

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF GENERAL EDUCATION QUALITY  
IMPROVEMENT PACKAGE (GEQIP) FUND IN BRINGING  
QUALITY EDUCATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF  
HARARI NATIONAL REGIONAL STATE**

**MA THESIS**

**HASSEN ZERU AYENEW**

**AUGUST, 2017**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY, HARAMAYA**

**he Effectiveness of General Education Quality Improvement Package  
(GEQIP) Fund in Bringing Quality Education in Secondary Schools of  
Harari National Regional State**

**A Thesis Submitted to Department of Educational Planning and Management  
Postgraduate Program Directorate**

**Haramaya University**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of**

**Master of Educational Leadership**

**Hassen Zeru Ayenew**

**August, 2017**

**Haramaya University, Haramaya**

**DEDICATION**

I dedicate this manuscript to my father ZERU AYENEW (1931-1992).

**POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**

As thesis research advisors, we hereby certify that we have read and evaluated the thesis prepared, under our guidance, by Hassen Zeru, entitled “The Effectiveness of General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) fund in Bringing Quality Education in Secondary Schools of Hariri Regional State.” We recommend that it can be accepted as fulfilling the thesis requirement for the degree of MA in Educational Leadership.

_____	_____	_____
Major Advisor	Signature	Date

_____	_____	_____
Co-Advisor	Signature	Date

As members of the examining board of the final MA thesis open defense, we certify that we have read and evaluated the thesis prepared by Hassen Zeru and examined the candidate. We recommended that the thesis be accepted as fulfilling the thesis requirement for the Degree of Master of Arts in Educational leadership.

_____	_____	_____
Chairperson	Signature	Date

_____	_____	_____
Internal Examiner	Signature	Date

_____	_____	_____
External Examiner	Signature	Date

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

## STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR

By my signature below, I declare and affirm that this thesis is my own work and that all sources of materials used for this thesis have been duly acknowledged. I have followed all ethical and technical principles of scholarship in the preparation, data collection, data analysis and compilation of this thesis.

This Thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an M.A. degree at the Haramaya University and is deposited at the University Library to be made available to borrowers under the rules of the Library. I assertively declare that this Thesis has not been submitted to any other institution anywhere for the award of any academic degree, diploma or certificate.

Brief quotations from this Thesis may be made without any special permission provided that accurate and complete acknowledgement of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this thesis in whole or in part may be granted by the director of the postgraduate program or Head of the Department of Educational Planning and Management when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author of the thesis.

Name: Hassen Zeru Ayenew

Date: August/2017

Department: Educational Planning and Management

## **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

The author was born in Gander Town, which is found in Amhara Regional State in July 1973. I attended my elementary and secondary education at Adisalem Elementary School and Fusillades Secondary School respectively. I completed my BA Degree in Amharic Language from Jimma University in 2009 and after that I was employed by Hariri Regional Education Bureau and worked as Abider secondary school administrator. Then, I joined this school of Graduate Studies of Haramaya University in 2013 to pursue MA program in Educational Leadership.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to extend heartfelt gratitude to my major advisor Dr. Get net Demise and co advisor Dr. Sirak Demelash for their valuable professional guidance, constructive comments, suggestions and encouragement starting from proposal development up to thesis research writing and completion.

I would like to thank the school principals, teachers, parent teacher association members (PTA), supervisors and school accountants for the valuable contribution they made. My special thanks extend to my families as a whole especially my brother Osman Abdlkader and my wife Aisha Abdella for their encouragement and special treatment both morally and psychologically to proceed with my education, feel confident and dreaming more.

My thanks go to Haramaya University staff, Ato Mohammed Kadar, Dr. Bihar Adam and others for their valuable support. A special word of thanks goes to who meticulously typed the thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank all of those who have knowingly or otherwise, helped me shape some ideas that have gone in to this study.

## **ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

ABE	Alternative Basic Education
ASS	Abider secondary school
ASSS	Abukir preparatory school
ETB	Ethiopian Birr
FEDO	Finance and Economic Development Office
GEQIP	General Education Quality Improvement Package
HNRS	Hariri National Regional State
HSSS	Harare Senior Secondary School
HSS	Hmarassa Secondary School
MoE	Ministry of Education
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MoFED	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
PTA	Parent Teachers Association
REB	Regional Education Bureau
SASS	Sakep Abdulhi Secondary School
SIP	School Improvement Program
SMC	School Management Committee
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations International Children Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR	iii
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF TABLES IN THE APPENDIX	x
ABSTRACT	xi
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	2
1.3. Research Questions	4
1.4. Objectives of the Study	5
1.4.1. General Objective	5
1.4.2. Specific Objectives	5
1.5. Significance of the Study	5
1.6. Delimitation of the Study	5
1.7. Limitation of the Study	6
1.8. Operational Definition of Key Terms	6
<b>2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1. Definition of Government Budgeting	8
2.2. School Budget in Ethiopia	9
2.3. Sources of the School Budget	11
2.4. Criteria and Mechanisms for Grants' Distribution	11
2.5. The Decision-Making Process of School Grants at the School Level	14
2.6. Utilization and Control of the School Grants	14
2.7. Factors that Affect the Effectiveness of GEQIP Funds in Achieving Quality Education	15
<b>3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1. Research Design	19
3.2. Description of the Study Area	19
3.3. Sources of Data	19
3.3.1. Primary Source	20

**Continues...**

3.3.2.Secondary Source	20
3.4.Population and Sample Size Sampling Technique	20
3.5.Sampling Techniques	20
3.6.Instruments of Data Collection	22
3.6.1.Questionnaires	22
3.6.1.1. Reliability	23
3.6.1.2. Validity	23
3.6.2.Interviews	23
3.6.3.Document review	24
3.7.Data Collection Procedures	24
3.8.Method of Data Analysis	24
<b>4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1.Background of Respondents	26
4.2.GEQIP Budget Preparation	27
4.3.GEQIP Budget Implementation	32
4.4.GEQIP Budget Contribution to Quality Education	35
4.5.Factors that influence GEQIP budget from achieving quality education	38
<b>5. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>46</b>
5.1.Summary	46
5.2.Conclusion	51
5.3.Recommendations	53
<b>6. REFERENCES</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>7. APPENDICES</b>	<b>50</b>
7.1-APPENDX-1 Questionnaire for Teachers	50
7.2-APPENDX-II: Questions for students	63
7.3-APENDEX-III: Interview	67

## LIST OF TABLES IN THE APPENDIX

<b>Table</b>		<b>Page</b>
1.	Block grant allocation per pupil per year at different levels of school	13
2.	School grant allocation per pupil per year at different levels of school	13
3.	School grant allocation per pupil per year at different levels of primary and Secondary school	13
4.	Population, Sample Size and Sampling Technique	22
5.	Background of the respondents	26
6.	The GEQIP Budget Preparation in the School(Mean	28
7.	Who Prepares GEQIP budget at the schoo.	31
8.	How the GEQIP budget plan is prepared	31
9.	GEQIP Budget Implementation	32
10.	GEQIP Budget Contribution to Quality Education	36
11.	Teachers' Response on Factors that Influence GEQIP Budget from Achieving Quality Education(percentage and mean)	38
.		
.		

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF GENERAL EDUCATION QUALITY  
IMPROVEMENT PACKAGE (GEQIP) FUND IN BRINGING QUALITY  
EDUCATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN HARARI NATIONAL  
REGIONAL STATE**

**ABSTRACT**

The main purpose of study is to assess the effectiveness of general education quality improvement package (GEQIP) fund in bringing quality education in secondary schools of Hariri Regional State. To achieve the above objective data were collected from five government secondary schools in Hariri Region. The sample respondents were 5 principals, 5 and vice principals selected by using purposive sampling techniques and 30 students selected by using stratified random sampling techniques, also 5 supervisors, 5 finance officers, 40 teachers and 5 PTA members selected by using availability sampling techniques. In general, the main data gathering tools used for this study were questionnaires, interview and document analysis. Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis methods were employed in order to turn up at the results. The major statistical tools employed were frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation. It was found that the GEQIP budget was sometimes implemented and has moderate contribution to facilitate the teaching and learning process in the School without any significant difference at 0.05 level. The findings identified the presence of Lack of assessing needs of school community on what to do with GEQIP budget, School's GEQIP budget stakeholder lack of freedom to plan and implement freely and Lack of providing on time report about GEQIP budget to stakeholder were Serious problems that Influence GEQIP budget from Achieving Quality Education at secondary schools without any significant difference at 0.05 level. GEQIP budget was not used to help poor students, female students, to reduce drop out students, improve teaching methods like group learning and failed to bring quality education. Based on the findings, the researcher recommends the region should solve the major problems. Thus the revision or redesigning seems to be necessary to properly implement budget offered to the school and to achieve the intended goal to improve the general quality of education which has negative impact for the proper Management of the allocated budget

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This section presents the background of the study, statements of the problem, research questions, Objectives of the study, significance of the study and scope of the study and limitation of the study and definition of the key terms.

### 1.1. Background of the Study

The Ethiopian education system is now in a process of implementing school Improvement Program (SIP) that gives emphasis for quality of education (MoE-1994). The Education and Training Policy has been launched in 1994. The most promising results of the 1994 education and training policy are increasing access to education and then to work with quality of education. Recently, the Ministry of Education has launched General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) which comprises six components. School Improvement and Leadership and Management Programs are two of the six GEQIP components. The launching of GEQIP shows that the government has now found its attention to improve the quality of education. To this end, the role of leadership is vital to bring transformative changes in the school improvement initiative.

Hence, educational institutions need careful educational planning and management practices. In connection to this, Edward (2010) states that the schools must deal with the tasks of proper planning, managing, and leading the human, material and financial resources. These are the complex tasks for educational leaders. Therefore, the proper preparation and management of budget for education is one of the major tasks to implement the educational plans in order to achieve educational objectives at Federal, Regional, Zonal, Woreda and School Levels in Ethiopia (MoE, 2004).

Ethiopia introduced fee-free primary education in 1994. To support this reform, several grant schemes were initiated in the education system. These are block grants and school grants. The first began in 2002 and its purpose was to cover the salaries of school personnel as well as the running costs of schools. The second introduced in 2009 as one of the components of the internationally sponsored General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP) which was intended to support school-based initiatives which improve the quality of education.

An initial strong research finding was the inconsistencies in the implementation of the policies across the country. In practice, the allocation of the block grant in particular was found to be very irregular (Dea and Basha, 2014). Although having its own distinct objective – to strengthen the quality of education – the school grants programme was also a means to address these shortcomings of the block grant. The set criteria of the Block grants were the number of employees, school enrolment, and class size. As for the school grants, enrolment was the only criterion. The set size of the Block grants was ETB (Ethiopia birr) 10 (\$0.5) per pupil for the 1st cycle of primary and ETB 15 (\$0.8) for the 2nd cycle of primary. As for the school grant, it was ETB 15 (\$0.8) and ETB 20 (\$1) for each cycle. It was learned that since the beginning of 2011, the amount of the school grants had increased to ETB 40 (\$2.0) and to ETB 45 (\$2.2) for each cycle (MOE, 2007).

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

According to Hopkins (2005), school improvement is a distinct approach to Educational changes that enhances students' outcome, raising students' achievement, focusing on teaching –learning process and conditions that support it. It is a strategy for improving the schools capacity for providing quality education in times of change. The education system in Ethiopia has been suffering from quality and relevance, efficiency, educational leadership practices and organization problems (MoE, 2005). School improvement program is one of the pillars that started since 2007 throughout the country to improve the quality of education.

The MoE has clearly noted the challenges facing the country with regard to education quality stating, “The achievements in enrolment have not been accompanied by sufficient progress in the quality of education. In fact, in some areas, quality has deteriorated, at least partly as a result of rapid expansion” (MoE, 2007). The key factors attributed to low student achievement included: poor school organization and management of finance, inadequate teacher training on subject mastery and pedagogical skills, inadequate school facilities and insufficient curricular and instructional materials (USAID, 2010). Above all, the practice of school leadership takes a lion share for the implementation of the package. This implies that, a leader

(manager) holds a special place in the system of management, because she/he leads and accomplishes overall school activities and we can say that schools grow, develop and prosper because of effective leadership. On the other hand, lack of effective leadership is the reason for the failure of schools.

Indeed, leadership makes the difference between successes and failures. However, the capability of leaders to carry out the program in mobilizing the stakeholders to functionalize the implementation of the package is under question. Berry and Workiye (2009) also stated that the implementation of GEQIP faces challenges that emanate from the low awareness level among stakeholders, weak understanding of how to integrate the packages and insufficient support system. Firdissa (2006) on his part argued that although there are established opportunities, including GEQIP for quality assurance in Ethiopian education system, many challenges such as the rapid enrolment expansion, scarcity of resources and low proportion of qualified teachers are untouched challenges. Moreover, as stated by UNICEF (2010), the weak capacity of the schools to correctly interpret, plan, implement, and monitor policies and programs, and inadequate resources highly affect the reform.

Mesele (2011) conclude that lack of awareness on the program, poor level of participation of stakeholders from planning to evaluation of the program and also inadequate of educational finance, lack of furniture and other facilities and inadequate competency of leadership were influencing factors of SIP implementation. In supporting this, Frew (2010) also stated that the major problem that affected the implementation of SIP are: insufficient budget, lack of school facilities, limited support of community and lack of the necessary awareness of stakeholders. Like other public organizations, the Secondary Schools in Ethiopia are affected by unspecified traditional methods of the preparation and management of budget, inappropriate budget utilization within Schools and by budget shortage problems (Adrian, 2001 and UNESCO, 2008). These could also negatively affect the proper utilizations of the preparation and management of budget in secondary schools in Hariri Town of HRS. Within this, prior to the preparation of the education plan, the school leadership needs to make preliminary revenue calculations so as to have well budgeted plan in accordance with the budget spending guidelines (Kruger, 2005 and MoE, 2005). This is due to a rapidly changing educational environment costs for periodic and intense

examination of alternative ways to prepare and manage the budget plan of the schools effectively. But, the current traditionally centralized methods of budgeting practices, inappropriate utilization of budget, the shortage of budget and the problems of the preparation and management of budget practices do not give the school administrators adequate right for using alternative plan to budget their plan flexibly (Getachew, 2005).

This research is unique because it studies only about GEQIP budget and attempted to assess the preparation and management of GEQIP budget, practices and problems or challenges related to school grant in the secondary schools in Hariri Town of HRS. The main reason of GEQIP budget is to improve the quality of education but the quality of education is not improving so far (MoE, 2007). Hence, this study tried to find out the effect of GEQIP budget on educational quality improvement. So, from the researcher's experiences and the assessment of review of the literature, there are problems of the preparation and management of GEQIP budget practices that negatively affect the quality of education especially the school grant. Therefore, this research focuses the effectiveness of GEQIP budget in bringing quality education in Secondary schools in Hariri town of HRS.

### **1.3. The Research Questions**

This study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. How was the preparation of GEQIP budget in secondary schools of Hariri region?
2. How was the GEQIP budget utilized and controlled in secondary schools of Hariri region?
3. To what extent GEQIP budget contributed to the achievement of quality education in Hariri region secondary schools?
4. What are the factors that affect the management and effectiveness of GEQIP budget in Hariri region secondary schools?
5. What has to be done to allocate the problems in the study area?

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

The objectives for this research problem are to,

1. Find out the perceptions of secondary school stakeholders towards GEQIP budget to improve quality education participation in educational leadership.
2. Determine the factors causing these perceptions and suggest possible solutions to overcome this problem

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

The main purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of GEQIP budget contribution in the achievement of quality education in secondary schools in Hariri Town of the Hariri Regional State.

##### **1.4.2 Specific Objectives**

Specifically, the specific objectives of the study was intended to,

- Asses how GEQIP budget was prepared in Hariri region secondary schools.
- Examine how GEQIP fund was used and controlled in secondary schools of Hariri region.
- Explore the extent to which GEQIP budget has achieved its goal of bringing quality education in Hariri regions high schools.
- Identify factors that affect the implementation and effectiveness of GEQIP budget in secondary schools of HRS.
- Suggest a solution or a remediation to alleviate the problems in the study area.

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

The study is expected to have the following benefits to school leaders, school communities and Hariri region education bureau experts. It may create some awareness in the school community about the preparation and management of GEQIP

budget. It may also benefit the school management and the regional education bureau to take the necessary remedial measures to minimize the problems related to the GEQIP budget use and administration. It may also help the schools leaders correct the inappropriate ways of GEQIP budget approaching in some secondary and preparatory schools of HNRS and reveal the secondary schools problems on the preparation and management of budget.

It may create awareness to finance policy makers and educational planners about the current secondary and preparatory schools GEQIP budget preparation, utilization and evaluation practices and problems to take corrective actions related to GEQIP budget preparation and its management. The result of this research may initiate other professionals to undertake further study. Therefore, this research may be helpful to those who want to

use it as an input to understand the problems related to GEQIP budget preparation and management. It may also increase the knowledge of educational leaders and others to take corrective measures in their organization.

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

The study was delimited to Hariri regions government secondary schools which are found in Hariri town. This study focused on whether there was quality of education as a result of GEQIP and investigated the current position of GEQIP budget preparation, management and control practices and its effect on bringing quality education. The method of the research was delimited to descriptive survey research designee in using closed-ended and open-ended questionnaires, interview and document analysis for data gathering instruments.

### **1.7 Limitations of the Study**

This study was involved in only government secondary schools (Abider, Harere, Hamaressa, Shekib Abdulahi secondary schools and Abokere preparatory schools). It would have been more comprehensive; primary schools had not been included. Because the researcher faced some problems while undertaking this study. Among them were the scarcity of local literature related to the study, the shortage of time and financial constraints respondents had during data collection, Hariri education office

not paid research paper payment. However, the research attempted his best to alleviate these problems and attained the objectives of the study.

### **1.8 Definition of Key Terms**

**Block grant** is to provide schools with a small, but regular and predictable income which they can use flexibly to cover operating costs based on their priorities.

**Budget management** is a process of reflecting revenues and expenditures of the various programs in the school, which is related to the school financial plan.

**Quality** is the heart of any educational system. It influences what students learn, how well they learn, and what benefits they draw from their quality education.

**School financial budget** is a plan that shows how the school will acquire its financial resources to achieve educational goals over a specified period of time.

**School grant** should be used to improve the provision of quality education, with a focus on GEQIP and SIP related items. GEQIP takes a holistic approach to improve the quality of general education by adapting the concept of the school effectiveness model.

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

This section deals with definition of government budgeting, Schools budget in Ethiopia, Sources of the school budget, school Grants purpose, Criteria and mechanisms for grant distribution , The decision –making process of school grants at the school level, utilization and control of the school grants and Factors that affect the effectiveness of GEQIP funds in achieving quality.

### **2.1 Definition of Government Budgeting**

As any activity of the government needs finance in order to operate; financial management is the most important part of the internal management of government. Budgeting is not just a mere listing of proposed expenditures, but a critical and most often complex decision-making process. As to Jensen (2003), budgeting is often used to refer to the overall process of allocating resources as well as to the preparation of specific documents.

It is also the central element of public fiscal management. Therefore, budget is both a document and a complex collective decision process. As a complex process, budgeting involves aspects of planning, politics, economics, and accounting. But, as a planning process because it involves making decisions under conditions of uncertainty that have consequences for future time periods (Sadison.D. 2003). This means that goals and objectives must be formulated, policies analyzed and comprehensive plans and programs delineated before the budget can be formulated. Lalli (2003) state budgeting includes the concept of political choice. Budgeting involves choices about values & purpose in the highest priority. It also involves questions about power as to how we are governed and by whom. Budgeting becomes a political choice because it is the allocation mechanism whereby decisions are made about “Who gets” what in the public sector? How are the resources allocated to different levels of governments? Budgeting is also an accounting process whereby revenue and expenditure information are structured to facilitate inspection, evaluation and management control of government. It is a decision making system for allocating funds and tapping resources in order to achieve governmental priorities and objectives efficiently, economically and effectively (Horngren, 2002).

Budget answers big questions of politics. Who gets how much for what purpose and who pays? The decision influence the proportion of national resources that go to the public sector and public priorities, the goal, objectives, so many programs and projects. As a result, the budget is the sum total of the aspirations, values, social and economic policies and services of government. It comprises expenditures and the means of funding them (Joshi, 2003). Budgeting, according to Neely .A et al. (2003), is and always has been the single most important decision making process in government organization. In their increasing voluminous and complex formats, budgets simultaneously record policy decision out comes; cite policy priorities, program goals and objectives , delineates a government's total service effort and measure its performance, impact and overall effectiveness.

Weber and Linder (2005), however, defines budget as it not merely a document but a plan for financing and enterprise or government during a definite period, which is prepared and submitted by a responsible executive to a representative body whose approval and authorization are necessary before the plan may be executed. From the above points, the government budgeting is the internal financial management that helps the government to answer the basic economic and political questions in order to accomplish the policy priorities, program goals and the predetermined objectives set by the government at respective administrative hierarchies (National, Regional, Zone, Woreda and School Levels).

## **2.2. School Budget in Ethiopia**

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

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

The block grant is to provide schools with a small, but regular and predictable income which they can use flexibly to cover operating costs based on their priorities. In practice, however, part of the block grant amount (the running costs) that reaches school level has been reported to be exceedingly low (MoE, 2006). In order to address the shortcomings of the block grant, the Government of Ethiopia and USAID launched a new comprehensive package, the General Education Quality Improvement Project (GEQIP), as a major endeavor to ensure the provision of quality education for its citizens (MoE, 2008). GEQIP is a comprehensive package with six major components: the teachers development programme, the school Improvement programme, the civic and ethical education programme, the curriculum improvement and implementation programme, the information and communication technology expansion programme, and the leadership and management improvement programme.

The budget required to implement the GEQIP package was provided by a number of development partners, mainly: the International development association, the fast Track initiative catalytic fund, and other development partners (the Netherlands, the UK department for international development, Italian development cooperation, Swedish international development cooperation agency, and the finish international development agency). A 'zone' is the administrative level in between the 'regions' and the 'woreda' in Ethiopia. Most regions are divided into several zones, but not all. In Addis Ababa city administration for instance, the zonal and woreda levels coincide. The Blue book is also at times referred to as the 'block grant guide lines' in the document. In collaboration with these development partners, the Government of Ethiopia designed the school grant policy to uphold the implementation of the GEQIP and more specifically, the SIP. As one of the six GEQIP components, the SIP aims to enhance student achievement and by increasing the capacity of schools to manage change in the following areas: teaching-learning process, school environment, school leadership and management, and community participation. The principal rationale for

the introduction of a school grant policy was to enhance the quality of education. School-level actors, mainly the school directors, SIP members, PTA chairpersons and members, described a school grants a means of improving the teaching–learning process.

### **2.3. Sources of the School Budget**

According to the Blue book (MoE, 2002) and school grant budget guidelines (MoE, 2009), the main sources of school funding can be the block grant , the school grant community contributions, support from NGOs or other external donors, and the school’s internal income. This was confirmed by most school-level actors, mainly school directors, teachers and school treasurers. This section examines the contributions received from the community and the schools’ internal income.

All government policy documents reflect the fact that the government alone cannot shoulder the immense educational expenditure of the country. Communities are expected to play a vital role in supporting the education system and their respective schools. The Education and Training Policy (MoE, 1994) and the Education Sector Strategy (MoE, 1994), together with the capacity building strategy and programmes, maintain that community participation should play an important role in financing education. In this respect, the Block Grant Guidelines (MoE, 2002) serve as a legal background for schools to mobilize their respective communities. Although general education (Grades 1 to 10) is free of compulsory fees, as stipulated in the Education and Training Policy (MoE, 1994), communities are encouraged to support schools voluntarily in the form of cash, kind, and labor. Also, as expressed by the school-level actors, though the main source of the school budget is the government, inadequacies and irregularities of educational finance have led the schools to look for alternative sources – support from the PTA, from parents and the general community.

### **2.4. Criteria and Mechanisms for Grants’ Distribution**

The block grant guidelines of 2002 and the school grant guidelines of 2009 were prepared and distributed to all schools. As indicated in the, this Blue book allocation should be based on the size of the student population, the number of teachers, and

class size (MoE, 2002). The size of the student population is the most crucial factor when allocating the block grant Guidelines (MoE,2002).The school director and the finance unit workers are relatively familiar with the details of the block grant , much more so than other school-level actors, such as parents, teachers, and students. In contrast with the block grant, the size of the school grant to be allocated to each school is only based on enrolment. The number of teachers and the class size are not taken in to account. The transfer mechanisms of both grants to each school are similar across the country. It was learned that a key player in the process is the (MoFED, 2004)

All information on the schools must be passed on, through several echelons, up to this ministry which is responsible for releasing the funds back down to schools. Schools prepare and submit the total number of their student population (the previous year's data) to their sub-city education office, which consolidates the data from all the schools and submits them to the regional education bureau. In turn, this education bureau combines the same school data and submits them to the city administration finance and economic development office (FEDO), which then pass them on to the (MoFED,2004) Following this process, the school grant get which is to be allocated to each school passes through the various levels of (MoFED,2004) to reach the school account.

In principle, the school grant funds should be transferred to the school level in two installments: the first in November and the second in January. According to the guidelines, the planning and Policy analysis department at the MoE is responsible for the success of the school grant program me at the federal level. The planning and policy analysis department liaises with the (MoFED, 2004) to calculate and then transfer funds to the regions. The funds go from the MoFED to the REB, and then to the sub-city FEDO, which distributes the funds to schools. The REB prepares the list of the schools and the amount of the school grant each school is entitled to and sends it to the sub-city office. In order to be provided with the first phase of the grant, the schools are required to submit a plan and for the second phase of the grant, both the plan and financial report of the first phase of the grant utilization. Once the funding is at the REB, the school grant can be then transferred by cheque to the accounts of the

schools from the local FEDO, whether Wereda sub-city, and the money is withdrawn by the schools with the signatures of school actors (MoE, 2009).

**Table 1 Block grant allocation per pupil per year at different levels of school**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Blue Book recommendations amount</b>
1 to 4	ETB 15 per child enrolled (\$0.8)
5 to 8	ETB 20 per child enrolled (\$1)
9 and 10	ETB 30 per child enrolled (\$1.6)
11 and 12	ETB 65 per child enrolled (\$3.5)

Source: MoE, 2002

**Table 2 School grant allocation per pupil per year at different levels of school**

<b>Grades</b>	<b>GEQIP school grant allocations</b>
1 to 4	ETB 15 per child enrolled (\$0.8)
5 to 8, 9 and 10 ,11 and 12	ETB 20 per child enrolled (\$1)

Source: MoE, 2009

According to Terry (2013) School Grant process developed through the last four years has become a very important instrument in systems development for Ethiopian schools. More than 31,000 schools are presently in receipt of grants. Confidence in the benefits of the approach may be seen in the growth of the School Grants budget year on year: 2003 Ethiopian Calendar (EC)- \$48.9 million; 2004EC - \$65.43 million; 2005EC- \$82.5 million. The per student capital grant has now been increased as shown below:

**Table 3 School grant allocation per pupil per year at different levels of primary and Secondary school**

<b>School Grade Level</b>	<b>School Grant per student (Birr)</b>
Primary 1 – 4 and ABE	75
Primary 5 – 8	80
Secondary 9 – 10	90
Secondary 11 – 12	105

An additional impact of the School Grant program me appears to be the success in harnessing additional resources for schools through parental and wider community contributions both in cash and kind. The 2012 Joint Education Sector Review report refers to the high levels of community participation and support witnessed during their mission and reported on by regional education bureaus. School are free to use grants to fund a range of teaching and learning inputs including buying reference materials and conducting school based continuous professional development for teachers. However, the scope of previous school grant evaluations was limited in that they only established the reach (to 98% of the schools) and use of grants (95% for SIP priorities), they did not assess the impact of school grants on teaching and learning outcomes at school level which for example can include better utilization of textbooks and application of student cantered methods. Bi-annual school grant evaluations are planned under GEQIP 2 and their scope will address this limitation by attempting to generate evidence of impact on quality and learning outcomes.

### **2.5. The Decision-Making Process of School Grants at the School Level**

In accordance with the MoE (2002), schools in Ethiopia are expected to be managed through a shared leadership process by the directors, deputy directors, PTAs, who represent the wishes of their respective community members. School directors carry out the day-to-day administration and are responsible for coordination and efficient management. The deputy directors, department heads, and unit leaders help the directors in academic and administrative decision-making.

### **2.6. Utilization and Control of the School Grants**

The guidelines for both the block grant (MoE, 2002) and the school grant (MoE, 2009) specify how each grant should be used, but only define wide budget lines. As discussed, at the school level, the block grant budget is expected to cover recurrent expenditures, that is to say salaries and running costs. The school grant should be used to improve the provision of quality education, with a focus on GEQIP and SIP related items: the teaching-learning process, the school environment, leadership and management, community empowerment, student achievement, and schools' capacity to manage change.

Each school and ABE centre can use their grant for the priority areas that will have the greatest impact on the quality of education in their school. According to the school grant guidelines (MoE, 2009), six items are excluded from the list of expenditures with the school grant: construction of new classrooms or buildings (construction of toilets is however permitted), purchase of televisions and DVD players, payment of salaries and per Diems, payments to individuals, and purchase of fuel or weapons. The school grant is used for all the expenses related to the improvement of the teaching /and learning activities. It is used to purchase books, reference materials, pens, materials for the preparation of teaching aids, and the like. It can also be used to repair classrooms, desks, etc. Regarding internal control the school grant guidelines (MoE, 2009) stated that the schools should post the amount they receive on the notice board located in a public place that is clearly visible in each school. They should also post reports on how the grant was used so that the entire school community, including parents, has equal exposure to the information on the amount of the school grant and how it was used.

Regarding external control the guidelines state that the REBs and bureau of finance and economic development are in charge of ensuring the success of the implementation of the grant programmes in their respective regions, and the woreda education office and the woreda finance and economic development office in each woreda. The woreda education office or sub-city EO, in collaboration with the woreda finance and economic development office, provides both professional and technical support to the allocation and utilization of the school grants.

## **2.7. Factors that Affect the Effectiveness of GEQIP Funds in Achieving Quality**

Although the precise definitions of quality are indeed varied according to the local educational contexts of different countries, UNICEF (UNESCO 2005) recognizes five dimensions of quality: the learners (healthy, supportive parents), the learning environment (class size, physical elements), content (student centered, relevant curriculum), processes (teachers, assessment and evaluation) and outcomes. Quality is the heart of any educational system. It influences what students learn, how well they learn, and what benefits they draw from their education (Jacobs & Kritsonis, 2006). However, quality education is an endemic in most developing countries (USAID, 2010). Hence, as stated by Grover (2002), achieving quality in education has

increasingly become crucial in strategic improvement plans of the countries. Similarly, in Ethiopia the declining quality of education at all levels of the education system has been sensed by all stakeholders, including the government.

Although remarkable success in expanding access to primary education has been attained in Ethiopia, from 61.6% gross enrolment rate in 1999 to 91.3% in 2005/6, the failure of school in addressing quality education has become manifest by the scores of the National Learning Assessments conducted in 2000, 2004 and 2008. For instance, achievement scores for grade 8 deteriorated from 41.1% in 2000 to 39.7% in 2004. The 2008 assessment report also shows that only 13.9% of students scored more than 51% the standard to pass the national exam and the majority, 62.1% scored below 51% (MoE, 2007).

In order to improve the situation, the government of Ethiopia launched a major nationwide reform program, quality education packages, or GEQIP (General Education Quality Improvement Program) in primary and secondary schools, aimed to improve the quality of general education throughout the country. There are six components which will be applicable for the project: curriculum, textbooks and assessment; teacher development program, school improvement program (SIP); management and administration program, information communication technology, and civic and ethical education. At the centre of strategies for accelerating the achievement of quality education is effective leadership at all levels of the school system. Effective school leadership is imperative for schools to function successful (Sergiovanni T.J, 1991, and Jacobs, 2006).

School principals exercise a measure, though indirect, effect on school effectiveness and student achievement. Leadership appears to particularly impact the quality of teaching in schools and effective utilization of GEQIP to achieve quality education (Tamara, 2002). However, any effort of promoting quality education is not a smooth function. Researches indicate the various constraints that schools may encounter in implementing quality education programs funds like GEQIP. According to Newman et al. as cited in James.J. (1997) there are three major challenges that school leadership may face during GEQIP fund implementation.

The first challenge is to define high standards of quality for instruction and learning and assign the appropriate fund for that. The second challenge is building

organizational capacity to achieve the defined standards of education quality. The third challenge is to sustain the effort of school improvement. Many schools implement improvement programs but few institutionalize these reforms in the culture of the organization.

Similarly, Pont (2008) identified the following factors as challenges to school leadership in an attempt to improve equality education: school autonomy, accountability for outcomes, insufficient preparation and training, and lack of clarity about the core roles of school leadership. Sungtong (2007) on his part identified three major challenges that school leaders face during school reform: restructuring school administration and management system, financial management related and parental expectation and relation. Following the formulation of the new Education and Training Policy (1994) major achievements have been retained in creating access to primary education. The key factors attributed to low student achievement included: poor school organization and management, inadequate teacher training on subject mastery and pedagogical skills, inadequate school facilities, and insufficient curricular and instructional materials (USAID, The Government of Ethiopia Quality Assurance & Examination Agency, 2010).

Above all the practice of school leadership takes a lion share for the implementation of the package. This implies that, a leader (manager) holds a special place in the system of management, because she/he leads and accomplishes over all school activities, and we can say that schools grow, develop and prosper because of effective leadership. In other hand, lack of effective leadership is the reason for the failure of many schools. Indeed, leadership makes the difference between successes and failures. However, the capability of leaders to carry out the program in mobilizing the stakeholders to functionalize the implementation of the package is under question.

Berry and Workiye (2009) also stated that the implementation of GEQIP faces challenges that emanate from the low awareness level among stakeholders, weak understanding of how to integrate the packages, and insufficient support system. Firdissa (2006) on his part argued that although there are established opportunities, including GEQIP for quality assurance in Ethiopian education system, many challenges such as the rapid enrolment expansion, scarcity of resources and low

proportion of qualified teachers are untouched challenges. Moreover, as stated by UNCF (2010), the weak capacity of the schools to correctly interpret, plan, implement, and monitor policies and programs, and inadequate resources highly affect the reform. In light of the above perspectives, the present study was, therefore, aimed at examining major challenges to school leadership that hinder the effective implementation of GEQIP.\

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

This section deals with research design, description of the study area, source of data, population, sample size and sampling techniques, instruments and procedures of data collection and methods of data analysis.

#### **3.1. Research Design**

Descriptive survey research design was employed in this study. This method is chosen for its appropriateness to the topic. This research design is also helpful to investigate the facts and information related to the research topic through collecting, interpreting, and reporting data about the effectiveness of GEQIP budget in bringing quality education in secondary and preparatory schools in Hariri Town of HNRS. Quantitative and qualitative research methods were used to collect and analyze the data so that the overall strength of the study will be greater than either qualitative or quantitative research alone (Creswell, 2005).

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

This study was conducted at Hariri region. This region is one of the nine regions in Ethiopia, which is located in the eastern part of country at about 525 km away from Addis Ababa. Out of four government secondary schools and one preparatory school in the region four all are selected for the study. The schools taken are Shakib Abdulahi Secondary School, Hariri Senior Secondary school, Abider Secondary School, Hamaressa Secondary school and Abukir preparatory school. These sites are chosen due to easy access to the researcher who has been working in the school and due to the assumption of the researcher that it may enable him to obtain cooperation from the participant during data collection. In addition, the researcher assumes that there is sufficient amount of information as there are experienced principals, teachers and other stockholders to schools in the region

#### **3.3. Source of Data**

The data for this study was collected from both primary and secondary sources.

### **3.3.1. Primary source of data**

Primary data was collected from teachers, the school principals, vice principals, supervisors, school finance head, students and PTA's in order to investigate their perceptions and practice of GEQIP fund implementation practice and effectiveness in achieving quality education.

### **3.3.2. Secondary source of data**

The secondary data was obtained from documents like budget plan, auditing report and all other documents that show GEQIP budget preparation and management practices in secondary and preparatory schools of the HNRs.

### **3.4. Population and Sample Size**

The population of the study was 170 school community members from 5 schools and each schools was used to the same number participants, which included 5 supervisors, 5 school finance officers, 40 department head teachers, 5 PTAs, 5 principals and 10 vice principals and 100 students (class monitors and student council members). In this study, the sample size was 95 out of 170. Purposive sampling technique, availability sampling technique and stratified random sampling were employed to select the sample representatives. Purposive sampling technique was used to take 10 principals and vice principals, Availability sampling was used to take the availability 5 supervisors, 5 school finance officers, 40 department head teachers and 5 PTAs. Using stratified random sampling 30 students in the five schools who were class monitors and students council were involved in this research. In general the data was collected from the sample size of 95 school communities. The sample size and sampling techniques are shown in the following table.

### **3.5. Sampling Techniques**

In this study, purposive sampling, stratified-random and available sampling techniques would be employed to select the sample representatives. Accordingly,

**Purposes sampling** is used to take the purposive 5 principals, 5 vice principals in the five schools, who used 10 participate for the interview. Totally they would be 15. The reasons for involving the entire population (10) would be manageable size.

**Available sampling** is used to take the 40 Teachers, 5 PTA's, 5 supervisors, and 5 budget expert in the five schools, who used participate for the questionnaire and interview. Totally they would be 55. The reasons for involving the entire population (55) would be manageable size, and it is appropriate for considering the nature of the study and leads to greater valid findings

A **stratified-random sampling technique** would be used to select a representative sampling of students who used to fill in the questionnaire first in dividing the population in to homogenous subgroup and then taking a simple random sample in each subgroup. The stratified-random sampling used to make sure that the sample is representative of the larger population under the study. The researcher follows the simple procedure to generate a series of random numbers on the computer after getting the list of participants in an EXCEL spread sheet separately.

John Adams (2007) suggested that in any study if the initial sample size is relatively very small compared with the population size (N) which is assumed to be known, and then an adjustment is needed using finite population correction to obtain the required sample size (n).

The formula is given by:

$$N = \frac{no}{1+no/N}, \text{ where;}$$

N = required sample size for needs analysis questionnaire survey

No = number of population in a group

N= Total source of populations for questionnaire survey (70).

The researcher takes the first 7 students out of 25 from HSSS, 6 students out of 20 from SASS, 5 students out of 15 from HSS, 6 students out of 20 from ASS and 6 students out of 20 from APS the names in the sorted list respectively. A total of 30 participants out of 100 students used to randomly selected and administered the questionnaire survey. The grant total samples that would be taken for the study from 170 target population may be 95 participants. The total population, sample size and sampling techniques are shown in the following table.

**Table 4 Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques**

Target population	Total population	Sample size	Sampling technique
Principals and vice-principals	15	10	Purposive
Department heads	40	40	Availability
Supervisors	5	5	Availability
School finance head	5	5	Availability
PTA (head )	5	5	Availability
Students (monitor and council)	100	30	Stratified random
Total	170	95	

### 3.6. Instruments for data collection

To achieve the objectives of the study, three research tools were used. These are questionnaire, document review and semi-structured interview.

#### 3.6.1 Questionnaire

The purpose of the pilot test was to enable the researcher to ascertain the reliability and validity of instruments and to familiarize himself with the administration of the questionnaires as well as to the improvement of instruments and procedures. The primary tool used to conduct this study was a questionnaire survey which includes close-ended and open- ended items to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. Questionnaire is used because it is helpful to collect quantitative data from a large population. The design of the questionnaire was based on the research questions of the study. The respondents, 40 department heads and 30 student monitors and council members (a total of 70) responded to the same written question items which enabled to collect quantitative data. The items were developed from the literature review. The researcher administered a pilot test to 15 teachers and 15 students. Therefore, the pilot test was given to a total of 30 respondents. The purpose of the pilot test was to enable the researcher to ascertain the reliability and validity of instruments and to familiarize himself with the administration of the questionnaires as well as to the improvement of instruments and procedures

### **3.6.1.1 Reliability**

It is the measure of degree to which a research instrument yields consistent result. The pilot study would be enable the researcher to assess the daring of the questionnaire items so that, those items found to be in adequate or vague will be modified to improve the quality of the research instrument to in hence its reliability. The questionnaire's items comprise six sections. Section 1 elicited nominal data except for the item on the respondents' background. Sections 2, 3 and 4 supported an ordinal level of measurement. a 6-point liker scale would be applied. Scales are utilized to enable respondents to report their attitudes or feelings in a continuum (Patrick McNeil & Steve chapmen, 2005). The response option for section 5 will be very serious problem, serious problem, medium problem, low problem and not problem. In section 6, the respondents used to require indicating their opinion by answering the open-ended part of the items. The sets-compact soft ware would be used to test the reliability of the study.

### **3.6.1.2 Validity**

Validity is defined as the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences, which are based on research results obtained from the analysis of the data, actually represents the phenomena under study. Validity refers to the problem of whether the data collected is a true picture of what is being studied. Is it evidence of what it claims to be evidence of (Patrick McNeill & Stevechapman, 2005)? The pilot study helps to improve face validity of the instrument through the feedback of the participants.

### **3.6.2. Interview**

The second type of tool that was employed in this study is an interview because it enables to collect reach qualitative data from small population which is 25. Based on the reviewed literature, semi-structured interview was conducted with school principals, PTA, supervisors and finance officers to elicit information with regard to GEQIP budget preparation, administration and related problems. In this study, interview was undertaken using semi-structured interview, enabling respondents to address ideas in their own words. The interview item was mainly presented for cross checking the results of the questionnaire.

### **3.6.3. Document review**

The third type of tool that was employed in this study is document review. Information was investigated from documentary source like school performance report, finance report and schools budget plan for the validity of the research findings.

### **3.7. Data collection Procedure**

Once the participants in the study are identified, questionnaires were employed for both head teachers and monitor students. The questionnaire was administered in the presence of the researcher and the questionnaire administration was held in the participants' work place within their preferred time schedule. First, permission was asked from both the school officials and the participants. Then questionnaires were distributed after clarifying the purpose and its importance. The interview was administered for 25 participants. During the interview, data collected was recorded on audiotape and field notes were taken simultaneously. The following factors were considered by the researcher to ensure a successful interview: Permission to use the tape recorder was sought before the interview. All the participants consented to its use. Use of the tape recorder enabled the researcher to maintain eye contact with the participants.

### **3.8. Methods of Data Analysis**

This research study is descriptive in nature and therefore descriptive statistics was employed to analyze quantitative data. Descriptive statistics enabled the researcher to summarize and describe quantitative data obtained from students and teachers. To enhance data management, the researcher used SPSS 20 and coded the responses. Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, weighted mean and p-value for judging the significance of multiple coefficients were used.

Qualitative data was collected from the small population size which is 25 and to collect deep and reach data that help us investigate deeply. Therefore, the rationale for using a qualitative approach in this research was to explore and describe the perception and practice of participants regarding GEQIP fund and its effect on achieving quality education. The data that is collected through the open-ended

questions, and from the respondents' interview, and document analysis were analyzed inductively using qualitative descriptive methods of data analysis.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the data collected by using different data collecting instruments were tabulated, presented, and analyzed by dividing them into sections based on the specific objectives of the study. An attempt was made to integrate the data obtained through different methods under each section.

### 4.1. Background of Respondents

In this section data regarding the participants' demographic characteristics will be presented. The Percentage Distributions of Respondents who completed and returned the questionnaires indicated by Sex, Age, qualifications, and Service Year are presented in the following tables.

**Table 5 Background of the respondents**

No	Dimensions		Respondents			
			Teachers		Students	
			F	%	F	%
1	Sex:	Male	30	75	16	50.7
		Female	10	25	14	49.3
		Total	40	100	30	100
2	Age:	10-15 years	-	-	6	20
		15-20years	-	-	16	53.3
		20-25years	5	12.5	8	26.7
		25-30years	11	27.5	-	-
		30-35years	3	7.5	-	-
		35-40years	9	22.5	-	-
		Above 40years	12	30	-	-
3	Qualification: (Grade level)	MA	3	7.5	-	-
		BEd	36	90	-	-
		Diploma	1	2.5	-	-
		Grade 12	-	-	3	10
		Grade 11	-	-	3	10
		Grade 10	-	-	12	40
		Grade 9	-	-	12	40
4	Experience	1-5yrs	8	20	-	-
		5-10yrs	8	20	-	-
		10-15yrs	7	17.5	-	-
		15-20yrs	3	7.5	-	-
		Above 20yrs	14	35	-	-
		Total	40	100	-	-

As it can be seen in table 5, among 40 teachers and 30 students, 30 (75%) teachers and 16 (50.7%) students were male. The data of the questionnaire suggests that the number of male teachers in secondary schools is three fold of the number of female teachers. This implies that as the level of management increases, the degree of participation of women decreases. The age distribution of the respondents indicates that majority of teachers (60%) were more than 30 years old. On the other hand, the majority (53.3%) of the students were between 16 and 20 years old. With respect to qualification, majority (90%) of the teachers were degree holders. Almost all (97.5%) teachers have the right qualification to teach at secondary school level. 12 (40%) students were grade 10 and 40% were grade 9, other 20 % were preparatory students. Regarding experience, 24 (60%) out of 40 teachers participated in this study have above 10 years work experience. This implies that majority of them had sufficient years of experience to provide the required data for the study. The implication for the presence of respondent with the right qualification and significant number of years of experience helped the researcher to obtain sufficient data on the effectiveness of GEQIP budget contribution in the achievement of quality education within secondary schools.

#### **4.2. GEQIP Budget Preparation**

This part deals with data regarding the participants' views on Issues related to GEQIP budget preparation within secondary schools of Hariri region in accordance with the guidelines of the MoE, MoF and MEDC. The result is summarized in Table 6,7 and 8. In accordance with the MoE (2002), schools in Ethiopia are expected to be managed through a shared leadership process by the directors, deputy directors, PTA members who represent the wishes of their respective community members. School directors carry out the day-to-day administration and are responsible for coordination and efficient management. The deputy directors, department heads, and unit leaders help the directors in academic and administrative decision-making.

First data regarding the participants views on their perceptions regarding the GEQIP budget Preparation in the School to answer the first research question "How was the preparation of GEQIP budget in secondary schools of Hariri region?" To obtain more information with reference to several activities related to the GEQIP budget preparation, teachers and students were asked how their school GEQIP budget is

prepared and rate the five-point Likert scale ratings (1 implies Never and 5 implies Always) and the results are presented in the following section. Never=1(Mean Scores between 1.01-1.49), Rarely =2(Mean Scores between 1.50-2.49), Sometimes=3(Mean Scores between 2.50-3.49), Often =4(Mean Scores between 3.50-4.49), Always =5(Mean Scores between 4.50-5.00). The responses are summarized in Table 6.

**Table 6 The GEQIP Budget Preparation in the School(Mean)**

	ITEMS	Resp.	N	Mean	Std.	WM	P-value
1	To what extent do teachers & students have representative participation in GEQIP budget plan preparation?	T	40	3.78	1.35	3.67	.48
		S	30	3.53	1.46		
2	How often the school notify GEQIP budget plan clearly on notice board for the school community?	T	40	2.50	1.49	2.59	.59
		S	30	2.70	1.56		
3	How often does the school collect needs assessment from teacher & student representatives about what to be done in GEQIP budget?	T	40	2.85	1.64	2.80	.76
		S	30	2.73	1.39		

Key=\* Significant difference at 0.05 level; Std.= Standard Deviation, Resp.= Respondent, N=Number, WM=Weighted Mean, S= student, T= teachers

The above table 6 shows teachers and students response on the GEQIP Budget Preparation in the School. As shown in the table, the weighted mean scores are between 2.59 and 3.67. Accordingly, when we see this with respect to each items, it can be seen that the mean value for the extent teachers & students have representative participation in GEQIP budget plan preparation result to be 3.78 and 3.53 by teachers and students, respectively. The result suggests that the school often participates teachers & students representative in GEQIP budget plan preparation (Mean Scores between 3.50-4.49). As the Mean value test shown in the P-value reveals, there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents to this issue. This shows that teachers and students representatives' participation in GEQIP budget plan

preparation is at a relatively good state in the secondary schools. In responding to how often the school notifies GEQIP budget plan clearly on notice board for the school community the data reveals the mean value of 2.50 and 2.70 by teachers and students, respectively. The result suggests that the school sometimes notifies GEQIP budget plan clearly on notice board for the school community (Mean Scores between 2.50-3.49). As the Mean value test shown in the P-value reveals, there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

With regard to the extent of the school collects need assessment from teacher & student representative about what to be done in GEQIP budget, the table depicts that the mean value result to be 2.85 and 2.73 by teachers and students, respectively. The result suggests that the school sometimes collected need assessment from teachers and students representatives about what to be done in GEQIP budget in secondary schools community (Mean Scores between 2.50-3.49). As the Mean value test shown in the P-value reveals, there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents at  $p > 0.05$  significant level. This shows lack of collected need assessment from teachers and students representatives in secondary schools.

The weighted mean value given by the two groups of respondents to the extent teachers & students have representative participation in GEQIP budget plan preparation, the school notify GEQIP budget plan clearly on notice board for the school community, and the school collects need assessment from teacher & student representative about what to be done in GEQIP budget were, 3.67, 2.59, and 2.80, respectively. The participants rated the extent of GEQIP budget Preparation in the School and viewed that the school sometimes to often perform the items listed in the table.

Further analysis suggests that the school often participates teachers & students representative in GEQIP budget plan preparation (Mean Scores between 3.50-4.49) while it sometimes notifies GEQIP budget plan clearly on notice board for the school community and collects need assessment from teachers and students representatives about what to be done in GEQIP budget in secondary schools (Mean Scores between 2.50-3.49). Relative top priority seems to be given to the extent that teachers &

students have representative participation in GEQIP budget plan preparation (Weighted mean=3.67) followed by the extent of the school collects need assessment from teacher & student representative about what to be done in GEQIP budget (Weighted mean=2.80) , and then the school notify GEQIP budget plan clearly on notice board for the school community(Weighted mean=2.59) without any significant difference at 0.05% level. The table appears to reveal that students and teachers gave high value to the extent that teachers & students have representative participation in GEQIP budget plan preparation was the greatest. This was expressed in the table by the weighted mean value (3.67) and the p-value of 0.48. As indicated in the P- value of the Mean test there is no significant difference between the groups in giving value to the GEQIP budget Preparation in the School. This appears to indicate that there is a general agreement between both respondents that the GEQIP budget Preparation in the School has contribution so as to facilitate the teaching and learning process.

An attempt was made to know the teachers opinion regarding the GEQIP budget Preparation in the School through open ended questionnaire and interview. They were asked “what were the extent teachers & students have representative participation in GEQIP budget plan preparation, the school notify GEQIP budget plan clearly on notice board for the school community, and the school collects need assessment from teacher & student representative about what to be done in GEQIP budget in the School” In response, majority of teacher respondents said stakeholders participate on GEQIP budget plan preparation in secondary schools, but lack of notifications of the GEQIP budget plan for the school community and collecting and assessing needs of school community on what to do with GEQIP budget.

Similarly document analyses witnessed that teachers, students and PTS representative participated on the GEQIP budget plan preparation. In contrast to this, the researcher found that school didn't conduct any need assessment and make clear notification about GEQIP budget plan for the school community during the period of the study. This implies that the school prepares GEQIP budget plan without studying the needs of the school community, decided to use the GEQIP budget without clear notification about GEQIP budget plan for the school community. The result matches with the teachers and students rating on the issue (Table 6).

**Table 7 Who Prepares GEQIP budget at the school**

Item 4 Who prepare GEQIP budget in your school?		F	%
1	Only Directors	8	20.0
2	Only Parents of students	2	5.0
3	Only Teachers	4	10.0
4	Committee from parents, teachers, students and school principals	16	40.0
5	I don't know	10	25.0

As indicated in table 7, majority 16 (40%) of respondents revealed that the budget in their school is prepared by the committee formed from parents, teachers, students representatives and school principals. Whereas 10(25%) of them expressed as they didn't know by whom the GEQIP budget was prepared in their school. The result is supported with teachers response to the open ended and interview questions. Accordingly, in response to the questions teachers confirmed that GEQIP budget plan preparation is done in Committee formed from parents, teachers, students' representatives and school principals.

**Table 8 How the GEQIP budget plan is prepared**

Items 5 How GEQIP budget plan is prepared?		F	%
1	By identifying, assessing and prioritizing needs	8	20.0
2	Only by considering director need	18	45
3	Only considering education bureaus needs	6	15.0
4	I don't know	8	20.0

As it is shown in Table 8, majority 18 (45%) of teachers said that the GEQIP budget plan is prepared in secondary schools only by considering the school director's need. The result is supported by the open ended questions and interview conducted with teachers. In response to the open ended questions and interview conducted with teachers, they said GEQIP budget plan was prepared only by considering directors need.

### 4.3. GEQIP Budget Implementation

This part deals with data regarding the participants' views on Issues Related to GEQIP budget Implementation at secondary schools to answer the second research question "How was the GEQIP budget utilized and controlled in secondary schools of Hariri region?" To obtain more information with reference to several activities related to the GEQIP budget Implementation at secondary schools, participants were requested to rate the five-point Likert scale ratings (1 implies Never and 5 implies Always) and the results are presented in the following section. Never=1(Mean Scores between 1.01-1.49), Rarely =2(Mean Scores between(1.50-2.49), Sometimes=3(Mean Scores between 2.50-3.49), Often =4(Mean Scores between 3.50-4.49), Always =5(Mean Scores between 4.50-5.00). The result is summarized in The Table 9. The table shows teachers and students response on the GEQIP budget Implementation at the school.

**Table 9 GEQIP Budget Implementation**

	ITEMS	Resp.	N	Mean	Std.	WM	P-value.
1	How often the school issue GEQIP budget to support female students?	T	40	2.58	1.50	2.70	.43
		S	30	2.87	1.53		
2	To what extent the schools support poor students not to drop out of school?	T	40	2.73	1.22	2.80	.57
		S	30	2.90	1.32		
3	To what extent the GEQIP budget helps in making the school attractive & conducive to learning?	T	40	3.05	1.34	2.91	.34
		S	30	2.73	1.39		
4	To what extent do students learn in group work with their friends?	T	40	2.88	1.44	2.89	.94
		S	30	2.90	1.45		
5	How often the school gives a prestigious award to students who get good result?	T	40	2.88	1.52	3.03	.33
		S	30	3.23	1.50		
6	How often internal or external auditor control the implementation of GEQIP budget?	T	40	3.23	1.56		

Key=\* Significant difference at 0.05 level; Std.= Standard Deviation, Resp.= Respondent, N=Number, WM=Weighted Mean, S= student; T= teachers,

As shown in the above table 9, teachers and students rated 2.05 and 3.23 and viewed the school sometimes implements the items listed in the table. Accordingly, when we see this with respect to each item, it can be seen that the mean value for the extent the school issue GEQIP budget to support female students seems to be 2.58 and 2.87 by teachers and students, respectively. The result suggests that the school Sometimes (Mean Scores were between 2.50-3.49) issue GEQIP budget to support female students. As the Mean value test shown in the P-value reveals, there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents. In responding to what extent the schools support poor students not to drop out of school, the data reveals the mean value of 2.73 and 2.90 by teachers and students, respectively. The result suggests that the school sometimes supports poor students not to drop out of school (Mean Scores were between 2.50 -3.49). As the Mean value test showed in the P-value reveals, there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents at the significant level.

With regard to the extent the GEQIP budget helps in making the school attractive & conducive to learning, the table depicts that the mean value result to be 3.05 and 2.73 by teachers and students, respectively. The result suggests that the GEQIP budget sometimes helps in making the school attractive & conducive to learning (Mean Scores between 2.50-3.49). As the Mean value test shown in the P-value reveals, there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

Regarding to the extent students learn in group work with their friends, teachers and students rated 2.88 and 2.90 and viewed students sometimes learn in group work with their friends, respectively. As the Mean value test shown in the P-value reveals, there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents to this issue. Therefore we can conclude from this that GEQIP budget is not helping to improve the class learning especial in providing materials for group work and for others which facilitate group learning.

Similarly, teachers and students rated 2.88 and 3.23 and viewed that the school sometimes gives a prestigious award to students who get good result (Mean Scores

between 2.50-3.49). As the Mean value test shown in the P-value reveals, there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

In response to item 6, Table 9 shows that the teachers rated the extent of internal or external auditor control the implementation of GEQIP budget were to be 3.23. The table reveals that internal or external auditor sometimes controls the implementation of GEQIP budget (Mean Scores between 2.50-3.49).

As shown in Table 9, the weighted mean value given by the two groups of respondents are between 2.70 and 3.03. The weighted mean value given by the two groups of respondents to how often the school issue GEQIP budget to support female students, extent the schools support poor students not to drop out of school, extent the GEQIP budget helps in making the school attractive & conducive to learning, How often the school gives a prestigious award to students who get good result, and How often internal or external auditor control the implementation of GEQIP budget were to be 2.70, 2.80, 2.91, 2.89, and 3.03, respectively. The result suggested that both groups of participants rated the extent of GEQIP budget implementation in the School and viewed the school sometimes implements the items listed in the table.

Relative top priority seems to be given to the extent that the school gives a prestigious award to students who get good result (WM = 3.03) followed by extent the GEQIP budget helps in making the school attractive & conducive to learning (WM= 2.91), students learn in group work with their friends (WM= 2.89), extent the schools support poor students not to drop out of school (WM= 2.80), and the school issue GEQIP budget to support female students (WM= 2.70). As indicated in the P- value of the Mean test, there is no significant difference between the groups in giving value to the GEQIP budget implementation in the School at 0.05% significant level. This appears to indicate that there is a general agreement between both groups of respondents that the GEQIP budget is sometimes implemented and has moderate contribution to facilitate the teaching and learning process in the School.

In response to item 1 of the open ended section of the questionnaire, teachers were asked if there were any other institute who control or monitor its plan and

implementation. They agreed that the school has management committee who monitored its budget plan and proper implementation. In the in-depth interview conducted with the key informants, respondents said the school has management committee, but strictly pointed out that the school principals are transparent and they are willing for the participation of responsible stakeholders in budget planning and financial resource utilizations in schools. The result was supported with document analysis witnessed the involvement of management committee name and signatures.

From the result, it could be concluded that the school management and community fully involved in preparing the GEQIP budget. It is believed that preparing well organized annual budget for school with the involvement of school management and community is a guarantee for school development and effective financial utilization which also avoids corruption.

#### **4.4. GEQIP Budget Contribution to Quality education**

This section deals with data regarding the participants' views on issues related to GEQIP budget contribution to quality education at secondary schools to answer the third research question "To what extent GEQIP budget contributed to the achievement of quality education in Hariri region secondary schools?" Participants were requested to rate the five-point Likert scale ratings (1 implies Never and 5 implies Always) and the results are presented in the following section. Never=1(Mean Scores between 1.01-1.49), Rarely =2(Mean Scores between 1.50-2.49), Sometimes=3(Mean Scores between 2.50-3.49), Often =4(Mean Scores between 3.50-4.49), Always =5(Mean Scores between 4.50-5.00). The result is summarized in Table 10. The table shows teachers and students response on the extent GEQIP budget contributed to the achievement of quality education in Hariri region secondary schools.

**Table 10 GEQIP Budget Contribution to Quality Education**

	ITEMS	Resp.	Mean	Std.	WM	P-value
1	To what extent the GEQIP budget helps in improving students result?	T	2.91	1.47	2.81	.47
		S	2.67	1.49		
2	To what extent the library contains important books and suitable for readings?	T	3.15	1.44	3.24	.53
		S	3.37	1.38		
4	To what extent GEQIP budget helps the school in fulfilling laboratory equipment in the school?	T	2.90	1.36	2.84	.68
		S	2.77	1.31		
5	To what extent the GEQIP budget helps the school & you to bring quality education?	T	2.90	1.53	2.86	.32
		S	2.80	1.47		
6	what is the extent of increasing students' interest to learn in the classroom?	T	2.91	1.47	2.77	.78
		S	2.57	1.48		

Key=\* Significant difference at 0.05 level; Std.=Standard Deviation, Resp.=

Respondent, N=Number, WM=Weighted Mean, S= student; T= teachers

The data in table 10 shows the extent of GEQIP budget contributed to the achievement of quality education in Hariri region secondary schools. The weighted mean values were to be 2.77 to 3.24.

Accordingly, it can be seen that the mean value for the extent the GEQIP budget helps in improving students result to be 2.91 and 2.67 by teachers and students, respectively. The result suggests that GEQIP Budget Sometimes (Mean Scores were between 2.50-3.49) contributes to Quality Education. As the Mean value test shown in the P-value reveals, there is no significant difference between the two groups of respondents at 0.05 % significant levels.

Next, the table appears to reveal that teachers and students gave the mean value of 3.15 and 3.37 in order to rate the extent the library contains important books and suitable for readings. As indicated in the P value of the mean test there is no significant difference between the groups in giving value to the GEQIP budget

contribution for the extent the library contains important books and suitable for readings. Moreover, from the data in the table, teachers and students presented the mean value of 2.90 and 2.77 to the extent GEQIP budget helps the school in fulfilling laboratory equipment in the school, respectively. The mean test depicts that there is no significant difference in rating the extent GEQIP budget helps the school in fulfilling laboratory equipment in the school.

Generally the findings from the questionnaire teachers and students responded GEQIP budget not support fulfilling laboratory equipment in the school; on the other hand majority of teacher and students agreed GEQIP budget support that the school library contains important books and it is suitable for readings. In contrast majority of the teacher and student respondents said GEQIP budget do not helps the school to bring quality education and support improving students result and interest to learn in the class is increasing. Whereas, School principals, supervisors and parents (through PTAs) interview and document analyses reflected GEQIP budget support the school library and it contains important books and it is suitable for readings.

#### **4.5. Factors that influence GEQIP budget from achieving quality education**

This section deals with data regarding the participants' views on issues related to GEQIP budget contribution to quality education at secondary schools to answer the fourth research question "What are the factors that affect the management and effectiveness of GEQIP budget in Hariri region secondary school

Participants were requested to rate the five-point Liker scale ratings not problem =1(Mean Scores between 1.01-1.49), Low problem =2(Mean Scores between 1.50-2.49),Medium problem =3(Mean Scores between 2.50-3.49), Serious problem =4(Mean Scores between 3.50-4.49),Very serious problem =5(Mean Scores between 4.50-5.00) the result is summarized in table 11.

**Table 11 Teachers' Response on Factors that Influence GEQIP Budget from Achieving**

	Items	Level of problem										mean	Std
		5		4		3		2		1			
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1	Absence of GEQIP budget implementation guideline	9	22.5	7	17.5	5	12.5	6	15.0	13	32.5	2.83	1.60
2	School's GEQIP budget stakeholder lack of freedom to plan and implement freely	16	40.0	10	25.0	6	15.0	4	10.0	4	10.0	3.75	1.35
3	Lack of providing on time report about GEQIP budget to stakeholder	10	25.0	13	32.5	9	22.5	6	15.0	2	5.0	3.58	1.17
4	Lack of assessing needs of school community on what to do with GEQIP budget	12	30.0	15	37.5	8	20.0	3	7.5	2	5.0	3.80	1.11
5	Lack of directors awareness how to plan & implement GEQIP budget	2	5.0	11	27.5	10	25.0	2	5.0	15	37.5	2.58	1.36
6	Practice of purchasing or using GEQIP budget for unnecessary purpose	10	25.0	12	30.0	9	22.5	5	12.5	4	10.0	3.48	1.28
7	Absence of clearly examining or notifying things that are done with GEQIP budget to school Community	8	20.0	12	30.0	10	25.0	8	20.0	2	5.0	3.40	1.17

Next, the table appears to reveal that teachers and students gave the mean value of 3.15 and 3.37 in order to rate the extent the library contains important books and suitable for readings. As indicated in the P-value of the mean test there is no significant difference between the groups in giving value to the GEQIP budget

Contribution for the extent the library contains important books and suitable for readings. Moreover, from the data in the table, teachers and students presented the mean value of 2.90 and 2.77 to the extent GEQIP budget helps the school in fulfilling laboratory equipment in the school, respectively. The mean test depicts that there is no significant difference in rating the extent GEQIP budget helps the school in fulfilling laboratory equipment in the school.

Generally the findings from the questionnaire teachers and students responded GEQIP budget not support fulfilling laboratory equipment in the school; on the other hand majority of teacher and students agreed GEQIP budget support that the school library contains important books and it is suitable for readings. In contrast majority of the teacher and student respondents said GEQIP budget do not helps the school to bring quality education and support improving students result and interest to learn in the class is increasing. Whereas, School principals, supervisors and parents (through PTAs) interview and document analyses reflected GEQIP budget support the school library and it contains important books and it is suitable for readings.

As it can be seen in table 11, majority, 16 (40%) of respondents agreed that school's GEQIP budget stakeholders lack of freedom to plan and implement freely is a very serious problems in secondary schools. 13 (32.5%) of them expressed Lack of providing on time report about GEQIP budget to stakeholders is a serious problem. Similarly, majority 15 (37.5%) of respondents expressed that lack of assessing needs of school community on what to do with GEQIP budget" is a serious problem in secondary schools. Moreover, 12(30%) of the respondents agreed serious problem with the practice of purchasing or using GEQIP budget for unnecessary purpose and absence of clearly examining or notifying things that are done with GEQIP budget to school community as a serious problem in secondary schools of Harari regional state.

On the other hand majority 15 (37.5%) teachers rated the statement "lack of directors awareness how to plan and implement GEQIP budget" is not a serious problem in secondary schools. Similarly,13 (32.5%) of the teachers reported that absence of GEQIP budget implementation guideline is not a serious problem in secondary schools. In accordance with the MoE guideline (2002), schools in Ethiopia are

expected to be managed through a shared leadership process by the directors, deputy directors, and PTAs, who represent the wishes of their respective community members. School directors carry out the day-to-day administration and are responsible for coordination and efficient management. The deputy directors, department heads, and unit leaders help the directors in academic and administrative decision-making.

The other serious problem mentioned by teachers is lack of freedom to plan and implement GEQIP budget freely. During interview, the participants said that:

“...the delay by education and finance bureau in releasing the fund on time. The criteria designated in the school grant guidelines, not withstanding some problems observed in the schools. Among the other common problems in relation to the school grant were: its low amount, the minor restrictions related to the grant, and the speed with which the grant is expected to be implemented and reported. Individuals who are working with finance-related tasks complained of a lack of adequate training programs. Finally, stockholders interviewed in the schools were frustrated that the policy has been introduced without any incentives and rewards. They pointed out that their loads have been increased with the introduction of the school grant ‘with no incentives and personal pay’...”

In comparison of the Participants response regarding their perceptions on the factors that influence GEQIP budget from achieving quality education, As shown in the table 11, from the mean values, it seems that they expressed their views as a Medium to Serious problem. The range of means 2.58 to 3.80. When we see this the teachers presented the mean values with the highest (3.80) for item 4 Lack of assessing needs of school community on what to do with GEQIP budget followed by (3.75) for item 2.School’s GEQIP budget stakeholder lack of freedom to plan and implement freely, and (3.58) for item 3.Lack of providing on time report about GEQIP budget to stakeholder viewed as a Serious problem.. Whereas (3.48) for item 6.Practice of purchasing or using GEQIP budget for un necessary purpose followed by (3.40) for item 7.Absence of clearly examining or notifying things that are done with GEQIP

budget to school Community, (2.83) for item1 Absence of GEQIP budget implementation guideline, and (2.58) for item5.Lack of directors awareness how to plan & implement GEQIP budget were perceived to be as Medium problem to Influence GEQIP budget from achieving quality education, respectively(Mean values were between 3.50-4.49).

Thus, in the rank order of the scores of the factors that Influence GEQIP budget from achieving quality education, it is the Lack of assessing needs of school community on what to do with GEQIP budget that stood first(mean=3.80 ); School's GEQIP budget stakeholder lack of freedom to plan and implement freely second(mean=3.75 ) and Lack of providing on time report about GEQIP budget to stakeholder(mean= 3.58) to be the third place viewed as a Serious problem(Mean values were between 3.50-4.49). The result matches with the participants' perceptions regarding on the GEQIP budget Preparation in the School (Refer table 6). This indicates that Lack of assessing needs of school community on what to do with GEQIP budget ,School's GEQIP budget stakeholder lack of freedom to plan and implement freely , and Lack of providing on time report about GEQIP budget to stakeholder were Serious problems that Influence GEQIP budget from achieving quality education at secondary schools(Mean values were between 3.50-4.49).

Generally the findings from the questionnaire, interview and document analyses clearly reflected that the major factors that hinder GEQIP budget implementations in secondary schools the teacher questionnaire and School principals, supervisors, parents (through PTAs) and schools finance heads interview and document analyses reflect give the school grant will be used respondents reported that absence of GEQIP budget implementation guideline and lack of directors awareness how to plan and implement GEQIP budget is not a serious problem in secondary schools. Moreover, with respect to School's GEQIP budget stakeholder lack of freedom to plan and implement freely; the majority of respondents, agreed that it is a very serious problems in secondary schools

Moreover, among the common problems with the school grant were its low amount, the minor restrictions related to the grant, and the speed with which the grant is

expected to be implemented and reported. Individuals who are working with finance-related tasks complaining of lack of adequate training program as a factor affecting implementation of GEQIP budget in secondary schools of Hariri regional state. This finding is similar to the studies of Berry and Workiye (2009) who also stated that the implementation of GEQIP faces challenges that emanate from the low awareness level among stakeholders, weak understanding of how to integrate the packages and insufficient support system. Moreover, as stated by UNCF (2010), the weak capacity of the schools to correctly interpret, plan, implement, and monitor policies and programs and inadequate resources highly affect the reform. In light of the above perspectives, the present study was, therefore, aimed at examining major challenges to school leadership that hinder the effective implementation of GEQIP fund. In the case of the school grant, several actors are involved in its implementation. One SIC member explained the basic process as follows: after the announcement is made by the school director on the amount, the school grant arrives at the school level, teachers usually meet with their respective departments to identify problems and set priorities. The SICs, found to be active in many schools, then collect these priorities and discuss them either with the SMC or with the PTAs. Together, these committees decide on a list of priorities for their respective schools. The personal and institutional arrangements involved in school-level decision-making vary substantially among the schools and do not necessarily reflect the level of authority allocated to the school by the guideline. For instance, in the school grant (MoE, 2009), the committee has always functioned well and contributed to the good management of the grant at school level. SICs consist of all department heads, the directors, deputy directors, and PTA chairperson, as well as representatives of both PTAs. According to one member of a SIC, The responsibility of the SIC is to identify the major school problems, suggest solutions to the problems, present them to the school management committee to prioritize the problems and follow up the interventions to solve the problems. In this school, SIC has regular meetings once a month and also conducts meetings with parents, teachers, and students at the beginning and end of the year. He added that, when necessary, the SIC also has meetings with the PTA and the SMC. One SMC member also confirmed this: 'The SMC plays a key role in the overall management of the school grant. It deals with both academic and non-academic affairs of the school. The principal only implements what is decided by the SMC'. However, the committee was not reported to be functional in all schools. The SMC was either weak or not functioning. One teacher

interviewed said: 'We only hear that the school has a school management committee, but we never saw the committee members being involved in any decision-making process of the school. What we see is the school director and the PTA chairperson making all the decisions of the school'.

With the exception of the school director, all teachers and students interviewed in this school considered that the necessary structures were not in place for the implementation of the school grant and that there was a definite lack of transparency in the school. One teacher said: 'The school does not have a school improvement committee or a finance committee and the SMC of the school is also not functional'. One teacher, who is a member of the SMC, added: 'The school management committee members are not consulted on how to use the school grant money'. One of the SIP committee members said, 'As a teacher I have to know every detail but frequently we hear just what has been done in the form of a report and thus our involvement is non-existent'.

The school grant guideline also specifies that, 'Parents and the general community will play a vital role in deciding to what extent schools use the school grant to improve the quality of education provided to their children'. Parents and community members have a vital role to play in deciding how the will school grant be used to improve the quality of education of their children. School principals, teachers, students, and parents (through PTAs) are expected to participate in the entire process of decision-making – primarily in identifying problems, setting priorities, planning, implementing, monitoring, and controlling their school activities.

In general, internal control of schools was observed to be carried out by various people such as the school directors, the chairpersons of PTAs and SMCs, as well as by school finance workers (treasurers and cashers). In the block grants are primarily managed and controlled by the school directors, school finance office workers, and the chairpersons of the SMCs. PSTAs are also part of the internal control through their chairperson who is a member of the SMC. The SMC is involved in controlling every aspect of the school finances. The system of external control in place for the school grant guidelines state that the REBs and bureau of finance and economic

development (BoFEDs) are in charge of ensuring the success of the implementation of the grant programmes in the region. Most school-level actors confirmed, 'We were given training and advice on how to use and report the school grants from time to time by supervisors coming from the *REB*.

As for the school grant, schools are expected to prepare financial and activity reports at the end of each phase: Another school director said, 'At the end of each phase of the school grant. They send the original receipts of the school grant expenses to the HEB together with the grant utilization report. Then the REB checks the accuracy and proper utilization of the school grant. So far we had no problem in this regard'. Annual audits are also conducted by the REB auditors at the end of the fiscal (budget) year, on 30 June. School supervisors also track and control the allocation and use of the school grants as an external body. School-level actors have reported that the largest share of the school grant goes towards the improvement of school activities (the teaching-learning process, the school environment, and facilities). One school director said, 'The school grant is used for all the expenses related to the improvement of the teaching and learning activities. It is used to purchase books, reference materials, pens, materials for the preparation of teaching aids, and the like. It can also be used to repair classrooms, desks, etc.' In most cases, the grant has been used according to the school grant guidelines (MoE, 2009).

The other important question that is presented to the school directors and administrators is whether GEQIP budget is helped in achieving its goal bringing quality education or not and they all agreed that currently GEQIP is not achieving its goal. The reason they gave is when GEQIP budget is first lunched is the main objective is to use the budget only for activities that help to bring quality education and it is in addition to the budget which is used to run the school which is block grant. However currently the budget which is expected to run the school, block grant is very small and is not coming on time. As a result only GEQIP budget is used to run the school and is using as block grant. If there is no GEQIP budget it will be very difficult to conduct the normal teaching and learning. In most school the block grant is released in may usually at the end of the year so it is only the GEQIP budget that come on September so it is used as administrative budget. Because of this GEQIP

budget is not helping to ringing to achieve quality education instead it used only to run the school.

In general we can conclude that GEQIP budget is not used to help poor students, female students, to reduce drop out students, improve teaching methods like group learning. Therefore it fails to bring quality education

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

The purpose of this study was to find out the perception of secondary school stakeholders towards the effectiveness of general education quality improvement program fund in bringing quality education in government secondary schools in HNRS. The objectives of the study are to find out the perceptions of secondary school stakeholders towards GEQIP budget to improve bringing quality education to determine the factors causing these perceptions and to suggest possible solutions to overcome this problem.

### **5.1. Summary**

The purpose of this study was to investigate that the effectiveness of general education quality improvement program fund in bringing quality education in secondary schools of Hariri regional state. Three research tools namely; questionnaire, semi-structured interviews and document analysis were employed to answer the research questions.

A descriptive survey method of study was designed for the purpose of the study. The subjects the study include 30 male and 10 female department head teachers, 5 supervisors, 5 school finance office and 5 PTA selected by available sampling technique; 10 school leaders such as principals, vice principals and 30 students were also selected by using stratified random sampling. Both qualitative and quantitative data of the study was obtained through questionnaires and interview as well as document analysis. Descriptive and inferential statistical analyses of data were employed. A five point Liker scale format questionnaire containing both close and open-ended items was prepared, piloted and administered to participants to elicit information related to the study. A null hypothesis is formulated which stated “No significant differences existed between groups responses at 0.05 levels with regard to each item in the questionnaires survey”.

The following basic questions were posed to assess the practice of GEQIP budget preparation in the schools:

1. How was the preparation of GEQIP budget in secondary schools of Hariri region?

2. How was the GEQIP budget utilized and controlled in secondary schools of Hariri region?
3. To what extent GEQIP budget contributed to the achievement of quality education in Hariri region secondary schools?
4. What are the factors that affect the management and effectiveness of GEQIP budget in Hariri region secondary schools?
5. What has to be done to allocate the problems in the study area?

### **Major findings**

Based on the analysis and interpretation of the data, the following major findings were drawn. The data of the questionnaire suggests that the number of male teachers in secondary schools is three fold of the number of female teachers. This implies that as the level of management increases, the degree of participation of women decreases.

The age distribution of the respondents indicates that majority of teachers (60%) were more than 30 years old. On the other hand, the majority (53.3%) of the students were between 16 and 20 years old.

With respect to qualification, majority (90%) of the teachers were degree holders. Almost all (97.5%) teachers have the right qualification to teach at secondary school level. 12 (40%) of students were grade 10 and 40% were grade 9, other 20 % were preparatory students.

Regarding experience, 24 (60%) out of 40 teachers participated in this study have above 10 years work experience. This implies that majority of them had sufficient years of experience to provide the required data for the study. The implication for the presence of respondents with the right qualification and significant number of years of experience helped the researcher to obtain sufficient data on the effectiveness of GEQIP budget contribution in the achievement of quality education within secondary schools.

The finding revealed the school sometimes collected need assessment from teachers and students representatives about what to be done in GEQIP budget with no

significant difference between the two groups of respondents at  $p > 0.05$  significant level (Mean Scores were between 2.50-3.49).

The finding revealed that the school often participates teachers & students representative in GEQIP budget plan preparation (Mean Scores were between 3.50-4.49). The finding revealed that the school sometimes notifies GEQIP budget plan clearly on notice board for the school community and collects need assessment from teachers and students representatives about what to be done in GEQIP budget in secondary schools (Mean Scores were between 2.50-3.49).

The finding revealed that the school sometimes and often performs the GEQIP Budget Preparation in the School. The weighted mean scores are between 2.59 and 3.67 with no significant difference between the groups in giving value to the GEQIP Budget Preparation in the School.

The finding revealed that the Relative top priority seems to be given to the extent that teachers & students have representative participation in GEQIP budget plan preparation (Weighted mean=3.67 ) followed by the extent of the school collects need assessment from teacher & student representative about what to be done in GEQIP budget (Weighted mean=2.80) , and then the school notify GEQIP budget plan clearly on notice board for the school community (Weighted mean=2.59) without any significant difference at 0.05% level.

The finding revealed that students and teachers gave high value to the extent that teachers & students have representative participation in GEQIP budget plan preparation was the greatest. The Mean test value indicated there is no significant difference between the groups in giving value to the GEQIP Budget Preparation in the School. This appears to indicate that there is a general agreement between both respondents that the GEQIP Budget Preparation in the School has contribution so as to facilitate the teaching and learning process.

The finding revealed that stakeholders participate on GEQIP budget plan preparation in secondary schools, but lack of notifications of the GEQIP budget plan for the school community and collecting and assessing needs of school community on what to be done on GEQIP budget.

Document analyses witnessed that teacher, students and PTS representative participated on the GEQIP budget plan preparation.

The finding revealed that school didn't conduct any need assessment and make clear notification about GEQIP budget plan for the school community during the period of the study. This implies that the school prepares GEQIP budget plan without studying the needs of the school community, decided to use it without clear notification about the plan for the school community.

The finding revealed that the school does not conduct participants need assessment before planning GEQIP budget.

The finding revealed that GEQIP budget plan was not designed based on the needs of the school community.

The finding revealed that the GEQIP budget offered to the school is not planned properly to achieve the intended goal to improve the general quality of education which has negative impact for the proper management of the allocated budget.

Majority 16 (40%) of respondents revealed that the budget in the school is prepared by the committee formed from parents, teachers, students representatives and school principals. Whereas 10(25%) of them expressed as they didn't know by whom the GEQIP budget was prepared in their school. The result is supported with teachers' response to the open ended and interview questions. Accordingly, in response teachers confirmed that GEQIP budget plan preparation is done in Committee formed from parents, teachers, students' representatives and school principals.

Majority 18 (45%) of teachers revealed that GEQIP budget plan is prepared only by considering directors need.

The finding revealed that the schools Sometimes issue GEQIP budget to support female students, supports poor students not to drop out of school, helps in making the school attractive & conducive to learning, learns in group work with their friends with no significant difference between the two groups of respondents (Mean Scores between 2.50-3.49).

The finding revealed that GEQIP budget is not helping to improve the class learning especially in providing materials for group work and for others which facilitate group learning.

The finding revealed that that internal or external auditor sometimes controls the implementation of GEQIP budget (Mean Scores between 2.50-3.49).

The finding revealed that that both groups of participants rated the extent of GEQIP budget implementation in the School and viewed the school sometimes issue GEQIP budget to support female students, support poor students not to drop out, gives a prestigious award to students who get good result, the GEQIP budget helps in making the school attractive & conducive to learning, and internal or external auditor control the implementation of GEQIP budget with no significant difference between the groups in giving value to the GEQIP budget implementation in the School at 0.05% significant level.

This appears to indicate that there is a general agreement between both groups of respondents that the GEQIP budget is sometimes implemented and has moderate contribution to facilitate the teaching and learning process in the School.

The finding revealed that teachers agreed that the school has management committee who monitored its budget plan and proper implementation. The result was supported with document analysis witnessed the involvement of management committee name and signatures.

The finding revealed that the school management and community fully involved in preparing the GEQIP budget. It is believed that preparing well organized annual budget for school with the involvement of school management and community is a guarantee for school development and effective financial utilization which also avoids corruption.

The finding revealed that the GEQIP budget sometimes helps in improving students result with no significant difference between the two groups of respondents at 0.05 % significant levels.

The finding revealed that the library contains important books and suitable for readings with no significant difference between the groups in giving value.

The finding revealed that teachers and students presented the extent GEQIP budget helps the school in fulfilling laboratory equipment in the school with no significant difference, .

The finding revealed that majority of the teacher and student said GEQIP budget do not help the school to bring quality education and support improving students result and interest to learn in class.

The finding revealed that majority 13 (32.5%) of the teachers reported that absence of GEQIP budget implementation guideline is not a serious problem in secondary schools.

The finding revealed that Lack of assessing needs of school community on what to do with GEQIP budget that stood first(mean=3.80 ); School's GEQIP budget stakeholder lack of freedom to plan and implement freely second(mean=3.75 ) and Lack of providing on time report about GEQIP budget to stakeholder(mean= 3.58) to be the third place viewed as a Serious problem(Mean values were between 3.50-4.49).

The finding revealed that Practice of purchasing or using GEQIP budget for unnecessary purpose followed by absence of clearly examining or notifying things that are done with GEQIP budget to school Community, absence of GEQIP budget implementation guideline, and Lack of directors awareness how to plan & implement GEQIP budget were perceived to be as Medium problem that Influence GEQIP budget from Achieving Quality Education.

## **5.2. Conclusions**

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

The school sometimes and often performs the GEQIP budget Preparation in the School. There is a general agreement between both respondents that the GEQIP budget Preparation in the School has contribution so as to facilitate the teaching and learning process.

Lack of clear GEQIP budget plan notification for the school community and collecting need assessment from teachers and students representatives in secondary schools

Relative top priority seems to be given to the extent that teachers & students have representative participation in GEQIP budget plan preparation (Weighted mean=3.67 ) followed by the extent of the school collects need assessment from teacher & student representative about what to be done in GEQIP budget(Weighted mean=2.80) , and then the school notify GEQIP budget plan clearly on notice board for the school community(Weighted mean=2.59) without any significant difference at 0.05% level.

Stakeholders participate on GEQIP budget plan preparation in secondary schools, but lack of notifications of the GEQIP budget plan for the school community and collecting and assessing needs of school community on what to be done on GEQIP budget.

School didn't conduct any need assessment and make clear notification about GEQIP budget plan for the school community during the period of the study.

The school prepares GEQIP budget plan without conducting need assessment before planning GEQIP budget decided to use it without clear notification about the plan for the school community.

The GEQIP budget offered to the school is not planned properly to achieve the intended goal to improve the general quality of education which has negative impact for the proper management of the allocated budget.

The budget in the school is prepared by the committee formed from parents, teachers, student's representatives and school principals.

The GEQIP budget plan is prepared in secondary schools only by considering the school director's need.

The school Sometimes issue GEQIP budget to support female students, supports poor students not to drop out of school, helps in making the school attractive & conducive to learning, learns in group work with their friends with no significant difference between the two groups of respondents.

Lack of assessing needs of school community on what to do with GEQIP budget, School's GEQIP budget stakeholder lack of freedom to plan and implement freely, and Lack of providing on time report about GEQIP budget to stakeholder were serious problems that Influence GEQIP budget from achieving quality education at secondary schools.

The school sometimes issue GEQIP budget to support female students, support poor students not to drop out, gives a prestigious award to students who get good result, the GEQIP budget helps in making the school attractive & conducive to learning, and internal or external auditor control the implementation of GEQIP budget with no significant difference between the groups in giving value to the GEQIP budget implementation in the School at 0.05% significant level. There is a general agreement between both groups of respondents that the GEQIP budget is sometimes implemented and has moderate contribution to facilitate the teaching and learning process in the School. The school management and community fully involved in preparing the GEQIP budget.

### 5.3. Recommendations

- **Increased school grant budget support.** The school-level actors who were involved in this research suggested an increase in the size of the school grant. Even though the school grant allocations were recently increased, it was reported by those interviewed that the amounts still do not match the price of goods.
- **Allocating adequate block grants across all schools.** School-level actors questioned the meagerness of the block grants in the Hariri region and their complete absence and delay. In these regions, the school running costs – which are a major expenditure of the block grants – were either not allocated to the school or the amounts were very small. These bleak realities have eroded endeavors to advance the provision of quality education.
- **Eliminating restrictions attached to the school grants.** Actors also felt strongly about changing some of the restrictions attached to the school grant and they requested more flexible spending, which should vary according to their needs.
- **Eliminating delays.** The school actors believed that one explanation for the delays was the lengthy transfer process. Transfers of the school grant should not

go through the long allocation procedure they currently follow and school-level actors would greatly prefer the funds to be transferred directly to school accounts.

- **Providing longer time frames for reporting.** School actors complained that short timeframes for reporting, coupled with short time frames for spending, often month end the level of their reporting.
- **Sharing experiences and best practices.** Although not mentioned by school actors in the field, the research team also believes that the sharing of experiences and best practices could benefit schools and allow for greater improvement in the delivery of quality education.
- **Capacity building in the recording of finances.** Another challenge that the research team encountered was the absence of systematic record-keeping. The researchers firmly believe that there is a great need for capacity building on how to keep adequate financial records at all levels. The revision or redesigning seems to be necessary to implement properly budget offered to the school and to achieve the intended goal to improve the general quality of education which has negative impact for the proper management of the allocated budget.

## 6. REFERENCE

- Adrian, F.2001, The Basic Budgeting problem: Approaches to Resource Allocation in the Public Sector and their Implications for pro-poor Budgeting. London: Overseas Development Institutions. Accessed on December10, 2013.
- Berry, C.& Workiye, T. 2009. General education quality packages: Promoting Inclusive Quality general education in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. 2005. Educational Research: Planning Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research 2nd Ed.
- Dea, & Basha, 2014. Leadership challenges facing school principals in Administration. Wolaita Sodo University.
- Edward, B. C. 2010. Challenges Facing Effective Implementation Of free Secondary Education public Secondary Schools in Hang undo District, Master's Thesis, Chuck University College.
- Firdissa Jebessa 2006. Quality Assurance in Higher Education Institutions: Challenges and opportunities, IER Flambeau, 14: 1-2.
- Frew Amsale 2010. Practices and Challenges of Implementing School Improvement Program in Primary Schools of Jimma City Administration: Addis Ababa University
- Getachew Negera 2005. Analysis of Medium Expenditure Planning and Government Primary Schools: Haramaya University.
- Grover, S. & Singh, N. 2002. The quality of primary education: A Case study of Madurai Vill- Upuram Districts in Tamilnadu. India  
[[www.earthinstitute.columbia.edu/cgsd](http://www.earthinstitute.columbia.edu/cgsd), Retrieved on January, 15/11]
- Hopkins, D. 2005.. In Harris, a. et al.(Eds.) Effective Leadership for School Improvement London:
- Horngren, F.2002.Introduction to Management Accounting. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Jacobs , K.D. & Kritsonis, W.A. 2006. An assessment of secondary principals' leadership behaviors and skills in retaining and renewing science educators

- in Urban Schools. National J. Pub. and Mentoring Doctoral Student Res., 3(1):1-8.
- James, J. 1997. A Research program consortium on implementing education Quality low income countries. Reviewed from <http://www.edqual.org>.
- Jensen, M., 2003. Paying People to Lie: The Truth about the budgeting process, European Financial Management, Oxford, 108-110.
- John Adams (2007). Research Methods for Graduate Business and Social Science Students Sage Publication Inc. Los Angeles, London. New Delhi. Singapore. [Www.Sagepublications.com](http://www.sagepublications.com). Accessed on December 17, 2013.
- Kruger, G.A, 2005. Efficient of Financial Management. In: Van Deventer, AG. Kruger (eds.): An Educator's Guide to School Management Skills. Pretoria. Van Schaik.
- Lalli, W. 2003. Handbook of Budgeting, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Wiley.
- Mesele W/Senbet, 2011. Current Practices and challenges of School Improvement Program in Some Selected Primary Schools of Sodo zura Woreda in Wolyita Zone: Senior Essay Addis Ababa University.
- MoE, 1994 Educational Training Policy. Addis Ababa: EMPDA 30-31p
- MoE. 2005. Education Sector Development Program me III Government Printer. Addis Ababa
- MoE. 2006. Joint Review Mission Report, Teachers Development Program me, Addis Ababa
- Ministry of Education 2007. General Education Quality Implementation Program Document. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa (unpublished)
- Ministry of Education MoE 2008. General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP), Government Printer, Addis Ababa.
- Ministry of Education MoE. 2009. Review of Education Pool Fund Project May/June 2009, Available at [www.dag.ethiopia.org/](http://www.dag.ethiopia.org/) (accessed on August, 2010).
- MoFED. 2004. Millennium Development Goals: Challenges and Prospect for Ethiopia, Government Printer, Addis Ababa. .
- Neely, A. et al. 2003. Budgeting or beyond budgeting? Measuring Business Excellence, Bradford, pp.22-28.
- Patrick McNeill & Steve Chapman. 2005. Research Methods. Third edition. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group press. Accessed on December 22, 2013.
- Pont, B., Nusche, D., & Moorman, H. 2008. Improving school leadership. Reviewed from <http://www.oecd.org/edu/schoolleadership>. Accessed on 21/01/11]

- Sadison, D. 2003. Activity-based planning and budgeting: A new approach for cost management, Boston, USA.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. 1991. The principal ship: A reflective practice perspective (2nded.). Boston: Allyn& Bacon publishing.
- Sungtong, E. 2007. Leadership challenges to public secondary school principals in the era of education reform. University of Missouri: Columbia.
- Tamara, S.2002. Principals' readiness for reform: A comprehensive approach principal leadership (Arlington, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals).[[www.nga.org/cda/files/091203\\_leadership.pdf](http://www.nga.org/cda/files/091203_leadership.pdf) 02/02/2011]
- Terry Allsop – an independent consultant. Abundant field evidence is available in the May 2013 report of the Comprehensive Evaluation of GEQIP Exit Survey
- United States Agency for International Development 2010. Review of Ethiopia's School Self-Assessment and Planning Frameworks Under GEQ[<http://www.et.undp.org>]
- UNESCO. 2008. Financial Education in Developing countries: New Modalities, New Approach: International Institute for Educational planning, working document .Paris: UNESCO HEP (unpublished). 10p.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific & Cultural Organization 2005. Education for All, Global Monitoring Report. UNESCO, Paris.
- United Nations Children Funds in Ethiopia 2010. Child friendly schools, Case study in Ethiopia. Education Section Program Division. Retrieved on January,18/2011 from [www.unicef.org/education](http://www.unicef.org/education).
- Weber, J. & Linder, S.2005 Budgeting, better budgeting Oder beyond budgeting cost management, Boston.(Broschiert).

## **7-APPENDX**

### **7.1-APPENDX-1 Questionnaire for Teachers**

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**  
**POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**  
**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

#### **Questionnaire for Teachers**

Dear participants

This questionnaire aims at investigating the” Factors that affect the effectiveness of General Education Quality Improvement Programme (GEQIP) fund in bringing quality education in secondary schools of Hariri Regional State.”The information you give in response to the items in the questionnaire will be used in a research leading to an M,A, degree in Educational Leadership , Such information is also vital for the development of suitable strategies by taking in to account specific relationship between Factors that affect the effectiveness of General Education Quality Improvement Programme(GEQIP) fund in bringing quality education in secondary schools of Hariri Regional State. You honest and thoughtful response is therefore very important. The researcher assures you that the information provided will be strictly confidential, and used for purpose of academic research only. There is no need for you to write your name on the questionnaire.

Please respond to each item. Do not omit any of them.

Thank you in advance

**General instruction;-** Where applicable please put a tick( ✓ ) mark and please write appropriate answer which you are asked for your extended opinion

## PART ONE--- BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In this section you are requested to tike the most appropriate alternative about your background information that is most appropriate.

1, School's name \_\_\_\_\_

2, Sex: Male  Female

3, Age:\_ Below 21 years  20---25  25----30  30 ----35   
35---40  above 40 years

4, Educational status: Diploma  Degree  M.sc/M.A

Please specify if any \_\_\_\_\_

5, Work Experience in year:- 1-5  5-10  10-15  15-20   
Ab0ve -20 years

## PART- 2: GEQIP Budget preparation

1. To what extent do have teacher's representative participation in GEQIP budget Preparation?

A, Always [ ] C, Sometimes [ ]  
B, Often [ ] D Rarely [ ] E, Never [ ]

2. How far the School notify the GEQIP budget to the school community on the notice board.

A, Always [ ] C, Sometimes [ ]  
B, Often [ ] D Rarely [ ] E, Never [ ]

3, when GEQIP budget is prepared to what extent is need assessment collected from school community?

A, Always [ ] C, Sometimes [ ]  
B, Often [ ] D Rarely [ ] E, Never [ ]

4,who prepare GEQIP budget in your school?

A, Only Directors [ ] C, Only Teachers [ ]

B, Only Parents of students [ ] D, committee from all [ ]

E, I don't know [ ]

5, How GEQIP budget plan is prepared?

A, By Identifying and assessing needs [ ]

B, Only by considering director need [ ]

C, Only considering Education bureaus needs [ ] D, I don't know [ ]

### Part 3. GEQIP budget Implementation

1, To what extent GEQIP budget helps to increase females students Participation in education?

A, Always [ ] C, Sometimes [ ]

B, Often [ ] D Rarely [ ] E, Never [ ]

2. To what extent the school support poor students not to drop out of school?

A, Always [ ] C, Sometimes [ ]

B, Often [ ] D Rarely [ ] E, Never [ ]

3, To what extent the GEQIP budget help the school in making the school attractive and conducive to Learning?

A, Always [ ] C, Sometimes [ ]

B, Often [ ] D Rarely [ ] E, Never [ ]

4. To what extent do you learn in students group work with your friend?

A, Always [ ] C, Sometimes [ ]

B, Often [ ] D Rarely [ ] E, Never [ ]

5. How often the school gives a predictions award to students who get good result

A, Always [ ] C, Sometimes [ ]

B, Often [ ] D Rarely [ ] E, Never [ ]

6, How often internal or external auditor control the implementation of GEQIP budget?

A, Always [ ] C, Sometimes [ ]

B, Often [ ] D Rarely [ ] E, Never [ ]

### Part 4 GEQIP Budget contribution to Quality education

1, To what extent the GEQIP budget helps in improving students result ?

- A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]  
B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]

2, To what extent the GEQIP budget help in function reference books In the school ?

- A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]  
B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]

3, To what extent the GEQIP budget helps the school and you to bring quality education

- A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]  
B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]

4, To what extent the GEQIP budget helps in giving teacher training ?

- A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]  
B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]

5, In your class to what extent the interest of students to learn is in increasing

- A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]  
B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]

### Part 5. Factors that GEQIP budget from achieving quality education

**Instruction:** after reading the given statement show your level of agreement or disagreement by making ( V ) sine.

5= very serious problem    4= serious problem    3= medium problem    2= Low problem    1 = not a problem

No	Statement	Level of agreement				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	absence of GEQIP budget Implementation Guide Line					
2	School's GEQIP budget stakeholder Lack of freedom to plan and implement freely					
3	Lack of providing on time report about GEQIP budget to stakeholder.					
4	Lake of assessing needs of school community on what to do with GEQIP budget					
5	Lack of directors awareness how to plan & implement GEQIP budget					
6	Practice of purchasing or using GEQIP budget for un necessary purpose					
7	Absence of clearly examining or notifying thing that are done with GEQIP budget to school Community					

### Part 6. Give your answer to the following question by writing on the given blank Space

1,How do you know whether GEQIP budget is planned & implemented appropriately?

is there any other institute who control or monitor its plan and implementation ?

---



---



---

2, Can you explain the contribution of GEQIP budget to education quality?

---



---



---

3, What are the challenges that you face in planning and implementing GEQIP budget appropriately? List all the challenges

---

---

---

## 7.2-APPENDX-II: Questions for students

**HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**  
**POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE**  
**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

### Questions for Students

#### Dear participants

This questionnaires aims at investigating the” The effectiveness of General Education Quality Improvement Program me (GEQIP) fund in bringing quality education in secondary schools of Hariri Regional State.” The information you give in response to the items in the questionnaire will be used in a research leading to an M,A, degree in Leadership Management, such information is also vital for the development of suitable strategies by taking in to account specific relationship between The effectiveness of General Education Quality Improvement Programme(GEQIP) fund in bringing quality education in secondary schools of Hariri Regional State. You honest and thoughtful response is therefore very important.

The research assures you that the information provided will be strictly confidential, and used for purpose of academic research only. There is no need for you to write your name on the questionnaire.

Please respond to each item. Do not omit any of them.

Thank you in advance

**General instruction;-** Where applicable please put a tike( ✓ ) mark and please write answer where a broken line is provided.

## PART ONE --- BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### QUATIONS FOR STUDENTS

In this section you are requested to tike the most appropriate alternative about your background information that is most appropriate.

School's name \_\_\_\_\_

Sex: Male  Female

Age: 15—20  20-25  25 & Above

Grade: 9  10  11  12

### Parte two -Questionnaire for Students

#### PART 2.1, GEQIP Budget preparation

1, To what extent students representative your school participate in GEQIP budget plan Preparation?

A, Always [ ] C, Sometimes [ ]  
B, Often [ ] D Rarely [ ] E, Never [ ]

2, How often the school notifies the GEQIP budget plane clearly for school community on the notice board.

A, Always [ ] C, Sometimes [ ]  
B, Often [ ] D, Rarely [ ] E, Never [ ]

3, When GEQIP budget is prepared to what extent is collect need assessment from Student's representative?

A, Always [ ] C, Sometimes [ ]  
B, Often [ ] D Rarely [ ] E, Never [ ]

### **Part 2.2. GEQIP budget Implementation**

- 1, How often the school issue GEQIP budget to support female students
  - A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]
  - B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]
2. To what extent the school support poor students not to drop out of school ?
  - A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]
  - B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]
- 3, To what extent the GEQIP budget help the school in making the school attractive and conducive to learning?
  - A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]
  - B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]
4. To what extent do you learn in a group work with your friend
  - A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]
  - B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]
5. How often the school give a predictions award to students who get good result
  - A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]
  - B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]

### **PARTE- 2.3. GEQIP Budget contribution to Quality education**

1. To what extent the GEQIP budget helps in improving students result?
  - A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]
  - B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]
- 2, To what extent the library contain important books and suitable for readings?
  - A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]
  - B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]
- 3, To what extent GEQIP budget helps the school in full fling Laboratory equipment in the school?
  - A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]
  - B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]

4, To what extent the GEQIP budget helps the school and you to bring quality education

- A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]  
B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]

5, In your class to what extent the interest of students to learn is in increasing

- A, Always [ ]      C, Sometimes [ ]  
B, Often [ ]      D Rarely [ ]      E, Never [ ]

### 7.3-APENDEX-III: Interview

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

**Questions for interviewing** - principals, vice principals, PTA members,  
supervisors and school budget expert

The main purpose of this study is to collect data about preparation and management of budget in some selected secondary schools in Hariri Town of Hariri National Regional State. Be sure that the information or data collected will be employed only for the research purpose. Therefore, you are kindly asked to give the necessary information that contributes much to the quality of this reach work.

Name of the school \_\_\_\_\_

Your position in the school \_\_\_\_\_

Your educational qualification \_\_\_\_\_

1. Is there scarcity of GEQIP budget in your secondary school for education? If your response is “yes”, how do you overcome this problem?
2. What ways/steps or means do you follow while preparing GEQIP budget for your secondary School?
3. What systems do you use to control and monitor the implementation of your secondary school GEQIP budget?
4. Does the GEQIP budget help improve your school students result and to bring quality education?
5. Please list down the problems on preparation, approval, implementation and evaluation of GEQIP budget practices in your secondary school.
6. Please suggest the possible solutions for the problems you have listed above.

**Thank you in advance for your cooperation.**