schools for effective implementation of SIP, secondary schools were not successful in this regard. Rather, it is the government that allocates budget for schools.

In response to item 3 of Table 7, both the rating of teachers and SIC members showed their uncertainty about the issue with the mean value of 2.5 and 2.77 and (S.D =0.04) and (S.D =0.04) showed their uncertainty. Thus, the response of teachers and SIC members for this item with average mean of 2.61 indicates that schools' effectiveness in communicating and promoting the importance of education in the community was medium or moderate.

However, data gathered from principals and supervisors through interview revealed that the effectiveness of secondary schools understudy in communicating and promoting the importance of education in the community was low. Data obtained from document analysis confirmed that the secondary schools understudy were not effective in communicating and promoting the importance of education in the community. Therefore, based on data obtained from principals and supervisors and the researcher's document analysis, confirmed that the secondary schools understudy were ineffective in communicating and promoting the importance of education in the community.

As described by MoE (2007), in promoting education, schools should advertise its achievements positively to the outside community to create awareness on the advantages and benefit of the school's activities through newsletters and other communication methods. Though schools are expected to promote education by advertising their achievements positively to the outside community through newsletters and other communication methods, the practice of communicating and promoting the importance of education in the community was not satisfactory.

4.3. The Extent of SIP Implementation in Meeting the Desired Objectives

As described MoE (2007c) document, the main objective of school improvement is increasing the learning outcome of students by changing the students' behavior and learning conditions. In Ethiopia, SIP has three specific objectives. The responses of the subject teachers and SIC members related to the three objectives of SIP were analyzed and discussed as follows

Table 8 Responses of Teachers and SIC Related to the Extent of SIP Implementation in Meeting the Desired Objectives

No	Items	Teachers (N=163)		SIC (N=27)		AV. Mean
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	
1	Improve students' learning and their learning outcome substantially	3.60	0.05	3.63	0.12	3.62
2	Brining success by creating a transparent, engaging and accountable school system	2.37	0.05	2.37	0.12	2.37
3	Enabling schools to enjoy extensive administrative freedom by structuring the management and administration in decentralized manner	3.62	0.05	3.56	0.11	3.59
Aggregate Mean		3.20	0.08	3.19	0.21	3.19

According to the table 8, in response to item 1, both teachers and SIC members rated the item as high and agreed to the statement that their school enabled to improve students' learning and their learning outcomes (achievement) substantially with the mean value of 3.60 and 3.63 and (S.D=0.05) and (S.D=0.12) respectively.

Thus, the response of teachers and SIC members for this item with average mean of 3.62 which is greater than the aggregate mean value of 3.19 indicates that secondary schools understudy were able to improve students' learning and their learning outcome substantially. In addition, data obtained from principals and supervisors and the researcher's document analysis confirmed that the achievement of secondary schools understudy in improving students' learning and their learning outcomes (achievement) was high. However, the extent of improving students' learning and their learning outcomes was a slow and gradual process.

Concerning, item 2 of Table 8 both teachers and SIC members respondents rated the item as low and expressed their disagreement with the statement that schools bring success by creating a transparent, engaging and accountable school system with the mean value of 2.37 and 2.37 and (S.D=0.05) and (S.D=0.12) respectively. Thus, the responses of teachers and SIC members for this item with average mean of 2.37 which is less than the grand aggregate mean value of 3.19 revealed that the achievement of secondary schools understudy in bringing success by creating a transparent, engaging and accountable school system was low. This was caused by the weakness of school leadership to implement shared leadership and collective responsibility in school system.

On the other hand, data obtained from school principals in secondary schools understudy revealed that schools were able to bring success by creating a transparent, engaging and accountable school system. This showed that the opinion of teachers and SIC members was different from principals. However, data obtained from document analysis confirmed that schools understudy had problems in creating a transparent, engaging and accountable school system. Therefore, based on the response of teachers and SIC members and document analysis secondary schools understudy were not able to bring success by creating a transparent, engaging and accountable school system

With regard to item 3 of Table 8 both the rating of teachers and SIC member respondents indicated that schools have enjoyed extensive administrative freedom by structuring the management and administration in decentralized manner with the mean value of 3.62 and 3.56 and (S.D=0.05) and (S.D=0.11) respectively. Thus, the responses of teachers and SIC members for this item with average mean of 3.59 which is greater than the grand aggregate mean value of 3.19 revealed that schools understudy were able to enjoy extensive administrative freedom by structuring the management and administration in decentralized manner.

In addition, data obtained from school principals and supervisors through interview confirmed that secondary schools understudy have enjoyed extensive administrative freedom by structuring the management and administration in decentralized manner. Therefore, based on the responses of the majority of teachers and SIC members and data obtained from principals and supervisors, it is possible to conclude that the secondary schools understudy were able to enjoy extensive administrative freedom by structuring the management and administration in decentralized manner.

4.4. Factors Affecting the Implementation of School Improvement Program

Various factors may affect the successful implementation of school improvement program. In the following table, the responses of the subject teachers and SIC members related to the factors that affect the implementation of SIP were analyzed and discussed as follows

Table 9 Responses of Teachers & SIC on Factors that Affect the Implementation of SIP

No	Items	Teachers (N=163)		SIC (N=27)		AV. Mean
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	
1	Lack of training and awareness for the stake holders to participate in SIP	3.55	0.03	3.33	0.06	3.44
2	Lack of good self assessment of schools in the process of SIP plan preparation	3.70	0.05	3.56	0.11	3.63
3	Developing school improvement plan without involving all stakeholders	3.71	0.06	3.56	0.11	3.64
4	Inability of the school leadership to coordinate efforts of all stake holders for SIP implementation	3.74	0.06	3.52	0.10	3.63
5	Ineffective use of financial and material resources to support the achievement of high level of students attainment	3.79	0.06	3.74	0.14	3.77
6	Lack of encouragement for effective teachers, school leaders, SIC members and parents who played a positive role for SIP implementation	3.55	0.04	3.33	0.06	3.44
7	Poor performance of SIC to play their role in the planning and implementation of school improvement program.	3.59	0.05	3.63	0.12	3.61
8	Lack of effective follow up , monitoring and supervision of school activities	3.62	0.05	3.52	0.10	3.57
Aggregate Mean		3.66	0.05	3.52	0.1	3.59

As shown in table 9, the rating of respondents on the factors that affect the implementation of SIP indicated that the mean scores were rated as high for items 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 with the mean score of 3.70, 3.71, 3.74, 3.79, 3.59, 3.62 and (S.D=0.05, 0.06, 0.06, 0.06, 0.05, and 0.05) for teachers respectively and 3.56, 3.56, 3.52, 3.74, 3.63, 3.52 and (S.D=0.11, 0.11, 0.10, 0.14, 0.12 and 0.10) for SIC members. For items 1 and 6 teachers rated as high with mean score of 3.55 for both items and (S.D=0.03, 0.04) and SIC members rated as moderate with mean scores of 3.33 for both items and (S.D=0.06) for both items.

However, the overall mean scores of both teachers and SIC respondents fell at high level with aggregate mean values of 3.66 and (S.D =0.14) and 3.52 (S.D =0.30) respectively.

With regard to item 1 of Table 9, the rating of teachers with the mean value of 3.55 and (S.D=0.03) showed their agreement about lack of training and awareness for all stake holders to participate in SIP implementation. On the other hand SIC members have expressed their uncertainty about lack of training and awareness for all stake holders to participate in SIP implementation with the mean value of 3.33 and (S.D=0.06).The overall mean of both teachers and SIC members 3.44 showed that uncertainty of the majority of respondents with the issue. In addition, data collected from school principals and supervisors through interview and document analysis regarding this item indicated that there was lack of training and awareness for all stake holders to participate in SIP implementation. This was mainly because of weakness of SIC and financial constraints. Therefore, from the discussion it can be deduced that the practice of providing training and awareness for all stake holders that enabled them to participate in SIP implementation was low. The MoE (2007) document emphasized importance of training and indicated that in advance the school improvement committee should provide training at the school level for teachers, students, parents and the community as well.

With respect to item 2 of Table 9, both the rating of teachers and SIC members with the mean value of 3.70 and 3.56 and (S.D=0.05) and (S.D=0.11) showed their agreement with the statement that there was lack of good self assessment of schools in the process of SIP plan preparation. In some schools SIP plan was copied from the previous year SIP plan without identifying strengths and weakness of the school. In addition, data collected from school principals and supervisors through interview and through document analysis regarding this item indicated that the practice of conducting thorough self assessment before preparing SIP plan was low. Therefore, from the above discussion, it can be deduced that the practice of conducting thorough self assessment of schools to identify strengths and weakness before SIP plan preparation was not satisfactory.

Concerning item 3 of Table 9, the rating of both teachers and SIC members with the mean score of 3.71 and 3.56 and (S.D=0.06) and (S.D=0.11) respectively showed that schools developed SIP plan without involving all stake holders. Moreover, data collected from school principals and

supervisors through interview and document analysis regarding this item indicated the practice of involving all stake holders in SIP plan development was low. Even in some schools SIP plan was prepared by school principals without involving others. Therefore, from the above result obtained through questionnaire, interviews and document analysis it can be deduced that the schools understudy developed SIP plan without involving all stake holders.

With regard to item 4 of Table 9, the rating of teachers with the mean score of 3.74 and (S.D=0.06) the rating SIC members with the mean score of 3.52 and (S.D=0.10) showed that school leadership was not able to coordinate efforts of all stake holders for SIP implementation. Moreover, data collected from school principals and supervisors through interview regarding this item indicated that school leadership has its own limitation in coordinating efforts of all stake holders for SIP implementation. Therefore, it can be deduced that in the secondary schools understudy, school leadership lacked the skills of coordinating efforts of all stake holders for SIP implementation.

With respect to item 5 of Table 9, both teachers and SIC members rated the item as high with the mean score of 3.79 and 3.74 and (S.D=0.06) and (S.D=0.14) respectively showed that the use of financial and material resources of schools to support high students' achievement was ineffective. In addition data obtained from principals and supervisors through interview and document analysis regarding this item confirmed that the use of financial and material resources of schools to support high students' achievement was ineffective. Even in some schools understudy, school grant budget was used for decoration of offices and maintenance of fences and for activities that has no direct impact on students learning outcomes. Therefore, from the above discussion it can be deduced that in the secondary schools understudy, the practice of using financial and material resources of schools for activities that directly support high students' achievement was not effective.

With regard to item 6 of Table 9, teachers rated as high with the mean value of 3.55 and (S.D=0.04) showed that there was lack of encouragement or motivation for effective teachers, school leaders, SIC members and parents who played a positive role for SIP implementation. On the other hand SIC members rated this item as moderate with the mean value of 3.33 and (S.D=0.06). In addition, data collected from school principals and supervisors through interview

regarding this item indicated that the practice of encouragement or motivation for effective teachers, school leaders; SIC members and parents who played a positive role for SIP implementation was low. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that in the secondary schools understudy, the practice of motivating effective teachers, school leaders; SIC members and parents who played a positive role in SIP implementation was not satisfactory

As can be observed in item 7 of Table 9, both teachers and SIC members rated this item as high, with the mean score of 3.59 and 3.63 and (S.D=0.05) and (S.D=0.12) respectively showed that SIC had poor performance in the planning and implementation of school improvement program. This was mainly because of lack of training and awareness of SIC members. Moreover, data collected from school principals and supervisors through interview and document analysis regarding this item confirmed that in the school understudy, the performances of SIC in the planning and implementation of SIP was low or insignificant. This poor performance can hinder effective implementation of SIP. Therefore, from the above discussion, it can be deduced that in the secondary schools understudy, poor performance of SIC members in the planning and implementation of school improvement program was one of the factors that hinder effective implementation of SIP.

Concerning item 8 of Table 9, both teachers and SIC members rated this item as high with the mean score of 3.62 and 3.52 and (S.D=0.05) and (S.D=0.10) respectively and this showed that there was lack of effective follow up, monitoring and supervision of SIP plan implementation. Moreover, data collected from school principals and supervisors through interview and document analysis regarding this item confirmed that the practice of effective follow up, monitoring and supervision of SIP plan implementation was absent. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that in the secondary schools understudy, effective follow up, monitoring and supervision of SIP plan implementation was not effectively exercised.

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with summary, conclusion and recommendations. In this section first, a summary of the study and the major findings are made. Second, conclusions of the fundamental findings are drawn. Lastly, some possible recommendations are made on the basis of the findings of the study.

5.1. Summary

The purpose of the study was to assess the implementation of SIP and identify the challenges encountered in the implementation process in Secondary Schools of Harari Region. In order to achieve this purpose the following basic questions were raised in the study.

1. To what extent secondary schools in Harari Regional State have implemented the four domains of SIP?
2. To what extent the implementation of SIP achieved its desired objectives in Secondary Schools of Harari Regional State?
3. What were the challenges encountered in implementing SIP?

The study was conducted in four public secondary schools that were selected by purposive sampling technique. Sample size of the study was 9 principals and vice principals, 27 SIC members, 163 teachers and 4 supervisors selected by available sampling technique. To achieve the very objectives of the study, data were gathered mainly through questionnaire, interview guides and document analysis. The questionnaire was piloted before it was distributed to the respondents. Both quantitative and qualitative data obtained through data gathering tools were analyzed by using percentage, mean scores, standard deviation and t-test.

Based on the analysis of basic questions and interpretations of data, the major findings of the study are summarized as follows.

The greater majority of principals and vice principals, SIC members and subject teachers and all the supervisors assigned in sample secondary schools were males. The numbers of females working in secondary schools in managerial and leadership positions and subject teachers were limited. With regard to educational background; greater majority of subject teachers teaching in

secondary schools and principals had first degree, while majority of supervisors had second degree. With respect to teachers' working load majority of them had a working load of 8 – 12 periods/week.

With regard to the implementation of teaching and learning domain: the practice of teachers' participation in continuous professional development, teachers' effectiveness in improving students' result and developing and using supplementary materials in the classroom were good. On the other hand, employing active learning methods and a range of continuous assessment methods in the classroom, the result of study indicated that the practice was poor.

Regarding the implementation of learning environment domain: the practices of motivations and participation of students in the lesson was satisfactory and good. On the other hand, the habit of taking responsibilities and leading a disciplined life among students, provision of quality school facilities for all staff and children and the presence of collaborative works at the school and community level to support inclusive education the result of study indicated that the practice was low and unsatisfactory.

Concerning the implementation of school leadership and management domain, structures and processes that support shared leadership and collective responsibility for student learning were put in place. Moreover, the practice of effectively communicating and following school policies and regulations were encouraging. But the study revealed that, carrying out schools' decisions and administrative processes, the practice was low.

With respect to the implementation of community involvement domain: teachers' practice of meeting with parents and providing quality reports about their children's learning achievement was fairly good. Moreover, the schools' practice of communicating and promoting the importance of education to the community was moderately implemented. But mobilizing the community to provide resources to support implementation of school improvement plan, the practice was low.

Considering SIP implementation in meeting the desired objectives: the practice of improving students' learning and their learning outcomes was successfully achieved its intended objective. Moreover, the practice of enabling schools to enjoy extensive administrative freedom by

structuring the management and administration in decentralized manner was implemented effectively and achieved its intended objective. On the other hand, the objective of enabling schools to become effective by ensuring transparent, engaging, accountable school system and democratic practices was far from achieving its intended objectives.

Regarding the challenges that encountered SIP implementation: the study showed that: inability of the school leadership to coordinate efforts of all stakeholders for SIP implementation, developing school improvement plan without involving all stakeholders and ineffective use of financial and material resources for activities that directly support improvement of students learning were some of the factors that hampered effective implementation of SIP. Moreover, lack of good self assessment of schools in the process of SIP plan preparation and lack of effective follow up, monitoring and supervision of school activities and poor performance of SIC members in playing their role in the planning and implementation process of school improvement program were among the challenges that need great attention

5.2. Conclusions

The main concern of the study was to assess the implementation of the four domains of SIP. Secondly the study attempted to investigate the extent of SIP implementation in meeting the intended objectives. The study also tried to identify the challenges that hampered the proper implementation of SIP in Secondary Schools of Harari Region.

Based on the findings of the study, the following major conclusions were drawn:

With regard to characteristics of respondents: it can be concluded that in the secondary schools understudy teaching and leadership position is overwhelmingly dominated by males and the number of female in the position of educational leader was limited. With regard to the qualification of respondents, study demonstrated that greater majority of subject teachers and supervisors of secondary schools have appropriate educational qualification and greater majority of subject teachers had sufficient teaching experiences

In relation to the extent of secondary schools in implementing the four domains of SIP: the finding of the study demonstrated that: the practices of regularly using active learning methods and employing a range of assessment methods in the classroom from the teaching and learning

domain; the practices of developing a habit of taking responsibilities and leading a disciplined life among students and provision of quality school facilities from learning environment domain; the practice of carrying out schools decisions and administrative processes from leadership and management domain; the practice of mobilizing the community to provide resources for SIP implementation and communicating and promoting the importance of education to the community; from community involvement domain were not effectively implemented by the secondary schools understudy.

In general, the finding of the study demonstrated that secondary schools understudy have implemented the four domains of SIP at moderate level, it is impossible to conclude that they are implemented as expected. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that even though secondary schools generally seem to perform moderately on the four domains of SIP, still there are some basic activities which were not properly accomplished by secondary schools.

With regard to the extent of SIP implementation in meeting the desired objectives, it is possible to conclude that even though secondary schools understudy generally seem to perform moderately on achieving the desired objectives of SIP, its implementation could not fully achieved the desired results.

Concerning the factors that affect SIP implementation, it is possible to conclude that, lack of good self assessment of schools to identify strengths and weakness before SIP plan preparation, inability of school leadership in coordinating all stakeholders for SIP implementation, poor performance of SIC in accomplishing their duties and lack of effective follow up, monitoring and supervision of school activities were the major factors that hampered effective implementation of SIP.

Moreover, problem of obtaining sufficient funds and ineffective use of financial and material resources for school activities and lack of encouragement for effective teachers, school leaders; SIC members and parents who played a positive role for SIP implementation were also additional factors that affected SIP implementation in the secondary schools understudy.

5.3. Recommendations

On the bases of findings obtained and the conclusion drawn, the following recommendations were forwarded to improve the practices of school improvement program (SIP) implementation in secondary schools of Harari Regional State.

For effective implementation of the four domains of SIP:

1. Subject teachers should regularly implement various active learning methods and employ a range of assessments in the classroom to support underperforming students.
2. It is advisable for HREB to equip secondary schools with quality school facilities like standardized laboratory, library, teaching materials and other services.
3. It is also advisable to conduct a regular evaluation and reviewing of school's decisions and administrative processes by supervisors to take appropriate and timely measures.
4. The school principals together with SIC, WEO and PTSA should work together to mobilize the community to obtain funds for SIP implementation
5. For SIP implementation to meet the desired objectives the HREB and WEO should provide training for school principals, SIC, PTSA and subject teachers to build their capacity to perform all activities related to SIP implementation effectively
6. For the factors that affect SIP implementation: schools should develop SIP plan after conducting effective self evaluation to identify their strength and weaknesses and implement SIP plan by involving all stakeholders.
7. It is better to organize a continuous program to update the awareness of school principals, SIC by introducing best practices of SIP implementation from abroad and local schools. The HREB and WEO should reward teachers, principals and SIC members who effectively improve students' learning and learning achievement to high standards

6. REFERENCES

- Abera Mekango. 2013. Practices and Challenges of Implementation of School Improvement Program in Secondary Schools of Metekel Zone. M.A. Thesis, Jimma University, Jimma, Ethiopia.
- Akyeampong, K. 2004. Whole school development: EFA monitoring report commissioned study, Ghana.
- Anderson, K. 2000. School improvement and school reform in Canada... whose perspective is it? 2000. Ways towards quality in education. International Conference proceedings. Brdo Pri Kranjo. Slovenia. Accessed from web on 5/1/2012
- Anderson, S. and Mundy, K. 2014. School Improvement in Developing Countries: Experiences and Lessons Learned. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto
- Asmaru Berihun. Adane Tesera, and Daniel Desta, 2006. Enhancing Active Learning Through Teachers' Peer and Self Reflection in Selected Primary Schools in Ethiopia, A Research project presented at Africa-Asia University Dialogue for Basic Education Development, CICE Hiroshima University: p2
- Australian Capital Territory. 2009. School Improvement Framework Canberra, Accessed from the web at www.det.act.gov.au on 10/042012.
- Bergeson, T. 2005. Instruction School Improvement: Planning Process Guide. 3rd Edition, 1st available online at: <http://www.k12.wa.us/SchoolImprovement/sipguide.aspx>
- Bryk, A. 2010. Organizing Schools for Improvement Carnegie: Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Stanford, Calif.USA.
- Canadian Education Association. Can be reached at. www.accesscopyright.ca, accessed on 12/18/2016.
- Catholic Relief Services (CRS). 2009. School Improvement Plans. Ecuador accessed from web on 12/20/2016.
- Chinsamy, B. 2002. Successful School Improvement and the Educational District Office in South Africa: Some Emerging Propositions. Developed Under the District Development Support Program Project. USAID
- Chi-Shing, C. 2006. School improvement through university school partnership: A case study in Hong Kong primary school. Chinese University of Hong Kong.

- Creemers, B. 2001. Capacity for Change and Adaptation of Schools in the case of Effective School Improvement, *GION Institute for Educational Research*, University of Groningen, the Netherlands.
- Creemers, M. & Kyriakides L. 2010. Using the Dynamic Model to develop an evidence-based and theory-driven approach to school improvement, *Irish Educational Studies* 29(1) 5-23
- Earl, L. Torrance, N. Sutherland, S., Fullan, M. and Ali, S. 2003. Manitoba School Improvement Program: Final Evaluation Report. University of Toronto, Ontario.
- Edmonds, R. 1982. Programs of School Improvement: An Overview. National Institute of Education, Washington DC
- Edmonds, R. 1983. An Overview of School Improvement Programs, Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, Michigan.
- Education Sector Support Program in Nigeria's (ESSPIN). 2010. Raising pupil achievement through school improvement: A practice-based approach. Accessed from web on 12/29/2016
- Fullan, M. 1985. Change Processes and Strategies at the Local Level. *Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. The Elementary School Journal* Volume 85(3) 17-19
- Fullan, M. 2008. From School Effectiveness to System Improvement: An Inevitable Conceptual Evolution Paper prepared for *Journal für Schulentwicklung* OISE/University of Toronto
- Glatter, R. Preedy, M., Riches, G., and M. Masterton, 1988, Understanding School Management, Open University press, Milton Keynes, Philadelphia
- Habtamu Dufera. 2014. Assessment of the Implementation of School Improvement Program in Selected Secondary Schools of West Wollega Zone. MA Thesis. Addis Ababa University
- Harris. A. 2000. Successful School Improvement in the United Kingdom and Canada. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, Issue #15,
- Harris, A. and Chris peels J. 2006. Improving Schools and Educational Systems. Rutledge. New York
- Hopkins, D. Harris, A, Stoll L. and Mackay, T. 2010. School and System Improvement: State of the Art Review. Limassol, Cyprus

- Hopkins, D. and Reynolds, D. 2001. The past, present and future of school improvement: Towards the Third age. *British Educational Research Journal*, 27(4) 459-475
- Khosa, G. 2010. Sustainable School Improvement. A partnership between the state, the private sector and civil society. Jet Education Services. Braamfontein. Accessed from www.jet.org.za 2/24/2013.
- Khosa, G. 2013. Systematic school Improvement Interventions in South Africa. African Minds for JET Education Services. Johannesburg. Accessed from the web on 11/30/2016 www.jet.org.za
- Kifle, D and Tariku S. 2014, investigating factors that affect the implementation of school improvement program in Gambeltu Cluster, *International Journal of Innovative and Applied Research*, 2(5) 34-37
- Lasonen, J. , Kemppainen, R. and Raheem , K. 2005. Education and training in Ethiopia: An evaluation of approaching EFA goals. *Institute for Educational Research, University of Jyväskylä. Finland*
- Leithwood, K. 2004. Parents' Participation in School Improvement Processes Canadian Education Association. Can be reached at www.accesscopyright.ca accessed on 12/18/2016.
- Macgregor, 2005. School Improvement planning: process Guide, Office of Superintendent of public Instruction Olympia, WA 98504-7200:
- Makoelle, T. 2014. Exploring Factors Contributing to School Improvement in South African Secondary Schools in the Free State Province *Int J Edu Sci*, 7(1): 119-130
- Masters, G. 2012. Measuring and Rewarding School Improvement. Australian Council for Educational Research. Melbourne
- MoE 1994. The Education Training Policy and Its Implementation, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Ethiopia.
- MoE 2005a. Program Action Plan ESDPIII, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Ethiopia.
- _____ MoE 2005b. School Improvement policy Framework, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Ethiopia.
- _____ MoE 2006a. JRM of ESDPIII, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Ethiopia.
- _____ MoE 2006b. JRM of ESDPII, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Ethiopia.
- _____ MoE 2006c. JRM of ESDPIII, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Ethiopia.

- _____ MoE 2007a. School Improvement Framework, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Ethiopia.
- _____ MoE 2007b. School Improvement Guide Line, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Ethiopia.
- _____ MoE 2007c. School Improvement program Implementation Manual, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Ethiopia
- _____ MoE 2008a. Review of the Ethiopian Education Training Policy and its Implementation Executive Summary, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Ethiopia
- _____ MoE 2008b. General Education Quality Improvement Package, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Ethiopia
- _____ MoE 2010. Education Sector Development Program IV, Program Action Plan, Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education, Ethiopia
- _____ MoE. 2011. Education Sector Development Program III. Program Action Plan. Addis Ababa
- Moyle, K. 2016. Using data, conversations and observations for school improvement. *Australian Council for Educational Research can be reached through web on www.acer.edu.au accessed on 12/29/2016.*
- Odada, M. , Omagor, M. and Siraj-Blatchford, I. 1997. The school improvement project of the Aga Khan Education Service Uganda. Uganda Aga Khan Foundation.
- OECD, 2008. A Report on Education and Training policy: Improving School Leadership, vol1, Policy and Practice: Paris, France: p2
- OECD, 2015. Education Policy Outlook 2015: Making Reforms Happen, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264225442-en>
- Pollard, A., and I., Bourne, 1994, Teaching and Learning in the Primary Schools, Open University, London: P255
- Potter, D., and G., Powell, 1992. Managing a Better School. Heinemann Educational, A division of Heinemann Publishers (oxford) L.td, Oxford,, London.
- Reddy, S. 2007. School Quality. Perspectives from the Developed and Developing Countries. Azim Bremji Foundation. India.
- Reynolds, D., Hopkins, D., Potter, D., Joy ford L. and Chapman, C. 2001, School Improvement for Schools facing Challenging Circumstances: A Review of Research and Practice. Nottingham, UK.

- Reynolds R, Hopkins D & Stoll L. 1993, Linking School Effectiveness Knowledge and School Improvement Practice: *Towards a Synergy in School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 4(1), 37-58 accessed from web on 9/30/12
- Rolheiser, C. 2009. School Improvement and Teacher Development: Complex, Challenging, and Connected. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE) accessed from web on www.oise.utoronto.ca
- Sadker, M.P., and D.M., Sadker, 2003, Teachers, Schools and Society. McGraw-Hill Higher Education, New York:
- Sanni, K. 2015. Taking school improvement to scale: the Education Sector Support Program in Nigeria. Cambridge Education, Demeter Cambridge. United Kingdom.
- Seyoum Ararso.2014 Leadership effectiveness of school leaders in implementing school improvement program in Ilubabor zone government secondary schools. Unpublished MA Thesis Jimma University.
- Solomon, M. 2016, Stakeholders Views About Preparation for Implementation of School Improvement Program, *Research in Pedagogy*, 6(2)
- Thompson, J. 2007. A History and Analysis of School Improvement Planning. Michigan State University. USA accessed from web on 2/17/2011.
- Tiongson, E.2005. Education Policy Reforms. Europe and Central Asia Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Group. Washington, DC. Accessed from web on 7/15/2016.
- Tracy, R. 2013. School Improvement Plans at Portland Public Schools. Portland, OR USA.
- UNESCO. 2004. Education for All, The Quality Imperative.7, Place de Fontenoy. Paris. France
- UNESCO. 2015. The EFA Global Monitoring Report. 7, Place de Fontenoy. Unesco Publishing. Paris France
- U.S. Department of Education. 2006. LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. Washington DC. Accessed from web on 10/25/2016
- Wijesundera, S. 2002 School Improvement: an action-based case study conducted in a disadvantaged school in Sri Lanka. *Educational Action Research*, Volume 10, Number 2. Accessed from the web on 13/06/2017.

World Bank, 2008, Project Appraisal Document on Proposed Credit to The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia In support of The First Phase of The General Education Quality Improvement Program: p79

Wudu Melese, 2007, School Curriculum Committee: It's Role in Curriculum Implementation, the Case of Amhara Region, *Jimma University: P75*

7. APPENDICES

7.1. Appendix 1

Questionnaires (Rating Scale) for Teachers

This rating scale is designed for gathering data required to evaluate the success of your school in implementing school improvement program and to identify the challenges that affect proper implementation of the program. Your genuine response to the questions will have significant contribution for the success of this study. Your response will be kept confidential and be used only for the purposes of the study. Note-you do not need to write your name on the questionnaire. Thank you very much for genuine cooperation.

Part One Personal Data

Direction: kindly put < ✓ > mark in a box provided in front of each item or give your response to the following items in the blank space provided.

1. Name of the school _____
2. Your Department _____
3. Qualification: Diploma , First Degree , Second Degree
4. Sex: Male , Female
5. Age (20-25) , (26-30) (31-35) (36-40) , (Above 40)
6. Numbers of years of teaching experiences (include work in other location:
(0-5) , (6-10) , (11-15) , (16-20) , (21-25) , (26-30) ,
(31 or more) ,
6. Years working in this school: (0-5) , (6-10) , (11-15) , (16-20) ,
(21 or more)
7. Grade taught: (9) , (10)
8. Numbers of periods per/week: (8-12) , (13-16) , (17-20) , (21-24)
(25 or more)

Part Two Rating Scale

Direction: The following statements are performance of how your school has successfully implemented the standards of practices under the four domains and elements of school improvement program. Think about your school as you read each of the statement below. Then indicate your agreement or disagreement to the statements by putting < ✓ > mark in one of the boxes that best describes your position on the scale.

No	Domain 1: Teaching and Learning <i>Element (I): Teaching</i>	Strongl y Agree	Ag ree	Unde cided	Disa gree	Strongly Disagree
1	Teachers have participated in continuous professional development (CPD), in order to learn new knowledge to apply in the classroom					
2	Teachers use active learning methods in the classroom to realize improved learning results					
3	Teachers achieve measurable improvements in student results					
4	A range of assessment methods are used in each grade to assess student learning, and based on the results, teachers provide extra teaching support to underperforming students.					
5	Teachers develop and use supplementary materials in the classroom to improve student learning.					

	Domain 2: Learning Environment Element (i) :Student empowerment	Strongl y Agree	Ag ree	Unde cided	Disa gree	Strongly Disagree
6	Students have developed a habit of taking responsibilities and leading a disciplined life.					
7	Students are motivated to learn and actively participate in lessons					
8	There is collaborative work at the school and community levels to support inclusive education for children and teachers with special needs.					

No	Domain 3: School Leadership . Element (i) :School management	Strongl y Agree	Ag ree	Unde cided	Disa gree	Strongly Disagree
10	Structures and processes exist to support shared leadership in which everyone has collective responsibility for student learning.					
11	School polices, regulations and procedures are effectively communicated and followed.					
12	The schools decision-making and administrative processes (including data collection and analysis, and communicating with parents) are carried out effectively.					

No	Domain 4: Community Participation	Strongl y Agree	Ag ree	Unde cided	Disa gree	Strongly Disagree
13	Teachers meet with parents when necessary, and at a minimum twice per semester, to provide quality reports and to discuss their child's learning achievement					
14	Schools successfully mobilize the community to provide resources to support implementation of the School Improvement Plan.					
15	Schools are active in communicating and promoting the importance of education in the community.					

Part Three

Direction: The following statements are designed to know how far the implementation of SIP in your school meeting the desired SIPs objectives. Read each of the statement below and indicate your agreement to the statement by putting $< \checkmark >$ mark in one of the boxes that best describes your positions on the scale.

No	Statements of objectives of SIP	Strongl y Agree	Ag ree	Unde cided	Disa gree	Strongly Disagree
1	Improving students' learning and their learning outcomes to a high standard.					
2	Brining success by creating a transparent, engaging and accountable school system					
3	Enabling schools to enjoy extensive administrative freedom by structuring the management and administration in decentralized manner					

Part Four

Direction: This rating scale is designed to gather data that helps to know the possible factors that affect the proper implementation of SIP in your school. Lists of statements that can affect the implementation of SIP are given below. Read each statement below and indicate your agreement or disagreement to the statement by putting <✓> mark in one of the boxes that best describes your position on the scale.

Standard	Domain 1: Teaching and Learning <i>Element (I): Teaching</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	Lack of training and awareness for the stake holders to participate in SIP					
2	Lack of good self assessment of schools in the process of SIP plan preparation					
3	Developing school improvement plan without involving all stakeholders					
4	Inability of the school leadership to coordinate efforts of all stake holders for SIP implementation					
5	Ineffective use of financial and material resources to support the achievement of high level of students attainment					
6	Lack of encouragement for effective teachers, school leaders, SIC members and parents who played a positive role for SIP implementation					
7	Poor performance of SIC to play their role in the planning and implementation of school improvement program.					
8	Lack of effective follow up , monitoring and supervision of school activities					

Others mention

7.2. Appendix 2

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE
Department of Educational Planning and Management

Title-Evaluating the Implementation of School Improvement Program in First Cycle Secondary

Schools: the case of Harari Region

Interview Guides

Interview for Supervisors

Name of Interviewees _____

Sex _____ Qualification _____

Date of interview _____

I. General Information.

Did you take any leadership/ management training?

In certificate _____ diploma, Degree _____ Masters Degree _____

II. Information on the implementation of school improvement program (implementation of the four domains of school)

1. How do you assess the efforts of your school in implementing the four domains of SIP?
2. To what extent the implementation of SIP in your school meeting the desired SIPS objectives?
 - 2.1. Has your school improved students learning and their learning achievement to a high standard?

2.2. Has your school ensured good governance and democratic practices by exercising shared, transparent and accountable decision making and governance?

2.3. Has your school enjoyed extensive administrative freedom through structuring the management and administration in decentralized manner?

3. What problems did your school face in effectively implementing the four domains of SIP?
Such as

7.3. Appendix 3

Questionnaires (Rating Scale) for SIC Members

This rating scale is designed for gathering data required to evaluate the success of your school in implementing school improvement program and to identify the challenges that affect proper implementation of the program. Your genuine response to the questions will have significant contribution for the success of this study. Your response will be kept confidential and be used only for the purposes of the study.

Note-you do not need to write your name on the questionnaire. Thank you very much for genuine cooperation.

Part One Personal Data

Direction: kindly put < ✓ > mark in a box provided in front of each item or give your response to the following items in the blank space provided.

7. Qualification: Grade 10 Complete , Diploma , 1st Degree , 2nd Degree

8. Sex: Male , Female

9. Age (20-25) , (26-30) , (31-35) , (36-40) , (Above 40)

Part Two Rating Scale

Direction: The following statements are performance of how your school has successfully implemented the standards of practices under the four domains and elements of school improvement program. Think about your school as you read each of the statement below. Then indicate your agreement or disagreement to the statements by putting < ✓ > mark in one of the boxes that best describes your position on the scale.

No	Domain 1: Teaching and Learning <i>Element (I): Teaching</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	Teachers have participated in continuous professional development (CPD), in order to learn new knowledge to apply in the classroom					
2	Teachers use active learning methods in the classroom to realize improved learning results					
3	Teachers achieve measurable improvements in student results					
4	A range of assessment methods are used in each grade to assess student learning, and based on the results, teachers provide extra teaching support to underperforming students.					
5	Teachers develop and use supplementary materials in the classroom to improve student learning.					

No	Domain 2: Learning Environment Element (i) :Student empowerment	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6	Students have developed a habit of taking responsibilities and leading a disciplined life.					
7	Students are motivated to learn and actively participate in lessons					
8	There is collaborative work at the school and community levels to support inclusive education for children and teachers with special needs.					
9	Schools provide quality school facilities that enable all staff to work well and all children to learn.					

No	Domain 3: School Leadership Element (i) :School management	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
10	Structures and processes exist to support shared leadership and collective responsibility for student learning.					
11	School policies, regulations and procedures are effectively communicated and followed.					
12	The schools decision-making and administrative processes are carried out effectively.					

No	Domain 4: Community Participation Element (i) : Working with parents	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
13	Teachers meet with parents when necessary, and at a minimum twice per semester, to provide quality reports and to discuss their child's learning achievement					
14	Schools successfully mobilize the community to provide resources to support implementation of the School Improvement Plan.					
15	Schools are active in communicating and promoting the importance of education in the community.					

Part Three

Direction: The following statements are designed to know how far the implementation of SIP in your school meeting the desired SIPs objectives. Read each of the statement below and indicate your agreement to the statement by putting < ✓ > mark in one of the boxes that best describes your positions on the scale.

No	Statements of objectives of SIP	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	Improving students' learning and their learning outcomes and ethics to a high standard.					
2	Brining success by creating a transparent, engaging and accountable school system					
3	Enabling schools to enjoy extensive administrative freedom by structuring the management and administration in decentralized manner					

Part Four

Direction: This rating scale is designed to gather data that helps to know the possible factors that affect the proper implementation of SIP in your school. Lists of statements that can affect the implementation of SIP are given below. Read each statement below and indicate your agreement or disagreement to the statement by putting <✓> mark in one of the boxes that best describes your position on the scale.

Standard	Domain 1: Teaching and Learning <i>Element (I): Teaching</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	Lack of training and awareness for the stake holders to participate in SIP					
2	Lack of good self assessment of schools in the process of SIP plan preparation					
3	Developing school improvement plan without involving all stakeholders					
4	Inability of the school leadership to coordinate efforts of all stake holders for SIP implementation					
5	Ineffective use of financial and material resources to support the achievement of high level of students attainment					
6	Lack of encouragement for effective teachers, school leaders, SIC members and parents who played a positive role for SIP implementation					
7	Poor performance of SIC to play their role in the planning and implementation of school improvement program.					
8	Lack of effective follow up , monitoring and supervision of school activities					

Others mention
