

**STATUS AND CHALLENGES OF KEBELE EDUCATION AND
TRAINING BOARD PARTICIPATION IN THE MANAGEMENT OF
PREPARATORY SCHOOLS IN NORTH SHOA ZONE OF OROMIA
REGIONAL STATE**

MA THESIS

JOTE ABDISA ARARSA

AUGUST 2017

HARAMAYA UNIVERSTY, HARAMAYA

**Status and Challenges of Kebele Education and Training Board
Participation in the Management of Preparatory Schools in North Shoa
Zone of Oromia Regional State**

**A Thesis Submitted to The College of Education and Behavioral Sciences,
Department of Educational Planning and Management,
Postgraduate Program Directorate
HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY**

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

Jote Abdisa Ararsa

AUGUST 2017

Haramaya Universty, Haramaya

HARAMAYA UNIVERSITY
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM DIRECTORATE

As thesis research advisors, we here by that we have read and evaluated thesis prepared under our guidance, by **Jote Abdisa** Entitled " Status and Challenges of Kebele Education and Training Board participation in The Management of Preparatory Schools North Shoa Zone". We recommend that it be submitted as fulfilling the Thesis requirements.

Dr. Dawit Negassa

Major Advisor

Signature

Date

Mohammed Kedir

Co-advisor

Signature

Date

As members of the Board of Examiners of the MA This Open Defense Examination we certify that we have read and evaluated the thesis prepared by Mr. **Jote Abdisa** and examined the candidate. We recommended that the Thesis be accepted as fulfilling the thesis requirement for master of Arts in Educational Leadership.

Chair person

Signature

Date

Internal Examiner

Signature

Date

External Examiner

Signature

Date

DEDICATION

I dedicated this thesis work to my beloved wife Jitu Ayalew and my family for their unreserved continuous advice and encouragement throughout my research work to complete it successfully.

STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR

First I would like to explain that this thesis is my own work and that all sources of materials used have been dully acknowledged. This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for MA degree in school leadership at Haramaya University and is deposited at the University library. I seriously declared that this thesis is not submitted to any other institution anywhere for award of any academic degree or others.

Brief citation from this thesis are allowed without special permission provided that accurate acknowledgment of the source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the dean of the Graduate Studies when his or her judgment the proposed used of material is in the interest of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

Name : Jote Abdisa

Date of submission: August 2017

Signature _____

Department: Department of Educational Planning and Management

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR

The author was born in 1984 G.C at North Shoa Zone, Wera Jarso Woreda in Oromia Regional state. He attended primary and secondary education at Ejersa elementary school grade one, Ali Berdada elementary school from grade 2-6 and Gohatsion elementary school from grade 7-8 and grade 9-10 at Gohatsion Secondary School and grade 11-12 at Gerba Guracha Preparatory School. The author received Bachelor of degree in Education with major in Mathematics and minor in physics from Jimma University in 2006 G.C/1998 E.C. Then, he served as Mathematics Teacher from 2007-2010, next as vice principal and principal of Gohatsion Secondary School. To pursue his further study, and improve his qualification, he joined the Postgraduate program Directorate at Haramaya University for MA degree program in School Leadership in 2015.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to praise the Almighty God for His blessing, and for providing me the opportunity strength and patience in the entire period of this study.

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my major advisor, Dr. Dawit Negassa and Co-advisor Mohammed Kedir (Assistant Professor) for their positive, valuable, reliable professional guidance, constructive comments, suggestions and encouragement starting from the proposal development up to thesis research writing and completion. Without their feedback and suggestions, I would not be able to complete satisfactorily the thesis.

Moreover, I would like to give special thanks to all selected preparatory school principals and teachers and KETB members and other respondents for their support in giving the required information of the study.

Last, but certainly not least, my deepest gratitude is for my family, without whom I would not be here, at all. I am extremely grateful to my beloved wife Jitu Ayalew, my sister Shewaye Abdisa, my brother Boja Leta, and my father Abdisa Ararsa for their unconditional love, support and encouragement throughout my life.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

FDRE	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
KETB	Kebele Education and Training Board
MoE	Ministry of Education
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
WEO	Woreda Education Office
UNESCO	United Nations, Educational Scientific, and Cultural Organization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iv
STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR	v
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
ABSTRACT	xii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
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	6
1.7. Limitation of the study	6
1.8. Operational definitions of Key Terms	7
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	8
2.1. Concept of Community Participation	8
2.2. Characteristics of Community Participation	9
2.3. The Rationale for Community Participation in the School Management	9
2.4. Types of Community Participation	10
2.5. The KETB and Its Area of Participations in Schools Management	11
2.5.1. KETB participation in planning	13
2.5.2. KETB Participation in Decision Making	13
2.5.3. KETB Participation in Resource Management	14
2.5.4. KETB Participation in Monitoring and Evaluation	14
2.5.5. KETB participation in disciplinary issues	15
2.6. Roles and Responsibilities of KETB in School Management	15
2.7. Composition of the School Board	16
2.7.1. Selection of school board	17
2.7.2. Size of board members	17
2.7.3. The School board's term of office	18

2.8. Relationship Between the School Board and the Community	18
2.9. Challenges in Participation of KETB in School Management	19
2.10. Strategies used for Improving KETB Participation	20
2.10.1. Providing training to school principals	20
2.10.2. Providing training to KETBS' members	21
2.10.3. Creating conducive environment	21
2.11. Community Participation in School Management in Ethiopia	21
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	25
3.1. Description of the Study Area	25
3.2. Research Design	25
3.3. Sources of Data	26
3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Technique	26
3.5. Instruments of Data Collection	27
3.5.1. Questionnaire	27
3.5.2. Interview guide	29
3.5.3. Document analysis	29
3.6. Procedures of Data Collection	29
3.7. Methods of Data Analysis	30
3.8. Ethical Considerations	30
4. DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	32
4.1. Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents	32
4.2. Current Status of KETB Members Participation in the Management	35
4.3. Participation of the KETB members in key management functions	38
4.4. Challenges in participation of KETB members in school management	48
4.5. Strategies for improving KETB participation in management of preparatory schools	54
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	55
5.1. Summary	55
5.2. Conclusion	58
5.2. Recommendations	60
6. REFERENCES	62
7. APPENDICES	67

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	pages
1. Population, Sample size and sampling techniques	27
2: Reliability	28
3: Socio- demographic characteristics of respondents	33
4: Current status of KETB members participation in management	35
5: KETB members participation in the school management	38
6: The KETB Members Participation in Planning	39
7: KETB members' participation in decision making	42
8:KETB members participation in monitoring and evaluation	45
9: Challenges affecting participation of KETB members in school management	48
10: Socio-culture factors that hinder the participation of all society groups included in the KETBs	Error! Bookmark not defined.

STATUS AND CHALLENGES OF KEBELE EDUCATION AND TRAINING BOARD PARTICIPATION IN THE MANAGEMENT OF PREPARATORY SCHOOLS IN NORTH SHOA ZONE

Jote Abdisa

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the status and challenges of KETB members participation in the management of preparatory schools in the North Shoa Zone. The study employed a descriptive survey research design, which employed both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis. Data were obtained from both primary and secondary sources. Six woredas and six preparatory schools were included in the study using random sampling techniques. The respondent of the study were Committees' members, teachers, school principals and supervisors that included 72 members of committees, 121 teachers, 12 school principals and 6 supervisors. While random sampling was used to select teachers and available sampling was used to select school committees' members, school principals and supervisors. The data collection instrument were questionnaire and interview. The collected data were analyzed using frequencies, percentages and chi-square test to see the significant difference among the respondent groups. Some of the major findings were, concerning to the current status of KETB members participation in the management such as KETB members visiting the schools beyond the regular meeting time, to give quick response to the problem encountered in teaching learning process, and to make decision for the complaints of principals and teachers were not done at all. With respect to participation of the KETB members participation in the key management functions such as planning, in allocating and approving budget and how the school budget is spent and participate in controlling school property, participate in monitoring and evaluation of the teacher performance and evaluating the impact of community participation in students achievement was very low. Regarding to challenges affect KETB members participation, lack of confidence, reluctance or lack of commitment, lack of incentive, inappropriate and shortage of time arranged for board meeting were found as major hindering factors. Thus, to improve this situation, involving KETB members in key management functions such as planning, decision making, implementation of the plan, managing disciplinary issues and monitoring and evaluation process, assessing the overall activities of KETB members and provide reward to those members who performed well in their respective positions, providing continued training to KETB members in planning, decision making, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation and working in the area attitudinal problems of the community problems in order to bring smooth relationship and active participation of community representative in the area of preparatory school management.

1. INTRODUCTION

This section consists of the background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation and limitation of the study and the definition of key terms.

1.1. Background of the Study

Schools are institutions which work with community and part of the community. They need assistance of community to accomplish their intended objectives. Schools cannot exist separately from the community (Swift-Morgan, 2006). That means, it is widely agreed that one of the key factors influencing school development in terms of student achievement and facilities enrichment is the extent of community participation in school operation. Research indicates that community participation in school affairs increases students' development, better behavior, higher graduation rates and greater enrolment in higher education (Zenebe, 2006).

Communities that are informed and engaged in education can promote accountability, learning by monitoring education performance, advocating for improved service, encourage learning in and out of the school (Bruns B,*et al.*, 2011). The participation of community members in school management contributes a lot in increasing the improvement of school effectiveness. This enables educational decision to fall at the hands of community so as to give solutions to educational problems relevant to the local need (Cummings, 1998).

To facilitate the mutual benefits school and community obtain from each other, there must be a coordinating body between them. As a result, KETBs were established according to the MoE guideline of 2002. Barrera *et al.* (2009) explains that the KETB may take on variety of school and community functions. These are approving school expenditure, participating in school budgeting processes, monitoring teacher performance, publicizing the status of learning in the community, raising funds for the school, serving as a channel for parental concerns, encouraging parents to monitor and assist in student learning at home, or facilitating communication and cooperation between school management, parents and the community. The object of establishing KETB is to help schools get quick decision and mobilize the efforts of communities to solve problems that schools are facing. Moreover, KETB has responsibility

to increase enrollment of girls and use alternative modes of delivery to provide education for children and adults who could not enroll in formal schools (BEA-E, 2007). To this effect, Pamoja (2005) states that in order to build a constituency for policy reform sustained and to create sustained pressure for change, different activities should be carried out. This is to say civil society groups and education officials need to foster a vigorous public debate on education problems, and to create empowering opportunities for ordinary people act in concert with others in order to bring about change in our schools.

As long as schools have established a strong and effective relation with the community, many things will get improved in the school management system. For example, there will be improvement in the quality, dropout and enrollment (Shaffer, 1994). In order to get such changes, school leaders are expected to establish an effective management system, which invites parents and the society to take part in the different school management functions.

The management of secondary and preparatory schools is left as the responsibilities of the region (Ayalew, 2000). The MoE (1994) has also set standard guides in 1994 for itself, regions, zone, woredas and schools. It is responsible for providing professional support, and setting country-wide educational standards. On the other hand, regions, zones, woredas and schools have shared responsibilities to implement the policy. But the role and responsibilities between woreda, kebele and school were not clearly stated in the guideline. As a result there were problems in the implementation of the policies at the grass root level (MoE, 1994).

To alleviate this problem, the MoE prepared management and organization, community participation and finance guideline (MoE 2002) which clearly demarcated the responsibility of educational management hierarchies at each level. Accordingly, the educational management is decentralized to woreda and schools to participate the community in the management of school. It briefly states the authority and responsibilities from the MoE down to school. Thus, more attention and emphasis has been given to local management of schools with more participatory decision making, implementation, monitoring (MoE, 2002). Even if authority is given down to local level, the management problem is still not solved in the zone under the study. Practically, it was observed that the KETB at preparatory school level are not discharging their roles and responsibilities to the required extent.

Moreover, in the North Shoa Zone, since, there is scarcity of studies which focus on the status and challenges of KETB participation in the management of schools, the researcher tried to investigate this topic by taking this zone as area of the study.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Ethiopia has recognized that the weak management and implementation capacity at school level was one of the barriers to access, equity in secondary education (MoE, 2005). Thus, the Ministry of Education acknowledged the importance of KETB school management or school-based decision-making .

KETB constitute part of the formal structures of governance through which the community are enabled to participate in the education of their children. It is assumed that through such structures educational provision is enhanced and school governance and educational quality is improved (Onderi, Andrew, and Makore, 2012). According to this view, we understand that community participation is very essential at all levels of education system because it bonds the society and the school together for their mutual interests and paves ways for the successful accomplishment of school activities. FDRE (2002) has stated that Kebele Education and Training Board serve as school governing bodies at school level.

These school governing bodies are also established at all schools of North Shoa Zone, however, the existing reality of their performance in carrying out their duties and responsibility does not show significant improvement. Long year experience of the researcher in the respective area has identified that KETB involvement in the management of preparatory schools of North Shoa Zone still in need of improvement. In most preparatory schools of North Shoa Zone, KETB does not exercise its roles autonomously.

Different researches were conducted in different countries with regard to community participation in education. For instance, the research which was carried out in Nigeria, under the title "parents' involvement in school administration as a correlate of effectiveness of secondary schools in Nigeria" (Ajayi, Haastrup and Arogundade, 2006) focused on the relationship between parents' involvement in the school administration and effectiveness of secondary schools in Nigeria.

In Ethiopia, a research was conducted in Bahir Dar by a team of graduate students from the George Washington University (Yodit, Goike, and Robbins, 2004). The research attempted to examine the need for the stimulation of external sources in community participation, impact of community participation on school quality. Moreover, there is also a research conducted by Edosa (2009) on the title "roles of stakeholders in management of secondary schools of West Shoa Zone". The main findings of this study were, due to the nature of their job KETB members participation was low, community lacks trainings related to their roles and responsibilities in school management.

But these researches did not show challenges that hinder the participation of KETB in the management of the schools. Besides, many preparatory school principals and teachers of North Shoa Zone often complain in different meetings that KETBs involvement in school management is poor. In order to fill this gap, it is necessary to conduct a study to assess the current status and challenges of KETB participation in the management of North Shoa Zone. Therefore, the researcher is initiated to conduct this study aiming at filling the research gap and resolving those complains.

1.3. Research Questions

This study aimed at investigating the status and challenges of Kebele education and training board participation in the management of preparatory schools in North Shoa zone. Based on this purpose, the researcher attempted to address the following basic questions:

1. What is the current status of KETBs members' participation in the management of Preparatory Schools in the North Shoa Zone?
2. What is the extent of participation of KETB in different management functions (planning, controlling, staffing, organizing) of preparatory schools in the North Shoa Zone?
3. What are the major challenges that affect the participation of the school KETB members in preparatory schools management system in North Shoa Zone?
4. What measures should be taken to improve the KETB members' participation in the management of preparatory schools in the North Shoa Zone?

1.4. Objectives of the Study

The general and specific objectives of the study are:

1.4.1. General objective

The general objective of the study was to assess the status and challenges of Kebele Education and Training Board participation in the management of preparatory schools in North Shoa Zone.

1.4.2. Specific objectives

The Specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Assess the current status of KETB members' participation in the management of Preparatory Schools of North Shoa Zone.
2. Examine the extent of participation of KETB members involve in the management function of Preparatory Schools of North Shoa Zone.
3. Identify the major challenges that affects the participation of KETBs members in school management of preparatory school of North Shoa Zone.
4. Suggest the measures to be taken to improve KTEB participation in the management of preparatory school of North Shoa Zone.

1.5. Significance of the Study

The findings of the study will be helpful to indicate the status of KETB members' in the management of preparatory schools of North Shoa Zone. The study may be useful as feedback for educational experts at regional level while assessing status and challenges of KETB participation in the management of preparatory schools in North Shoa Zone. It may also reveal the challenges encountered in the participation of KETB and will provide measures that improve KETB participation in the management of North Shoa Zone preparatory schools. It may help educational leaders at woreda level to train and develop the skill of KETB members; further it contributes in developing the awareness of principals, vice-principals, and teachers in the schools to enhance KETB participation.

Moreover, the findings valuable information to the zone and woreda education experts about the status and challenges of KETB participation in the management of preparatory schools of North Shoa Zone. It will also provide solutions to the major problems that will be discovered under investigation. In addition to this, the finding of the study will be served to identify the success and challenges of KETB participation in the management and to indicate the gap as input for administrators to design future programs and to use a spring board for further research who are interested to work in this area.

1.6. Delimitation of the Study

Although the role and responsibilities of KETBs in school management were the problem that requires studying, conditions such as material, financial, time and geographical area constraints forced the researcher to delimit the scope of the study in terms of time and geographical area. Hence the study was conducted in North Shoa Zone preparatory schools. There were 14 woredas and 14 preparatory schools in the Zone. To make the study manageable, it was confined to 6 woredas from exist woredas by simple random sampling. In addition to this the researcher selected 6 preparatory schools from the sample woredas of the zone through availability sampling techniques.

The population of the study were 174 teachers, 12 principals 6 supervisors and 72 members of school committees (KETB, PTA) in North Shoa preparatory schools. The researcher cannot take all preparatory schools of the zone as sample because of the time, resource and finance constraints, 121 teachers, 12 principals, 6 supervisors and 72 members of committees took as sample of the study. The study delimited to the extent of board participation in management of preparatory schools, management functions mainly, planning, finance management and decision making issues problems that hinder board participation and possible solution to tackle the problem. The subjects of study was KETB members, Teachers, school supervisors and principals.

1.7. Limitation of the study

It is clear that a research work may not be totally free from limitation. Because of this fact some respondents lack interest and being reluctant of some teachers and committee's members

in the process of filling and returning the questionnaire. As the result, it was difficult to collect all questionnaires as it was intended. However, the researcher had done all the possible efforts to complete this study successfully.

1.8. Operational definitions of Key Terms

Community : A group of people living in particular area and those who have an influence on schools. These include parents, local leaders, social workers and the likes

Government Preparatory school : The school which has second cycle levels (grade 11-12) that owned by the Government (MoE, 2002).

Kebele : The lowest local administrative unit which is accountable for woreda.

Kebele Education and training board (KETB) : A committee formed that contains a maximum of eight person to make decision on different school level activities and accountable to kebele council (MoE, 2002)

Management : The process of planning, decision making, monitoring and evaluation, and the handling of disciplinary issues.

Participation: Active involvement of the KETB members in the school management activities.

School Board: A body who works as local educational authority or committee that is responsible for overseeing the schools in area known as school district.

School Management: The process of leading people to achieve effective school operation of which key elements are planning, fitting policy, making decision, communicating with community, government and non government organization.

Woreda: Sub division of Zone administration which is responsible for administering various kebeles.

Zone: Refers to the middle level of government administration that is below region and above woreda or subdivision of a region that consists of some numbers of woredas.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This section deals with the definition and concept of community, KETB, challenges that affect KETB, and strategies used to for improve KETB participation in the management.

2.1. Concept of Community Participation

Community is defined as a social unit where the locality in which they reside is an integral part; within which members interact together to do things and to achieve what they want. By participating in various groups and collective action, communities are able to act together regarding the common concerns of their lives (Aref & Asnarulkhadi, 2011). Community is also referred to the group of people who are sharing similar experience if properly coordinated can provide greater support; if this participation properly managed it can bring about the desired achievements in education system. However, due to different factors local communities lack coordination through their representative like school committee and other to participate in educational issues and contribute less to the success of their respective schooling activities.

Community participation is the process by which community groups assume control and authority over decisions and resources of local school. Community participation is a meaningful when the community are actively involved starting from planning, management and, evaluation and implementation (Narayan and Ebbe, 1997, Importo and Jeff, 2003). Community participation itself is not a goal in education delivery, nor a panacea to solve complicated issues contributing to poor educational quality rather it is a process that facilitates the realization of improving educational quality and the promotion of democratic within society (Uemura, 1999).

Norman (2000) pointed out that community participation is one of the key ingredients of empowered community. Participation is the heart that pumps the community's lifeblood-its citizen in to the country's business. To this effect, community participation is being carried out in the management of schools through members of Kebele Education and Training Board.

2.2. Characteristics of Community Participation

Though it varies from place to place, several participating communities share several characteristics. Norman (2000), indicated that participating community, many people are involved, power and responsibilities are decentralized. Norman (2000) also states that participating communities encourage citizens to offer their best for the common good, make no distinctions among various groups, and operate openly and with an open mind.

Community participation can be made efficient and effective if it is based on basic principles of participation. Some of these principles are stated as follows: a) Conducting meeting-frequent meetings must be made with the community in order to discuss on the interest and problems of the school, b) Identifying a leader who believes in the importance of education and who has an acceptance by others, c) Providing parents with a real role in the day-to-day management of the school (MoE, 1998).

Community participation is not a convenience or simply a means to an end. It is a concept and a practice based on solid rational and experiences of many countries and communities in their development endeavors in education and other sectors (Zenebe, 2006).

2.3. The Rationale for Community Participation in the School Management

There are numerous benefits from well-implemented school and community partnership programs. They include increased student attendance, higher achievement, and report-card grades, fewer behavioral problems, and an increase in positive attitude about school and homework (Adelman and Taylor, 2007). Community participation is the main factor, which can affect on processes of community development could not be achieved (Aref and Asnarulkhad, 2011).

Norman (2000) also attempted to describe the importance of community participation as follows: Community participation is a condition for success. Studies have documented those communities that engage their citizens achieve more results, and develop in a more holistic and ultimately more beneficial way. Community participation, then, is critical to community

success. Therefore, genuine participation increases the likelihood that communities will have ownership of their development projects (Solomon *et al.*, 2007).

Community participation is much useful for the progress and development of school organizations. School is not static rather it is dynamic so that in order to adapt itself with the changing environment, it requires the active involvement of the community. to this effect, Zenebe (2006) has justified community participation as: a) A means for exercising and expanding democratic processes, and enhancing public accountability and transparency b) A matter of citizenship right c) A mechanism for influencing policy and strategic directions and actions; d) A tool for sensing people's real needs and acting collectively to solve problems and address established needs.

Onderi and Andrew (2012) stated that community involvement and active support in teaching and learning is critical to sustained educational quality; their support is critical factor in the success of the school and their cooperation with teachers enhances pupils' performance. Community participation can strengthen and tie the bond between the society and the school. Therefore, the fundamental reason for creating close and intimate relations between the school and community are economic, and educational and socio-psychology (Zenebe, 2006).

2.4. Types of Community Participation

UNESCO (2002) categorizes community participation as: Voluntary participation where the community takes the initiative itself to participate in running educational activities; Induced participation where the administrator takes initiatives to promote participation; and compulsory participation (manipulated to mobilize the community to get man power or financial contribution).

Community participation can also be classified based on the extent or degree of influence practiced on decision-making. These include purely formal participation (nominal participation) where the flow of information is one way from principal to community. It is simply to attend meetings to receive information. Participation confined to consultation is the second type where the community is not only informed but also able to react and assert its opinion. the third type is participation-involving power sharing where the community controls

the decision making process (UNESCO, 2002). Though there are different types of community participation, to choose the best types, we have to consider the situation.

According to Epstein, 1995 cited in Davis (2000), there are six general categories of partnerships that exist between schools, families, and communities. These are: a) parenting: Helping families establish home environments to support children as learners b) Communications: The use of effective forms for school-to-home and home to-school communications c) Volunteering: The recruitment and organization of the school's volunteer program d) Learning at Home: Helping families assist their children with homework and recognizing other learning at home opportunities e) Decision-making: Including parents, with the community: The identification and integration of resources and services from the community.

On the other hand, Colletta and Perkins (1995) illustrate various forms of community participation in educational organizations: a) participatory research and data collection(which intends to get good information about the perceptions, values and existing organizational structures and association of beneficiary community); b) dialogue with policymakers (include community representatives in the dialoge on education policy can help to ease the implementation of reforms). c) school management(recognizing that the beneficiaries(parents, community leaders, and students) can often determine best what they want from their school, and what measures are needed to make it more effective, there is a strong case for devolving authority over aspects of school management to the local level. d) development of curriculum and learning materials (community participation in the curriculum design and the production of learning materials ensures that the curriculum and materials used are appropriate to interest and experiences of students); e) school construction (the involvement of communities in the construction of schools can help to create sense of belongingness and ownership on the part of the society).

2.5. The KETB and Its Area of Participations in Schools Management

The purpose of school board is to determine the feasibility of adopting community involvement model for lifelong learning. Schmitt (2003) stated that among the tasks to be

accomplished by the group are determination of the level of interests, degree of commitments, and status of financial support for the concept that exist in schools and the greater community.

On the other hand, from the experience of most countries community elects their representatives to govern the school that they own. They should, therefore be kept informed on regular bases about how money is being spent and how effective education being provided. According to Bagin (2001), a school board must know something about the nature of public opinion in order to run good to school system.

If they fail to do what the public wants sharp criticism and opposition will be followed. Therefore, to every school board constantly faces the task of trying to satisfy all the people and groups in the community. The school board embodies the principle of collaboration between parents and staff and community partnership. Its members need to include parents, principal and teachers.

Accordingly, the MoE (1994) established the KETB, and gave the overall responsibilities for managing schools to kebele. The member of the boards are drawn from representative of the kebele administration, principal of the school as secretariat, representation of PTA members, representative of women and youth association, and representative of teacher associations. These school boards in each school are instrumental organs towards empowering communities to exercise their rights, duties and responsibilities.

Kebele education and training board (KETB) participation plays an important role in all aspects of education from raising resources to managing schools. But, KETB to carry out more of what is expected from them and to support the school, they must further enhance participation of the community on different management functions. Supporting to contributing resource UNESCO (2006) stated that community participation in school management has very often been to requests or even demands for contribution in kind, in cash or labor.

To make participation meaningful and active it has to go to the extent of participating in planning, decision- making, budgeting monitoring and evaluation and managing disciplinary issues and process.

2.5.1. KETB participation in planning

Planning is the process of deciding in advance, what is to be done, how it is to be done, where, when and whom. Among the managerial functions, planning is the first and most important one which gives direction to educational institutions. It is the process preparing a set of decisional action for the future directed at achieving goals by option means (Donald and Bagin, 2005). The participation of community in the planning of the school development activity is important for various reasons. It would be seen that each community has knowledge, skill and experience to benefit the school by serving on planning committee, finance, and building or community relations. Planning involves determination of objectives to be achieved as well as the activities required to achieve the objectives (Birhane *et al.*, 2009).

The involvement of the community in planning helps to create a sense of ownership on the community and to strengthen the relationship between the school and society. A school committee or council, comprised of teachers, school leadership, parents and/or community members, is a common mechanism of promoting community involvement in education (Barrera *et al.*, 2009). Therefore, the school has to engage the school board members in the planning of school activities (FDRE, 2002). If this not carried out, there will be a gap between the society and the school. Hence, the school may encounter difficulties in implementing the plan.

2.5.2. KETB Participation in Decision Making

Decision-making is the process of choosing one course of action from the available alternatives (Alpha University College, 2006). When the group of people works together well, decision making improves. The areas that school board, and community need to participate in decision making includes decision on the overall school policy, overall management of the school, financial management, monitoring of teacher attending and sanction of teachers leave (Coladarci, 1995; Davidoff and Lazarus, 2002; Sujatha, 2000).

Some decisions may not involve the community. For instance, decisions about the assignment of staff and pupils, method of instruction, scope and sequence of curriculum, etc., are professional judgments. The principal and staff must take responsibility for these decisions

and make them based upon their best professional judgment. The principal should, however, make explanations to, discuss with, and seek input from the community (Davidoff and Lazarus, 2002). School leaders need to give emphasis to the importance of school board members' involvement in the decision making process of school management. Therefore in order to make a sound and genuine decision, school leaders must foster the active participation of the school board members in their decision making process.

2.5.3. KETB Participation in Resource Management

According to UNESCO (2002), the participation of the KETB in financing schools takes three forms: monetary contribution, contribution in kind and contribution in the form of free labor. To run school activities properly and effectively, the use of these resources should be managed effectively by the school board and the community. Usually, parents and the community at large limit themselves to be resource of finance, material support and physical labor. However, parents and school committees have to go beyond this and assume a large role in examining and improving school budgets and in deciding how resource spent (Shaffer, 1994; UNESCO, 2002). Responsibilities for budget preparation, however, rests with the school principal, while the prepared budget document has to be submitted the school board, which adopts rejects or modify it. Appraising how it is spent must come at last, which is the responsibility of the school board.

Along the same line, FDRE,(2002) empowers the community to participate in the financial management of school through Kebele Education and training Board . These members have the right to follow up and control how schools are utilizing the available resources.

2.5.4. KETB Participation in Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation will help forecast on future plan and assist in avoiding to repeat previous mistakes. It is also an opportunity to learn from experiences and accomplishment for continuous improvement when things are going properly, to stay on the track, when there are undesirable deviations from the plan, to revise as required (Koufman, 1995). According to Townsed (1994), the two purpose of monitoring and evaluation conducting by school board

and PTA are to enable decision making to be based on acceptable data and to provide accountability for what has already occurred.

To this end, conducting monitoring and evaluation at the school level is constructive for the proper functioning of the school, to identify its weakness and strengths, and to take corrective measures. However, in order to do these, principals are expected to be open and democrat so that they can involve the community in the monitoring and evaluation process of their schools (UNESCO, 2002).

2.5.5. KETB participation in disciplinary issues

The main purpose of any educational system is to cultivate the individual's capacity for problem solving and adaptability to the environment by developing the necessary knowledge, ability, skill attitude and good discipline. Several authors approved the discipline and learning must go hand in hand for effective teaching. Therefore, the discipline is the most important for the criteria and maintenance of effective learning situation and its need and its needs a high involvement of community or their representatives. Parents must be invited to visit school and have a task with teachers about their children's school work. In addition to this Shamroc (2002) has argued teachers should take close contact with parents in order to identify the overall problems of the child at home and at school. This indicates that the interaction of parents and community or community representative is very important for maintaining good discipline in the school.

2.6. Roles and Responsibilities of KETB in School Management

Education is considered as the fundamental responsibility of central government for many years and decades; this weakened links with local communities. As a result, vast human and materials resources of the community could not be utilized to establish and strength the school system. This is the reason for transfer of the educational management away from the center to local communities. In supporting this ideas, Swift-Morgan (2006) state that Ethiopia's current education policy calls for greater community engagement as the final, most localized level of the decentralized system and explicitly mandates participation in school operations and management. MoE gave special emphasis to the importance of community involvement in the

school management; therefore, it developed a guideline in 1994 for kebele Education and Training Board to be established in all schools with clearly specified roles and responsibilities.

A school committee comprised of teachers, school leadership, parents and /or community members, is a common mechanism of promoting community involvement in education (Barrera *et al.*, 2009). Parent Teacher Association and Board governors constitute part of the formal structures of governance through which parents and the community are enabled to participate in the education of their children. It is assumed that through such structures education provision is enhanced and, school governance and educational quality are improved (Onderi, Andrew and Makori, 2012).

Kebele Education and Training Board (KETB) has the responsibility to approve annual plans and budgets of schools and follow up its implementation; increase the awareness of the community; support extra-curriculum activities; monitor the proper upkeep and use of school property; monitor the performance of the school principal, teachers as well as other non-teaching staff to ensure that the teaching-learning process is carried out as planned; mobilize the community to support school and the like (FDRE, 2002).

The representation of the community in the school affair through school committee (school board) does not indicate participation meaningful and active it has to go the extent to participate in planning, decision making, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation, student and staff discipline management (Shaeffer, 1994). Parents and the community involvement is made possible when the school is governed by a relatively decentralized management where parents, as school board and PTA members, have a say in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the school development activities (Zenebe, 2006). Therefore, the community participation should be carried out in schools by giving due attention to the management functions and by allowing the community to take part freely in all managerial activities.

2.7. Composition of the School Board

According to the FDRE (1998) "the board members or the local committee should be those individuals who believe in the importance of education and schooling, who have confidence of a number of other community members. In support of this (Chuabe and A.Chuabe, 2000 cited

in Feleke , 2012) states that individuals intervened in affairs of the school and belonging to different classes, should be committee, parents, teachers, principals, financial support of the school and others should be included in a proper ration. This is to minimize of internal conflict and the existence of different interest groups in communities. For these and other reasons efforts must be made to represent all groups in the board. In order to make decisions that satisfy both groups most of the time especial emphasis has been given to women membership in the committee because they play crucial role in making (FDRE, 1998).

2.7.1. Selection of school board

Regarding membership of the school board different methods have been used to select members of the board. One of the methods used is election of individual by people (MoE, 2002). Additionally, popular election recommended that permit the people to elect individuals who have public spirited, commitment and self interests to same public education (FDRE,1998) . Another method is appointment of members of the committee by the local councils or mayor.

2.7.2. Size of board members

The KETB is a representative of the community which is formed with the aim to direct the educational activity of their children and youth. Allan, L. and Lunenburg (1991) noted that the board, as representative of the community, is assumed to have significant decision-making responsibilities in the overall operation of schools. That is, the board can enable the local community to actively involved in the endeavors exerted to tackle the problems of the schools in the area, can also give and promote timely decisions to schools.

A KETB is legally nominated body that over sees all schools in a kebele or municipal. The board of the board composed of eight members. This are the Kebele (municipal) administrator as the chair of the board the school principal as a member and secretary of the board, three representative from the PTA, two representative from youth and woman association and one representatives from kebele (municipal) schools teachers association.

The board intended to coordinate the community in a school catchment area and to solve educational problems of schools. Encourage enrollment, promote girl education solve counter factors by motivating the community around the schools.

2.7.3. The School board's term of office

The office term of the board would be the same with that of the kebele council (MoE 1994) and when it finds necessary, the community could appoint or remove a member any time (MoE 1994). The board those who stay for a long period in the office can gain enough knowledge skill and experience that to manage effectively. On the contrary short term of office will result in the election of new board members with less skill; knowledge experience have negative consequence of the effectiveness of the board in school management (FDRE,1998).

2.8. Relationship Between the School Board and the Community

The board should assist community members in exchanging information acquainting community with the schools and their functions sharing ideas and working on problems which effect children. In general, the board has the responsibilities to make positive relationship with the community by enhancing their involvement in different affairs of the schools (Gallagher,1997).The board and the community relation as function on all levels of the school system establish program to improve and maintain optional levels of students' achievement and public support (Holiday,1998 cited in Feleke, 2012).The function that consists of communication with the involvement of the internal and external publics in the school system designed to promote a positive and challenging school climate include student achievement and staff productivity are fostered. It encourages maximums involvement of parents at home and in school in their children's educational development involves citizens in cooperate learning practices partnership and other means to make full use of human and offer learning resources in the community. It also builds public knowledge of the purposes and need of the school system leading to public understanding and support (Holday, 1998).

Sometimes there is challenging the board in communication with people "many citizens do not exactly what school board members do not get paid for services and other have no idea of the amount of time spent the board members on school matters or the number of materials they

attend (Gallagher 1997). In addition to this some practices of the board and its members are offensive to the public (Reader, 1954 in Feleke, 2012). According to Feleke (2012) these offensive practices that weaken the relation between the board and community are giving the impression that the school belong to them rather than to the public wasting money in the school through in efficient business procedures and also awarding contracts for sheets supplies equipment and other materials to themselves their relation or their friends.

2.9. Challenges in Participation of KETB in School Management

The challenges that affect the KETB participation may source from the school principal, Kebele (municipal) administrator, parents or community and school PTA in different contexts. The challenges also vary from one stakeholder to another because each group has its own vision to achieve the common goal of increasing educational access and improving its quality.

School boards are performing many tasks in managing the school, but most of them are not successful in the improvement of the schools. The work of Amend and Cistone (NWREL, 2001 cited in Feleke, 2012) identify and describe some factors that hinder the board's success in carrying out their new responsibilities.

Firstly, the lack of knowledge of school board members in which they have little knowledge regarding to their newly assigned responsibilities in case of planning, organizing, decision making process and others in the school manner. Secondly the lack of group process skills from the board members side. Moreover, they may also lack the necessary training and orientation, and this contributes to their inability to actively participate in school management. Besides, inappropriate or shortage of time arranged for board meetings influences the level of their participation in school management(copper and Ulrich,1996). So schools should pay attention to these factors so that the level of participation can be enhanced.

Regarding the attitude of principal and teachers towards school board, UNESCO (2002) noted that principals and teachers sometimes refuse to encourage the school board and association members to actively participate for they fear that these community groups would get over all control of pedagogical matters with which they have no mastery. Besides, the school principals, in particular, sometimes hesitate that the community may want to have control over

the school management and because of this fear he or she consciously limits the degree of participation (Naryan,1995).

Moreover, principals and teachers may perceive that the school board and association members often have few decision making skills, and because of this perception, they degrade the capacities of the community representatives to participate on the management of school(UNESCO, 2002). So, principals and teachers shall have a health attitude on the capacities and participation of the community representatives.

The school principal usually developed formal meeting agenda which may be used simply to disseminate the formally made decisions. In this case, In this case, the KETB members may only be supposed to listen with no inputs to add and because of this trend they may be reluctant to participate on the school management issues (Copper and Unrich, 2003)

The representative of the community for they are not professional often perceive that the school and principals are more knowledgeable and experienced may develop of felling of dominated in their initiatives. Therefore, as a result of these felling the representative of the community may restrain from actively participating on the issues to school management Stoops (2006). Thus school especially principals and teachers shall inform the real sense of participation to the community participation representatives so as to bring the necessary behavioral change with them.

2.10. Strategies used for Improving KETB Participation

In the named earlier section, it has been stated that KETB participation can be hampered by different factors. However, KETB participation can be improve by making use of various strategies.

2.10.1. Providing training to school principals

The number of solutions that can be used to improve KETB participation are substantial. The most important of these, however, is for the principal the school to be totally committed (Labahn, 1995). Principals are key contributors to helping parents and other educators understand each other (World Bank, 2008). School principal can play a vital role in improving

the involvement of community in preparatory schools. Therefore, to do participative management, leaders need to have adequate training (UNESCO, 2002).

2.10.2. Providing training to KETBS' members

Since school board members are representing the community, they need to build their capacity. Therefore, KETB has to be providing training to school board in relation to budgeting, planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. This helps the KETB effectively function in the management of schools (Sujatha, 2000)

2.10.3. Creating conducive environment

The creation of good atmosphere in the management of schools is a vital for the effective involvement of KETB. According to Zenebe (2006), strategies such as creating an enabling environment, dealing with influence groups, building trust and confidence trust and confidence within the community, and forming a team for goal setting and engagements are some of the major ones. Therefore, principals have to motivate and respect community representatives in the management of schools. Schools should be flexible and democrat to deal with KETB. This can help the KETB to have say and develop a feeling of ownership in the school management system. School need to have norm of openness to the outside community, to new ideas and new ways of doing things, and to change (Barrera *et al.*,2009). With this, the quality of education may lead to the awareness that education is not restricted to professionals but rather the concern of the entire community(UNESCO,2002).

2.11. Community Participation in School Management in Ethiopia

Historical study of Ethiopia indicate that traditional education system of the country was religious oriented; the two institutions that monopolized traditional education for centuries were the Orthodox Church and Mosque" (Seyoum, 1996). During this time ,the purpose of education was to prepare young men for the service of the church . The role of the parents and the communities was confined to rewarding the priests with material, gift depending on their wealth (Tekeste, 2006). In general, during this time the community was taking part in

education system by providing food, financial and material resources to the priests and religions students. However, the people were not able to say anything about the education.

Modern education in Ethiopia has started since the establishment of Menelik II School in Addis Ababa in 1906 E.C, starting this time until early 1950, the government took full responsibilities to establish schools and hire teachers for the schools (Ayalew, 2000); Seyoum,1996). The administration of schools was highly centralized and was the responsibilities of individual school directors.

As a result, the schools had not been in close contact with the community and remained as Island or foreign body. Their contact with community was limited to "visits once or twice a year when school celebrate school day or parent's day" (Seyoum, 1996). Later on the environment of students increased and the government was not able to build many schools as needed because of financial constraints (Gebre Kidan, 2001).

It was at this stage that the government had issued order No 94 of 1947 to establish local board of education which was authorized for the accounting of local education expenditure of the ministry (Jeilu, 2001). The main responsibility of the local board of education was to ensure the expenditure of the education tax on elementary in that province. However, the expenditure for education from local education tax and from the government fund could not keep pace with the ever increasing students' enrolment (Gebrekidan, 2001).

Consequently, the MoE in the Derg regime outlined the establishment of new relationships for the education system in decentralized structures intention of democratizing education which calls for community participation as an immediate goal MoE (Jeilu, 2001). The desire was encouraging community participation through the establishment of school committee. Accordingly proclamation No 103 of 1976 gave emphasis to the establishment of the school committee that comprises parent, teachers, students and community representatives. The committee was given authority to manage and control schools in accordance with directive laid down by the MoE. In line with the guideline, the committee was responsible for overseeing and operation of each school system by means of generating resource their own localities (Swift-Morgan, 2006).

Following this, proclamation No 260 of 1984 came up and strengthened the management of school by establishing school committees. Each of these committees had members elected by urban dwellers or peasant associations. The government school committee was assigned to supervise the proper management and utilization of subsidies and overall administrations of the school property to ensure that it is used for what it is designed to (Gebrekidan ,2001).

Though, there was little shift of authority and responsibilities to the lower administrative levels and community organizations in Emperor's and Dergue regime, the system of educational management was highly centralized and bureaucratic that gave seldom responses to local initiatives and needs (Mulgeta, Akililu, and Seyoum In Jeilu, 2001).

With the intension of addressing this problem, the new strategy which emphasizes on importance of decentralization has been set since 1994. In a decentralization education management system greater autonomy for decision and policy making are being made closer to the local community and organizations (Ayalew, 2000).The transition from the previous regime in 1991 into the current one was made possible by offering nations, nationalities and people's greater decision making and institution building in their own regions.

Thus, the devolution decision making authority to regional states has changed by roles and responsibilities of educational organizational management (Ayalew, 2000) the education and training policy of (MoE, 1994) states that clear guide line starting the rights and duties of all involved in education will be issued to ensure participatory and proper professional relations in their activities in line of this policy the Ministry has set standard for itself, Regions, Zones, woredas and schools (MoE, 1988). Accordingly, the Ministry is responsible for providing professional support setting national education and training policy and setting country wide national standards. On the other hand, regions are responsible in managing elementary secondary and preparatory schools, and college institutes.

Furthermore Zones, woreda and schools have shared responsibilities to implement the policy (Ayalew, 2000). But much of the authorities to make decision on different school affairs were not passed to the grass root organizations. Thus, community participation was eroded and the objectives' of the policy were not fully achieved (MoE, 2002). After realizing the weakness of policy implementation the ministry has set another revised guideline in 2002. The new

guideline briefly and clearly states that the roles and responsibilities of MoE, Regional educational Bureaus, Zonal education departments, woreda education offices, woreda education and training boards, kebele education and training boards, Parent teacher associations and the school principals. The guideline gives more emphasis for shared decision making power at local level with more community participation.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This section of the study describes research design, sources of data, instruments of data collection, population, sample and sampling techniques, method of data collection method of data analysis and ethical considerations.

3.1. Description of the Study Area

The study was conducted in Oromia Regional State North Shoa Zone. There are 14 woredas in the zone. Geographically, the zone is divided in to highland, sub lowland and low land. The climatic condition of North Shoa zone is sub tropical and tropical. According to the statistical data in 2007, the population and housing census result of North Shoa Zone, was 1,431,305, of whom 717,552 were male and 713,753 were female. The socio-economic background of the zone is mostly based on agriculture. The major types of crops that are produced are cereals. The most frequently used language in the zone is 'Afan Oromo' and also 'Amharic' in few towns and rural areas'. According to the evidence of North Shoa Zone education office, one college and one University, fourteen preparatory and thirty eight secondary schools are found in the zone.

3.2. Research Design

Research design is a plan of study that indicates a program that guides the researcher as he or she collects, analysis and interprets data (Oppenheim, 1996). The design that the researcher used is descriptive survey design. Descriptive survey design was employed in this study on the ground that it is found to be helpful to obtain reliable and relevant information (Leedy and Ormord, 2005). Descriptive survey design focuses on organizing, recording, analyzing and interpreting data gathered from respondents. The mixed research method was used for the necessity of the topic that need detail investigation of facts and opinion. It helps to collect and analyze data for the generalization of the results and to put solution for the problem.

3.3. Sources of Data

In order to conduct this study, data were collected from both primary and secondary sources. The primary source were KETB members, teachers, principals and supervisor through questionnaire and interview. Moreover, the secondary source relevant documents like KETB plans, reports, minutes and guidelines.

3.4. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Technique

The study was designed to assess the status and challenges of KETB participation in the management of preparatory schools in the North Shoa zone. According to North Shoa Zone education office statistical data, currently there are 14 woredas in the zone with 14 preparatory schools. Since it is difficult to cover all areas of the study and manage it properly, 6 woredas were selected from 14 woredas by simple random sampling technique, There are six preparatory schools in 6 woredas that were selected by available sampling technique. The population of the study were 174 teachers, 12 principals, 6 supervisors and 72 members of school committees (KETB, PTA) in North Shoa preparatory schools.

The researcher couldn't take all preparatory schools of the zone as sample because of the time, resource and finance constraints. So, sample of the study was 121 teachers, 12 principals, 6 supervisors and 72 members of committee has taken as sample of the study. Sample size determination was calculated by using (Yemane, 1967) $n = \frac{N}{1+N(e^2)}$, where N = population, e = error by taking 95% confidential level. Teachers population 174, e = 0.05, sample size n = 121 which is 69% of teachers population and 48 of KETB members population. 12 principals, 6 supervisors and 72 members committees were taken 100% by availability sampling and 121 teachers were selected by simple random sampling technique.

Table . Population, Sample size and sampling techniques

Preparatory schools	Respondents											
	Teachers			Committees (PTA, KETB)			Principals			Supervisors		
	P	S	%	P	S	%	P	S	%	P	S	%
Gohatsion	40	28	69	12	12	100	2	2	100	1	1	100
Gerbaguracha	46	32	69	12	12	100	3	3	100	1	1	100
Degam	17	12	69	12	12	100	2	2	100	1	1	100
Fitche	26	18	69	12	12	100	2	2	100	1	1	100
DebraTsigie	18	12	69	12	12	100	1	1	100	1	1	100
Muketuri	27	19	69	12	12	100	2	2	100	1	1	100
Total	174	121	69	72	72	100	12	12	100	6	6	100
Sampling method	Simple random			Availability			Availability			Availability		

Note : P = Population, S = Sample and % = percent of sample selected

3.5. Instruments for Data Collection

In order to get first hand information for this study, three basic instruments were used. These are questionnaire, interview, and document review.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

Questionnaires are preferable to involve large size sample of the population and factual information is desired (Best, 2006). The questionnaires allow the researcher to collect large amount of data in relatively short period of time. Besides, questionnaires allow the researcher to obtain tangible information to respond to the basic questions. The questionnaire was prepared in English for respondents but for some members of committee based on their interest it was translated into Afan Oromo language. This was made to avoid ambiguity and language difficulty that may encounter during questionnaire administration.

The questionnaires have both closed and open-ended and it contains Likert scale types. The questions in the questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first section requires the participants to give demographic information, the second set of questions based on the five point Likert scale responses and the third section consists of open ended type of items to

collect data. The questionnaires were prepared for 72 School committee members and 121 teachers. The researcher prepared a set of similar questionnaire for both teachers and committees. The questionnaire first prepared and then approved by the advisor before it administered.

Pilot test was conducted to check validity of the questionnaires. For this purpose, Tullu Milki preparatory school which, was not be included in the sample schools, was purposively selected as it is nearest to a researcher work place. The questionnaire was distributed to 28 teachers and 10 committee' members for pilot test.

Based upon Cohen *et al.* (2005) criteria for accepting the given instrument as reliable, the reliability coefficient should be greater or equal to 0.70. Once the questionnaires returned, based on the pilot test, they were modified and restructured for final study. Then the questionnaires were distributed to 72 School committees' members, and 121 teachers. The questionnaire was administered by the researcher, a principal and an assistants that were assigned by the researcher at each school under study. The questionnaires were focused on the status and challenges of KETBs participation in North Shoa Zone preparatory schools of Oromia Regional State.

Table 2: Reliability

No	Questionnaire section	No. of item	Reliability Test
1	Current status of KETB members participation	4	0.978
2	KETB members' participation in planning	2	0.939
3	KETB members' participation in decision making	4	0.922
4	KETB members' participation in monitoring and evaluation	3	0.897
5	Challenges in participation of KETB members	5	0.959

Cronbach alpha coefficient value ranges from 0 to 1. If the cronbach alpha coefficient value is greater than 0.70, it would imply that the data has strong reliability. Thus, data of the study as

indicated from the above table 2 the cronbach alpha coefficient is greater than 0.07 which indicate strong reliability of the data.

3.5.2. Interview guide

Semi-structured type of interview was used as a second instrument to collect data from preparatory school principals and Supervisors. The interview items consisted 6 questions and each supervisor and principal was interviewed in their respective schools concerning the period of time 20 minutes will be given for one interviewee . The items in the interview include issues such as the area and level of participation of KETB members in school management system, the relationship between the community, challenge in education system, the frequency of given to KETB, meetings and efforts made to enhance the involvement of the community of the schools as well as measures to be taken to improve the participation of KETB in the management of schools. The interview carried out with the help of note taking methods. This is done by the researcher himself. This helped the researcher to get in-depth information on the intended study.

3.5.3. Document Analysis

In order to find facts in the study area, the researcher reviewed different documents of the sample preparatory schools, minutes, guidelines and reports (monthly, quarterly and annual). This helped the researcher to make a cross check against the collected data.

3.6. Procedures of Data Collection

Data gathering tools were designed on the basis of related literature. The questionnaires and interview questions were developed in line with the basic question of the study. The researcher conducted preliminary test of data collecting tools and eliminates problems to make corrective adjustment before data collection. Before administering the questionnaire, pilot test was made at Tullu Milki Preparatory School for validity and reliability with 28 teachers and 10 committees' members with different form of questionnaire separately.

The data was collected from the respondents through questionnaires and interview one after the other based on the existing conditions. Regarding to document review and interview the

instrument was directly utilized by the researcher to collect relevant information. Generally, the time for collecting data determined through mutual discussions between the researcher and the respondents.

Finally, the document review and interview were conducted by physical presence of the researcher himself to gather relevant information. Accordingly, the final questionnaires were administered to respondents in the school. The respondents were allowed to give their own answers to each item independently and the data collector closely assisted and supervised them to solve any confusion regarding the instrument. At the end, the questionnaires collected and made ready for data analysis.

3.7. Methods of Data Analysis

Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis methods were used in the study. Data collected through questionnaires were scored and categorized. Once the quantitative data collection were completed and appropriately scored, the data were entered into the statistical package for social science (SPSS Version 20.0) software for analysis. Statistical procedures were performed on quantitative data gathered from the respondents.

Depending on the nature of the data, descriptive statistics such as percentage, frequency and inferential statistics chi-square were used to interpret quantitative data. Frequency and percentage were used to interpret the responses out of the whole of respondents in relation to the whole or hundred percent. On the other hand, qualitative data, which was collected through interview, open ended and document was analyzed qualitatively by the use of narrative Analysis. Myers (2008) states that narrative analysis is an in-depth approach to analyze qualitative data.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

To conduct this research support letter from the department of Educational Planning and Management of Haramaya University was obtained. After receiving this letter from the department, the researcher travelled to the study area and contacted members of committees, preparatory supervisors, principals and teachers to get their consent and to arrange their

convenient time respondent to the questionnaire and interviews. In general, the respondents were informed about the purpose of the research and that data will be used for the purpose of research only.

4. DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This section of the study deals with presentation, analysis and discussion of data obtained through two groups questionnaire: from preparatory school committee members and teachers. Interview was also conducted with preparatory school principals and supervisors. Besides, information was gathered from document. The information collected through interview and documents were also qualitatively described in words. This was made to answer the basic questions that were set in the study.

The researcher distributed 193 copies of questionnaire to 121 teachers and to 72 committee members. Out of 193 respondents, it was only 106 teachers and 63 committee members who filled and returned the questionnaires. In general, 169 (87.6%) of the respondents participated in responding the questions where as the remaining respondents didn't return the questionnaires. The collected data were presented in tables and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools, such as percentage, frequency, and Chi-square test was employed to see the significant different among the respondents.

4.1. Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents include sex, age, educational level, position and work experience. The result are presented in the table below.

Table 3: Socio- demographic characteristics of respondents

Variables	Variables Category	Respondents		KETB, PTA (committee)	
		f	%	f	%
Sex	Male	86	81.1	57	90.5
	Female	20	18.9	6	9.5
	Total	106	100	63	100
Age	20-30 years	34	32.1	6	9.5
	31-40 years	48	45.3	40	63.5
	41-50 years	24	22.6	11	17.5
	50 and above	-	00	6	9.5
	Total	106	100	63	100
Education level	Less than grade 10	-		12	19.0
	Diploma	-		21	33.3
	Degree	75	70.8	28	44.4
	Second degree	31	29.2	2	3.2
	Total	106	100	63	100
Position	KETB members	-	-	38	60.3
	PTA members	-	-	25	39.7
	Teachers	106	100	-	-
	Total	106	100	63	100
Work experience (service)	1-5 years	15	14.2	63	100
	6-10 years	48	45.3	-	-
	11-15 years	22	20.8	-	-
	More than 15 years	21	19.8	-	-
	Total	106	100	63	100

Note : 'f' frequency

Table 2 above deals with socio-demographic characteristics of respondents. Regarding to socio-demographic characteristics the first item was sex, 86 (81.1%) of the teacher respondents were male while 20 (18.9%) of the respondents were female. On the other hand, 57 (90.5%) of the committee members were male while 6 (9.5%) of the respondents were female. From the above information, it is possible to infer that the majority of teacher respondents were male and majority of committee respondents were also male. Thus, the majority of teachers and committee respondents were male. This indicates that females' participation in the management of preparatory schools of North Shoa Zone is low.

As presented in table 2, the age distribution of respondents shows that 34 (32.1%) teachers were between the age 20 -30 years, 48 (45.3%) teachers were the age of 31-40 years and 24

(22.6) were found between 41-50 years of age while among committee members, 6 (9.5%) of them were found between the age 20-30 years, 40 (63.5%) were the found at the age of 31-40 years and 11 (17.5%) were found between 41-50 years of age. Based on this, it is believed that most of respondents were matured enough to provide honest opinions and suggestions regarding the issue under study.

Regarding educational level, 75 (70.8%) of teacher respondents were in the category of first degree educational level while 31 (29.2%) of the respondents were second degree holders. On the other side, 28 (44.4%) of the committee respondents in the educational category first of degree, 21 (33.3%) of the committee respondents in the educational category of diploma and 12 (19.0%) less than grade 10. Thus, from the above information it is possible to infer that the majority of teacher respondents were in the educational level of first degree while the committee respondents were also in educational category of first degree.

The interview was conducted with principals and supervisors about trained manpower in the respected position. One of the principals said that *for the school management the only trained man power is not guaranty to success the school performance but also the proper utilization of the trained man available by the responsible managing bodies are very crucial.*

Pertaining to the position of teacher respondents 106 (100%) of them engaged in teaching in the selected preparatory school while the committee 38 (60.3%) of the respondents were KETB members and 25 (39.7%) of them were PTA members.

With regards to the work experience of the teacher respondents 48 (45.3%) have work experience of 6-10 years while 22(20.8%) of the respondents had a work experience of 11-15 years. On the others hand, 63 (100%) of committee respondents have service year of 1-5 years. Thus, from the above information, it is possible to infer that the majority of teachers respondents had work experience of 6-10 years while the majority of committee respondents had work experience of 1-5 years.

4.2. Current Status of KETB Members Participation in the School Management

It is believed that in decentralized school management, self governance and management decision become closer to local schools. This can promote participation of communities in making decision on the different issues of their schools. They make decisions on generating revenue, mobilizing community, allocating resources and supporting and coordinating the school activities are some of the role play the school KETB members.

Table 4: Current status of KETB members participation in the school management

Item	Responses	Teacher		Committee		X ²	Df	P-value
		f	%	f	%			
1.KETB members visit the school beyond regular meeting time	Never at all	93	87.7	56	88.9	0.05	1	0.822
	Sometimes	13	12.3	7	11.1			
	Often							
	Always							
	Total	106	100	63	100			
2.KETB members participate on management functions	Never at all	85	80.2	51	88.9	0.015	1	0.904
	Sometimes	21	19.8	12	11.1			
	Often							
	Always							
	Total	106	100	63	100			
3.KETB members give quick response to the problem encountered in the teaching learning process	Never at all	54	50.9	35	55.6	3.747	3	0.29
	Sometimes	35	33.0	21	33.3			
	Often	11	10.8	7	11.1			
	Always	6	5.66					
	Total	106	100	63	100			
4.KETB members decision making for complaints of principals and teachers	Never at all	52	49.1	32	50.7	1.423	3	0.700
	Sometimes	38	45.3	18	28.6			
	Often	13	12.3	11	17.5			
	Always	3	2.8	2	3.2			
	Total	106	100	63	100			

Key: f= frequency , %= percentage, df = degree of freedom

Table 4 shows the current status of KETB members participation in the management. To assess the current status of KETB members participation in management the above items were designed and the results are presented as follows. The first item was ' How often do the KETB members visit the school beyond the regular meeting time'. In this regard, 93 (87.7%) of

teachers respondents responded never at all and 13 (12.3%) of teachers respondents replied sometimes, while 56 (88.9%) of the committee answered never at all while 7 (11.1%) of the committee respondents were said sometimes. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 0.05$, at $df=1$, $P=0.822 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between the two group of respondents. This means considerable proportion of both teachers and committee members agreed on the KETB members visit the school beyond the regular meeting.

Furthermore, from the interview with school principals, it was found that KETB members never visited the school beyond the regular meeting time. One of the school principal said: *"KETB members can support the schools even by mobilizing the community in the school, providing materials, skill and labor but actually in our school, KETB members never visit schools beyond the regular meeting time"*.

Item 2 is about the frequency of the KETB members participation on management function. Against the item 85 (80.2%) of teacher respondents said never at all and 21(19.8%) of teachers respondents said sometimes while 51 (88.9%) of the committee members also repeated never at all and 12 (11.1%) of the committee respondents responded sometimes. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the groups. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 0.015$ at $df=1$, $P=0.904 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents. This means considerable proportion of both teachers and committee members were equally agreed on the KETB members never participate on the management functions.

Furthermore, from the interview with principals and supervisors, it was found out that in most school matters decisions were often made by principals themselves together with unit leaders and vice principals. in support of this idea, one of the supervisors of selected preparatory schools stated as follows:

"Most of school principals make decision by themselves. Sometimes they may involve KETB members; however, still the great role is played by the principals. hence, KETB members are often forced to accept decisions based on the need of the principals, they

are not initiated to discharge their responsibilities. This will result in the absence of genuine decision and instead leads to conflicts. This has become a serious problem in most of preparatory schools".

In all above cases, it is possible to conclude that KETB members participation in management functions was poor. Genuine participation requires the active involvement of KETB members in decision making process (Shaeffer,1994)

The third item was how often do the KETB members give quick response to the problems encountered in the teaching and learning process. Against this, 54 (50.94%) of teacher respondents said never at all and 35 (33.02%) of the teacher respondents said sometimes. While 35(55.6%) of the committee respondents replied never at all and 21 (33.33%) of committee respondents also said sometimes. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 3.747$, $df=3$, $P=0.290 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. Therefore, the majority of the respondents confirmed that KETB members never give quick responses to the problem encountered in teaching-learning process.

The interview that was held with school principals can be evident of the existence of the problem stated in item 3. During interview, one of the interviewees said," *we school directors often hold meetings to discuss and give response on problem that encountered in the teaching learning process with KETB members at least one day per two weeks so that some of the KETB members may not participate on the meeting. The reason is that they may have their own work to do with in these days or they may not permission from their work place"*. In line with this issue, another school principal said " *those KETB members who are engaged on trading are not often available on our meeting particularly on the market days"*.

In all the above cases we observe that there was lack of time on the part KETB members. Consequently, meetings were not conducted with the presence of all members. Sufficient time must be devoted to engaging communities in discussions of the problems in their schools and possible solutions (Colletta and Perkins, 1995).

Item 4 is 'how often do KETB decision making of KETB members for complaints of principle and teachers'. Regarding to this statement, 52 (49.06%) of teacher respondents and 32 (50.7%) of the committee respondents said never at all and 38 (45.28%) of the teacher respondents and 18 (28.57%) of committee respondents said sometimes. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the groups. Accordingly, the result ($X^2=1.423$, $df=3$, $P=0.700 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. Therefore, the majority of the respondents confirmed that KETB members never give decision making for complaints of principals and teachers.

From the response of respondents of interview it was possible to conclude that when complaints made between principals and teachers the decision making process of the board is not urgent as a expected and takes time even try to solve the problems that affect the conducive environment of teaching learning process. And hence, the board wants to push authority to education offices to give decision making process of their school complaints.

4.3. Participation of the KETB members in key management functions

Table 5: KETB members participation in the school management

Item	Response	Teacher		Committee		X^2	Df	p-value
		f	%	f	%			
KETB members participate in the school management	Not at all	21	19.8	14	22.2	5.853	4	0.210
	Very rarely	40	37.7	27	42.9			
	Sometimes	28	26.4	19	30.1			
	most of the time	10	9.4	3	4.8			
	Always	7	6.6					
	Total	106	100	63	100			

Key: f= frequency , %= percentage, df = degree of freedom

Table 5 showed that KETB members participation in the school management. Regard to this statement, 40 (37.7%) of teacher respondents replied that KETB members participation in the school :management was very rare, on the other side, 27 (42.9%) of the committee member respondents said also very rare. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 5.853$, $df=4$, $P=0.210$)

> 0.05) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. This means considerable proportion of both teachers and committee members equally agreed on the KETB members very rarely participate on the management.

The interview that held with the principals of the sample schools has confirmed the presence of stated problem. One of the sample principals said, *"Since the KETB members of my school do not spend much time in school related works, I have been discouraged to involve them in every school management system"*.

The data in table 5 indicates that school principals were not doing their best to bring active participation of KETB members in the management of the school. MoE (2002) states that the school principal is responsible to encourage and maintain healthy relationship with representative of the community to take part in management functions.

Table 6: The KETB Members Participation in Planning

Item	Response	Teachers		Committee		X ²	Df	p-value
		f	%	f	%			
The KETB members participate in planning (the strategic plan)	Strongly disagree	52	49.	47	74.	12.655	3	0.005
	Disagree		1		6			
		31	29.	11	17.			
			2		5			
	Undecided	15	14.	5	7.9			
			2					
	Agree	8	7.5					
	Strong agree							
	Total	106	100	63	100			
The KETB members participate in planning (annual plan)	Strongly disagree	50	47.	44	69.	10.024	3	0.018
	Disagree		2		8			
		38	35.	10	15.			
			8		9			
	Undecided	11	10.	4	6.3			
			4					
	Agree	7	6.6	5	7.9			
	Strong agree							
	Total	106	100	63	100			

Key: f= frequency , %= percentage, df = degree of freedom

Table 6 depicted that KETB members participation in strategic planning. Regarding to strategic plan 52 (49.1%) of the teacher respondents were strongly disagree to the statement while 47 (74.6%) of the committee respondents were also strongly disagree and 31 (29.2%) of teacher respondents disagree to the statement and 11 (7.5%) of the committee respondents were disagree to the statement. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, ($X^2= 12.655$, $df=3$, $P=0.005 < 0.05$) shows there is statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. This means more committee members strongly disagreed on the KETB members participate in strategic planning as compared to the teachers.

In the review literature part of this study it has been discussed that planning play an important roles. Furthermore, planning is the most important tools which gives direction to the educational institutions. It is the process preparing a set of decisional action for the future directed at achieving goals by option means (Donald and Bagin, 2005). The participation of the KETB members in planning of school development activity is important for various reasons, if the KETB members ask to serve on planning they will fell a sense of belonging and be honored that they are invited to help improve the school.

As shown in table 6, item 2 above, 50 (47.2%) of the teacher respondents and 44 (69.8%) of the committee respondents strongly disagreed on the KETB members participate in annual planning and 38 (35.8%) of teacher respondents and 10 (15.9%) of the committee respondents were disagreed to the statement. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, ($X^2= 10.024$, $df=3$, $P=0.018 < 0.05$) shows there is statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. This means more committee members strongly disagreed on the KETB members participate in annual planning as compared to teachers.

From the data of table 6, it is possible to understand that KETB members were not effectively taking part in the implementation of school plans. In supporting this idea, the interview held with principals has also confirmed clearly the existence of this problem. During interview, one of the principals said, "*most of KETB members never check what has been planned at school so that they give little room for the implementation of the plan. Besides, they consider planning as it was the concern of school principals*".

In connection to this, another principal also stated as follows: *"KETB members are not willing to spend time during the development of school plan, consequently; they offer all the responsibility to principals and prefer to stay home. They often forward reasons not to participate at the preparation of plans"*.

Furthermore, the document analysis also confirmed that school plans were developed by department heads, principals and vice principals and were discussed on staff meeting for further amendments. Finally, the adjusted plans were sent to the Woreda Education Office. The document of staff meeting supports this but on the part of KETB there was no document found which indicated their involvement in the planning of school activities.

From this it can be understood that KETB members involvement in the work of school plan implementation is inadequate or low. This could be either due to low level of participation during planning process. The lower involvement during planning and decision making, the harder it will be during implementation(kaufman,1995).

Table 7: KETB Members' Participation in Decision Making

Item	Response	teacher		committee		X ²	df	p-value
		f	%	F	%			
1.Members of KETB identify problems and make decision to solve problems which are related to school	Strongly disagree	46	43.4	33	52.4	3.326	3	0.34
	Disagree	36	34.0	22	34.9			
	Undecided	16	15.1	4	6.3			
	Agree	8	7.5	4	6.3			
	Strongly agree							
Total		106	100	63	100			
2.Members of KETB participate in allocating and approving the school budget	Strongly disagree	18	17.0	14	22.2	2.177	3	0.537
	Disagree	48	45.3	26	41.3			
	Undecided	27	25.5	12	19.1			
	Agree	13	12.3	11	17.5			
	Strongly agree							
Total		106	100	63	100			
3.Members of KETB participate in decision how the school budget	Strongly disagree	19	17.9	7	11.1	5.730	4	0.220
	Disagree	49	46.2	36	57.1			
	Undecided	27	25.7	17	27.0			

should be spent	Agree	5	4.7	3	4.8			
	Strongly agree	6	5.7					
	Total	106	100	63	100			
4.Members of KETB participate in controlling school property	Strongly disagree	49	46.	34	54.			
	Disagree	32	30.	16	25.	1.27	3	0.735
			2		4	3		
	Undecided	17	16.	10	15.			
			0		9			
	Agree	8	7.5	3	4.8			
	Strongly agree							
	Total	106	100	63	100			

Key: f= frequency , %= percentage, df = degree of freedom

Item one from table 7 shows that members of KETB identify problems and make decision to solve problems which are related to school. Regarding to this statement 46 (43.4%) of the teachers and 33 (52.4%) of the committee members respondents were strongly disagreed. On the other side, 36 (34.0%) of teachers and 22 (34.9%) of committee members respondents were disagreed to the statement. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 3.326$, $df=3$, $P=0.34 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. This means considerable proportion of both teachers and committee members equally strongly disagreed on the KETB members identify problems and make decision to the solve problems which are related to school.

The interview conducted with principals and supervisors with also revealed that the process of decision making was undertaken by principals and unit leaders without the participation of community representatives this in turn hinders the participation of KETB members. One of the sample of supervisors said, "*KETB members do not have the habit of participating identifying the problems and make decision to solve problems which are related school*".

As it reviewed in related literature part of this study, decision making is the process of defining problems, generating alternative solutions, choosing one alternative implement it (Holt, 2004). Decision making is a key management function which determines the success or fail of our organizational goals because all organizational activities can be interpreted best in

terms of decision made so far, participation in this aspect is not an easy task that could be carried out by a certain individuals .

The second item was members of KETB participate in allocating and approving the school budget. Regarding to this, 48 (45.3%) of the teacher respondents were said disagree while 27 (25.4%) of teacher respondents reported undecided to the statement. On the other side, 26 (41.3%) of committee respondents were said disagree while 14 (22.2%) of the committee respondents said strongly disagreed to the statement. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2=2.177$ $df=3$, $P=0.537 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. From table 6 item 2 the data reveals that the majority of the respondents attempted to show the participation of KETB members in allocating and approving school budget as low and below that. In supporting the above idea, the interview that held with preparatory school supervisors has clearly reflected the existence of the problems. During the interview, one of the sample supervisors said that,

"KETB members do not have the real habit of allocating and approving school budgets. When the school wants to allocate and approve the school budget the principals accomplish all process by themselves but simply informs KETB members "

This can lead us to the conclusion that KETB members engagement in allocating and approving school budget was not satisfactory. Members of KETB cannot limit themselves to mobilize the community to get money. Rather they are also expected to go beyond that and assume key role in allocating and approving school budgets (Sheaffer, 1994).

The third item, members of KETB participate in decision how the school budget should be spent. Regarding to the above statement, 49 (46.2%) of the teacher respondents were said disagree to the statement while 27 (25.5%) of the teacher respondents were reported undecided. On other side, 36 (57.1%) of the committee respondents said disagree to the issue while 17 (27.0%) of the respondents said undecided. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 5.730$, $df=4$, $P=0.220 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between

responses of the two groups. This means more teachers and committee members disagreed on the KETB members participate in decision that how the school budget should be spent.

In supporting this idea, one of the supervisors of the selected schools stated as follows:

"KETB members do not participate in decision, how the school budget should be spent. When the school wants to purchase any educational or office materials, the principals simply informs KETB members what is going to be purchased. These members often do not consider the importance and the process of what is going to be purchased. they also never follow up whether the proposed things are bought or not".

This can lead us to the conclusion that KETB members participation in decision how school budget should be spent was not satisfactory.

Item 4 is 'members of KETB participate in controlling school property'. Regarding to this issue, 49 (46.2%) teacher respondents and 34 (54.0%) of the committee members respondents were strongly disagreed to the statement. On the other hand, 32 (30.2%) of teacher respondents and 16 (25.4%) of the committee members respondents were disagreed to the statement. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 1.273$, $df=3$, $P=0.735 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. Therefore, the majority of the respondents confirmed that KETB members were not participate in controlling school property.

The data obtained through open-ended questions also revealed that the participation of KETB members in allocating, approving, and making decision how the school budget should spent and controlling the school property was not efficient. Furthermore, the interview administered with principals indicates also KETB members participation on the above issue is insufficient.

Table 8:KETB members participation in monitoring and evaluation

Item	Response	teacher		Committee		X ²	df	p-value
		f	%	f	%			
1.Members of	Strongly disagree	50	47.2	33	52.4			

KETB monitor the implementation of the school plan	Disagree	39	36.8	18	28.6			
	Undecided	14	13.2	9	14.3	1.45	3	0.692
	Agree	3	2.8	3	2.8	9		
	Strongly agree							
	Total	106	100	63	100			
2.Members of KETB participate in monitoring and evaluating the teaching performance	Strongly disagree	46	43.3	33	52.4			
	Disagree	41	38.3	18	28.6			
	Undecided	11	10.4	10	15.9	4.07	3	0.253
	Agree	8	7.5	2	3.2	6		
	Strongly agree							
Total	106	100	63	100				
3.KETB members evaluate the impact of community participation in students achievement	Strongly disagree	18	17.0	8	12.7			
	Disagree	45	42.4	29	46.0			
	Undecided	26	24.5	12	19.0	7.84	4	0.097
	Agree	17	16.1	10	15.9	5		
	Strongly agree			4	6.3			
Total	106	100	63	100				

Key: f= frequency , %= percentage, df = degree of freedom

In table 8, item 1 shows the response toward the participation of the members of KETB in monitoring the implementation of the school plan. Regarding this, 50 (47.2%) of teacher respondents replied that strongly disagree whereas, 39 (36.8%) of teacher respondents said disagree. On the other side, 33 (52.4%) of committee respondents said strongly disagree while 18 (28.6%) of the committee respondents said disagree. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2=1.459$, $df=3$, $P=0.692 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. This means considerable proportion of both teachers and committee members equally strongly disagreed on the KETB members participation in monitoring the implementation of the school plan. Therefore, from the analysis of the responses of the respondents we can conclude that members of KETB do not participate effectively in monitoring and ongoing evaluation of the school plan.

As it is reviewed in related literature part of this study, participation in monitoring and ongoing evaluation can be only if committees are providing the information they are entitled to, especially in respect to the resources and distributions. Regarding this Townsend (2004) explained that one of the tasks of the board members is to monitor and evaluate the performance of the school along with its plan.

Item 2 is 'members of KETB participate in monitoring and evaluating the teaching performance'. Against this statement, 46 (43.3%) of the teacher respondents were strongly disagreed while 41(38.7%) of teacher respondents disagreed to the statement. On the other side, 33 (52.4%) of the committee respondents were strongly disagreed while 18 (28.6%) of the committee respondents were disagreed to the statement. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 4.076$, $df=3$, $P=0.253 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. Therefore, the majority of the respondents confirmed that KETB members never participate in monitoring and evaluation of the teaching performance.

Item 3 is 'KETB members evaluate the impact of community participation in students achievement'. Regarding to this, 45 (42.4%) of teacher respondents were disagreed to the statement while 26 (24.5%) of the respondents were said undecided. On the other side, 29 (46.0%) of the committee respondents said disagree while 12 (19.0%) of the committee respondents said undecided. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 7.845$, $df=4$, $P=0.097 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. This means considerable proportion of both teachers and committee members equally disagreed on the KETB members evaluate the impact of community participation in students achievement.

Additionally, from the interview with school principals, it was found that the role of KETB in the monitoring and evaluation of school activities was poor. One of the sample school principals said,

"KETB members never attempt to evaluate what has been carried out in school compound. They usually come to school when there is a meeting or when they are required to sign on some school issues. Even when they are called for a meeting, they never want to spend much time rather they prefer to finish it soon and go back home immediately".

4.4. Challenges in participating of KETB members in school management functions

The following are the major factors affecting KETB members participation in the management preparatory school. The results are presented as follows.

Table 9: Challenges affecting participation of KETB members in school management

Item	Response	teachers		committee		X ²	df	p-value
		f	%	f	%			
1.KETB members lack of confidence to participate on the School management	Strongly disagree	18	17	8	12.7	1.59 5	4	0.810
	Disagree	17	16.0	10	15.9			
	Undecided	25	23.6	12	19.0			
	Agree	41	38.6	33	52.0			

			7		4			
	Strongly agree	5	4.7	3	4.8			
	Total	106	100	63	100			
2.KETB members reluctance or lack of commitment for participation in the school management	Strongly disagree	15	14.	6	9.5			
			2					
	Disagree	18	17.	11	17.	4.52	4	0.340
			0		5	3		
	Undecided	23	21.	13	20.			
			7		6			
	Agree	45	42.	33	52.			
			5		4			
	Strongly agree	5	4.7					
	Total	106	100	63	100			
3.Lack of incentive for KETB members	Strongly disagree	15	14.	7	11.			
			2		1			
	Disagree	18	17.	8	12.	7.24	4	0.124
			0		7	1		
	Undecided	25	23.	9	14.			
			6		3			
	Agree	45	42.	39	61.			
			5		9			
	Strongly agree	3	2.8					
	Total	106	100	63	100			
4.Lack of knowledge of school board members in case of planning, organizing, decision making process	Strongly disagree	25	23.	19	30.			
			6		2			
	Disagree	48	42.	26	41.	3.20	4	0.524
			8		3	4		
	Undecided	18	17.	11	17.			
			0		5			
	Agree	11	10.	7	11.			
			4		1			
	Strongly agree	4	3.7					
			7					
	Total	106	100	63	100			
5. Inappropriate or shortage of time arranged for board	Strongly disagree	12	15.	3	4.8			
			0					
	Disagree	18	16.	8	12.	3.44	4	0.487
			9		7	2		
	Undecided	26	24.	18	28.			

meeting		5	6		
	Agree	45	42.	29	46.
			4		0
	Strongly agree	5	4.7	5	7.9
	Total	106	100	63	100

Key: f= frequency , %= percentage, df = degree of freedom

Regarding factors that hinder the KETB members participation table 8, item 1 shows that 41 (38.7%) of the teacher respondents said agree to the statement while 25 (23.6%) of the teacher respondents said undecided. On the other side, 33 (52.4%) of the committee respondents agreed to the statement while 12 (19%) of the committee respondents undecided to the statement. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 1.595$, $df=4$, $P=0.810 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. Therefore, the majority of the respondents confirmed that KETB members lack of confidence hinders them from active participation in the school management.

One of the sample school supervisors said,

"KETB members lack of confidence hinders them to participate in schools management. And also replied that the KETB members for they are not professional often perceive that the school teachers and principals are more knowledgeable and experienced may develop of felling of being dominated in their initiatives".

Community participation, if properly managed, can bring about the desired achievement in the management of preparatory schools. But representative of the community, due to various factors, a develop of felling of being dominated in their activities as the result of these felling they may restrain from actively participating on the issue of school management (Stoops 2006)

Item 2 is KETB members reluctance or lack of commitment for participation in the school management. Regarding to this issue, 45 (42.5%) of the teacher respondents were agreed while 23 (21.7%) of the teacher respondents were undecided. On the other side, 33 (52.4%) of the committee respondents were agreed to the statement while 13 (20.6%) of committee respondents were said undecided to statement. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 4.523$,

df=4, $P=0.0340 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. This implies that the agreement of the majority indicate that reluctance or lack of commitment of KETB members hinders them from active participation.

The school principal usually developed formal meeting agenda which may be used simply to disseminate the formally made decisions. In this case, the KETB members may only be supposed to listen with no inputs to add and because of this trend they may be reluctant to participate on the school management issues (Copper and Unrich, 2003)

Item 3 is lack of incentive for KETB members. Regarding to this challenges 45 (42.5%) of teacher respondents were said agreed while 25 (23.6 %) of teacher respondents were said that undecided. On the other side, 41 (61.9%) of committee respondents were said that agreed while 9 (14.3%) of the respondents said undecided. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2=7.241$, df=4, $P=0.124 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. Therefore, the majority of the respondents confirmed that lack of incentives for KETB members affect active participation of the them in school management.

The interview that was held with preparatory school supervisors about the presence of the stated problem. One of the sample supervisors said, *"lack of desired encouragement, lack of consistent psychological rewards based on their performance which was not provided by the respected bodies and this is the challenges which affect active participation of the KETB members"*.

Item 4 is lack of knowledge of school board members in case of planning, organizing, decision making process. Against this statement 48 (42.8%)of the teacher respondents were disagreed to this statement while 25 (23.6%) of teacher respondents were strongly disagreed to the statement. On the other part, 26 (41.3%) of the committee respondents said strongly disagreed to the statement while 19 (30.2%) of the committee respondents undecided to the statement. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 3.204$, df=3, $P=0.524 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. Therefore, the

majority of the respondents confirmed that there was no lack of knowledge of school board members in the case planning, organizing and decision making process.

Item 5 is inappropriate or shortage of time arranged for board meeting. Regarding to this issue, 45 (42.4%) of the respondents were agreed to the statement while 26 (24.5%) of the respondents were undecided to the issue. On the other side, 29 (46%) of the committee respondents were agreed to issue while 12 (19%) of them said undecided. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 3.442$, $df=4$, $P=0.487 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. This means considerable proportion of both teachers and committee members equally agreed on the inappropriate or shortage of time arranged for board meeting is factor that hinder the participation of KETB members in the management of preparatory school.

As it is reviewed in related literature part of this study, inappropriate or shortage of time arranged for board meetings influences the level of their participation in school management(Copper and Ulrich,1996)..

Item	Response	Teacher		Committee		X ²	df	p-value
		f	%	f	%			
1.Are socio -culture factors that hinders the participation of all society groups included in the KETBs?	Yes	88	83.0	47	74.8	1.74	1	0.187
	No	18	17.0	16	25.4			
	Total	106	100	63	100			

Key: f= frequency , %= percentage, df= degree of freedom

Table 9: deals with socio culture factors that hinders the participation of all society groups included in the KETBs. Against their statement, 88 (83.0%) of the teacher respondents said yes while 18 (17.0%) of the respondents said No. On the other hand, 47 (74.8%) of committee

respondents yes while 16 (25.4) of the respondents said No. Then, chi-square test was computed to check whether there is significant difference between the group. Accordingly, the result ($X^2= 1.741$, $df=1$, $P=0.187 > 0.05$) which shows there is no statistically significant difference between responses of the two groups. This means considerable proportion of both teachers and committee members equally agreed that there is socio cultural factors that hinders the participation of society groups included in the KETBs.

From open-ended questions the respondents responded that disparity of sex in the school board participation and some of the majority groups in some school area were unwilling to participate the minority groups in the school matter and the take the top level of management. And they consider the school around them serves only their benefits.

Besides, from the interview with school principals, it was found that socio culture factors hinders the participation of all society groups included in the KETBs.

One of the school principals said,

"In some of the schools the minority groups are not allowed to get in the community based social institution even they are not included as a KETB members in the schools. And also , in most of schools we observed that the participation of female is less than as expected in the document. From interview the majority of respondents responded that the school board expects some incentives or per-diem for the time and energy they spent for school matter. Most of the board and the community consider as any school process left for government and the community participation only in some school constructions. Moreover, in some schools board members are proposed and nominated through election process those are closer to school principals and talkative persons which influence the school community for their benefit".

Therefore, some of socio-cultural factors such as attitudinal and racism of some ethnic society groups is hindering equal participation of all society in the KETB members are some of the major ones.

4.5. Strategies for improving KETB participation in management of preparatory schools

Practically, bringing KETB participation to the desired level might be difficult and time consuming task. However, it is important to exert maximum efforts by taking various measures which could solve the problems and shows the way for active committees participation. With this regard, the data obtained through interview and from open -ended questions, concerning measures to be taken in order to increase the KETB members participation in the management of preparatory schools, the respondents suggested that creating role and responsibilities for KETB members, conducting the necessary skill training for KETB members, strengthening the skills of principals and teachers towards the role of KETB members could improve the problem of KETB members participation in the management of preparatory schools.

As it is reviewed in the related literature as part of this study, the schools should be flexible and democrat to deal with KETB. This can help the KETB to have say and develop a feeling of ownership in the school management system. School need to have norm of openness to the outside community, to new ideas and new ways of doing things, and to change (Barrera *et al.*,2009).

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

5.1. Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess the status and challenges of Kebele Education and training board participation in the management of preparatory schools of Oromia Regional state North Shoa Zone. In order to achieve this purpose, the study was made to seek answers to the following basic questions:

1. What is the current status of KETBs members' participation in the management of Preparatory Schools in the North Shoa Zone?
2. What is the extent of participation of KETB in different management functions (planning, controlling, staffing, organizing) of preparatory schools in the North Shoa Zone?
3. What are the major challenges that affect the participation of the school KETB members in preparatory schools management system in North Shoa Zone?
4. What measures should be taken to improve the KETB members' participation in the management of preparatory schools in the North Shoa Zone?

The study conducted in six woredas of North Shoa Zone of Oromia region. Descriptive survey study design was employed and the related literature was reviewed. The necessary data was collected from committee members (KETB, PTA) and teachers using questionnaires'

quantitatively. Moreover, interviews conducted with the principals and supervisors and document analysis conducted in schools. The respondents who completed the questionnaires were 106 teachers and 63 committee members. Moreover, 8 preparatory schools principals and 4 supervisors are interviewed. The data collected through questionnaires' tabulated, analyzed, using different statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, and interviews were analyzed using narration. Chi square test was employed to see the significant different among the respondents. Based on the research questions the following are the major findings drawn from the analysis.

5.1.1. Issues related to distribution of sex, age, educational level and services

According to data analyzed, it was pointed out that the majority of the respondents, teachers 86 (81.1%) and committee members 57 (90.5%) of them are males. And teachers 20 (18.9%) and committee members 6 (9.5%) of them are females. With regard age the majority of respondents were active level of age because of 48 (45.3%) of teachers and 40 (63.5%) of the committee members were in the range 31-40 years.

Based on the level of education to read and interpret the policy documents and guideline in the educational status of respondents are important. So that majority of respondents revealed that 106 (100%) of teacher respondents are first degree and second degree holders. On the other side, 49 (77.8%) of the committee respondents are diploma and above. The majority of preparatory school teachers are first degree and M.A holders in different discipline. This show that the level of education was not the only guaranty for interpret and used it but also the field of study in which the graduate and the commitments of the school board members were some of the problems under the study area.

With regards to the work experience of the teacher respondents 48 (45.3%) have work experience of 6-10 years while 22 (20.8%) of the respondents had a work experience of 11-15 years. On the others hand, 63 (100%) of committee respondents have service year of 1-5 years.

5.1.2. Issues related to Current Status of KETB Members Participation in the Management

With regard to the current status of KETB members participation in visiting schools beyond the regular meeting, most respondents 149 (88.2%) revealed that KETB members never visited the school beyond the regular meeting time.

Similarly, regarding the KETB members participation in management function, most respondents 136 (80.5%) unveiled that KETB members never at all participate in the management functions.

Regarding, whether KETB members giving quick response in school when problems encounter teaching-learning process, the participation of KETB members on this issue was very low and this confirmed by 89 (52.7%) of the respondents and KETB members decision making for complaints of principals and teachers is never at all and this decided by 84 (49.7%) of the respondents.

5.1.3. Issues related to participation of the KETB members in key management functions

KETB members did not participate in preparing school strategic plan and annual plan process . This is confirmed by 99 (58.6%) respondents and do not participate in preparing school annual plan process and this is decided by 84 (49%) of the respondents .

In relation to decision making, members of KETB did not participate in identifying problems and in making decision to solve problems related to schools, taking the initiative to mobilize the community to enhance their contribution, participating actively in allocating and approving the school budget, controlling budget, controlling the school property, and holding meeting with parents and communities on students poor achievement.

Regarding the monitoring and evaluation, KETB members do not monitor the implementation of the school plan and evaluate the teachers' performance and the impact of community participation in student's academic achievements.

5.1.4. Issue related to Challenges affecting participation of KETB members in school management

With respect to challenges that hinders the KETB members in the school management: lack of confidence of KETB members, the majority agreements 71 (42%) of respondents indicated that members of KETB lack of confidence by the assumption that they are not professional this turn hinders their participation. Also reluctance or Lack of commitment of KETB members hinders the participation of them in school and this confirmed by 78 (46.2%) respondents. Additionally, lack of incentive for KETB members is the challenges affecting participation of KETB members in the school management and this decided by 84 (49%) of respondents. Another factor that hinders KETB members participation is in appropriate time and place of meeting: in this regard 74 (47.8%) respondents confirmed that in appropriate time and place of meeting hinders the KETB members participation in preparatory schools.

In general this study found out that the major challenges which affect the participation of school boards in the management of preparatory school are: School KETB members expecting incentives for their services where the time spend in the school, lack commitment and reluctance of the KETB members, lack of confidence of KETB members, inappropriate or shortage of time arranged for board meeting and some of socio-cultural factors such as attitudinal and racism of some ethnic society groups

5.1.5. Issues related to possible solutions to tackle the problem of KETB members participation

The data obtained through interview and open ended questions concerning the possible solutions to be taken to increase the KETB members participation, respondents suggested that, creating role and responsibility for KETB members participation, conducting the necessary skill training KETB members, and strengthening the skills of principals and teachers towards the role of KETB members participation in the management of preparatory schools could improve the situation.

5.2. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn.

1. In this study, it was found out that current status of KETB members participation in the management was not adequate enough. This was because the fact that KETB members did not

visit the school beyond the regular meeting time, KETB members did not give quick response to the problem encountered in teaching learning process and KETB members did not make decision for the complaints of principals and teachers. From this it can be concluded that, KETB members were not participating in school management at the expected level in the study area.

2. The finding of study showed that the participation of KETB members in the management functions such as participating in preparation of school strategic and annual plan, decision making, monitoring and evaluation of the teacher performance and evaluate the impact of community participation in students achievement found to be low.

3. The study has showed that different factors have hampered the participation KETB members in the management of schools. Some of these factors were lack of commitment, lack of training, inappropriate time and place of meeting, lack of confidence and reluctance of committee members, and lack of incentive for committees members which were caused by stakeholders.

4. Finally, some possible measures were suggested to be taken for improvement. The provision of the necessary skill training, addressing clear roles and responsibilities, and creating conducive environment, strengthening the skill of principals and teachers toward the positive role of KETB members were some of the major ones. However, the success of these measures strongly relies on the collaborative efforts of all educational personnel beginning from school to regional levels.

Regarding the possible solutions to tackle creating clear role and responsibilities for KETB members, participation in management of preparatory schools suggested as solution to improve the situation.

Generally from the findings one can conclude that KETB members participation in the management of preparatory school of North Shoa Zone was not in line with the MoE guideline (2002) of school board participation. This in turn could result in poor school management function, poor school resource capacity, low school attendance, severe discipline of students and poor students' academic achievements.

5.2. Recommendations

Successful strengthening status and overcoming challenges of KETB members participation in management of preparatory school require hard working inspirations and cooperation of all stakeholders that found at different levels and positions. So, on basis of finding and conclusion drawn, the following recommendation were forwarded to improve participation of KETB members in the management of preparatory schools.

1. As indicated in the education and training policy document of MoE (2002), participation is being encouraged in the management of the schools through KETB members. Different experiences and knowledge assured that community representatives can be a great input for school to achieve their objective. If members of KETB in particular allowed to participate in management key can develop a sense of ownership which serves as driving force for them to discharge their responsibility. Hence the school principals should involve KETB members in key management functions such as planning, decision making, implementation of the plan, managing disciplinary issues, and monitoring and evaluation process.

2. In finding of the study there was reluctance and less commitment of KETB members to discharge their role and responsibilities in the study area. Therefore, Woreda education Office and school principals should assess the overall activities of KETB members and provide reward to those members who performed well in their respective positions. This kind of reward can motivate the and KETB members to work much harder in their work. Besides, even those who are not rewarded will be motivated to improve their performance in their future carrier.

3. In the preceding findings of study, it has been mentioned that KETB members were not given any training before and after they were posted to current positions. Hence, this has contributed to the low level of participation KETB in the school management system. As long as they are representatives of the community, they must take part in the school management being active participants. However, in order to do this they need to get some awareness about their respective responsibilities and roles in the school management. Therefore, the community participation has to be facilitated by providing continuous training to KETB members in planning, decision making, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation. Such program should be

organized at school level by the principals, and teachers, supervisors, Woreda Education Experts, Zone Education Officials or Regional Bureau.

4. In the conclusion of this study, it was identified that inappropriate time and place of meeting were the major one which affected the participation of KETB in the management of schools. In order to alleviate these constraints, the school principals should:

- Notify members about the purpose and written agendas should be prepared and disseminated to KETB members in advance.
- Design the meeting place in a way that suits the convenience of KETB members.
- Making the meeting short so as to reduce absenteeism for the next meeting.

5. As indicated in the findings, some of the challenges that affect active participation of school board were Lack of commitment, reluctance of the KETB members and social cultural factors of the school board in the area of school activities. Therefore, the school principals together with local government with a great commitment and devotion to work in the area attitudinal problems of the community problems in order to bring smooth relationship and active participation of community representative in the area of preparatory school management.

6. REFERENCES

- Adelman, H and F. Taylor .2007. *Fostering family and community Involvement*: Washington, DC: The Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence and NRL.
- Alla, L. and Lunenburg . 1991 . *Education Administration: Concepts and practice*. New York: Wards Worth pub. Comp.
- Alpha University College. 2006. *Introduction to management (TVET)*. Addis Ababa: Alpha University College.
- Aref,F. and A. Asnarulkhadi. 2011. The Theoretical and Conceptual Framework and Application of Community Empowerment and Participation in process of Community Development in Malaysia. *Journal of American Science* 2011; 7(2): 186-195
- Arnot, Margaret A. and Charles D. Raab . 2000. *The governance of schooling comparative studies of Development Management*, London: Routledge.
- Ayalew Shibeshi. 2000. *Educational policy management of change, module of instruction* Addis Ababa AAU.
- Bagin,D. and Donal.2005. *The School Community Relations, 8th Edition*, Bosten. New York:Routledge
- Bagin, D. and R. Donald. 2001. *The school and community Relations 7th edition*. London: Allyn and Bacon.
- Barrer F.,T. Fasiha and H.A. Patrions. 2009. *Decentralized decision-making in schools*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- BEA-E . 2007. *An Assessment of the Implementation of Status and Impact of the " Directive for Educational Management, Organization, Public Participation and finance"* of the Ministry of Education: *Addis Ababa*. The Royal Netherlands Embassy and Irish Aid.
- Best. 2006. *Research in education* (10thed). New York. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Birhane Sime, Temesgen Abiyo and Zebene Gelaglie . 2009. *Educational Organization and*

Management: Adama University.

- Bruns, B, D. Filmer and H.A. Patrions. 2011. *Making Schools Work: New Evidence Accountability Reforms*. Washington: World Bank.
- Chaube, S.P and Chaube. 2000. *School organization*, New Delhi: Vikas publishing house PVT.LTD.
- Cohen, L., Manion, l. and mornison, k.2005. *Research methods in education*(5th ed). London: Routledge.
- Colletta, J. Nat and G. pekings,1995. participals' Perception of Community and Staff Involvement in Shared Decision-Making," *Journal of Research in Rural Education*. 12(1),17-24.
- Commings,W.1998."Quality of education for all: Community oriented management initiatives for reaching the periphery" In Amare Asgedom and others editors of Quality Education in Ethiopia: vision on for the 21th centure. Proceeding of National conference Held in Hawasa college of teacher education from july12/18/1998 A.A.U. Institution of education research.
- Copper and Ulrich.1996." Deconstructing site based management: possibilities for emancipation alternative means of control", *International Journal of Educational Reform*.Vol.5.No.1.pp.56-69.
- Copper, T. and Ulrich.2003. Deconstructing Site-Based Management. *International Journal of Educational Reform* Vol 5(1) 56-69.
- Davidoff, S . and S. Lazarus.2002. *The learning school: An Organization Development Approach*. Kenwyn: Juta.
- Davis, D. 2000. *Supporting parent, family, and community involvement in your School*: NWREL, Portland, Oregon.
- Edosa, T. 2009. *Roles of stakeholders in management of secondary school of Western Shoa Zone*. Master thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- FDRE(1998) Educational Sector development program Implement, Manuals, Addis Ababa: Unpublished living Document.
- FDRE (2002) Education sector Strategy, Addis Ababa:EMPDA.
- Feleke Tesema. 2012. *Factor inhibiting active participation of Kebele Education and training board in school management: In the case of Gurage Zone of SNNPRS*: The thesis presented for institute of Education and Training research: Hawasa University

- Gallagher, R-Donald et al.1997.*The School of Community relations*, Baconavian Company.
- Geberkidan,W.2001. A study of local community participation in the implementation of primary school improvement project in Tigray, Master thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Holiday Albert. E.1998. School and Community relation. *Journal of education public relations* 2nd Quarter Comphill,17001-0657...
- Imparto, I. and R. Jeff. 2003. *Slum upgrading and participation: Lesson from Latin America*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Jeilu. 2001. Decentralization of education management case study in Oromiya National Regional State. Master Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- LaBahn, J.1995. *Education and parental involvement in secondary school: Problems, solutions, and effects*. Educational Psychology Intractive. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University.
- Leedy. P.D. and Ormand, J.E. 2005. *Practical research planning* and design publisher : peatson .
- Kaufman, R.1995. *Mapping Educational Success: Strategic Thinking and Planning for School Administrators*. New York: Crown press, Inc.
- MoE .1994. *Federal Democratic republic of Ethiopia education and training policy*. Addis Ababa.
- _____.1998. *Educational sector development and program implementation manual*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA
- _____. 2002. *Educational management, organization, community participation and educational finance: A guide line*. Addis Ababa, EMPDA printing press.
- _____. 2005. *Education sector development program III*. Addis Ababa: Etiopia.
- Myers, M. 2008. *Narrative analysis: Qualitative research in business and management*. Sage Publication Ltd.
- Narayan, D. 1995. *The contribution of people's participation* . Washington D.C: World bank.
- Narayan, D. and E. katrinka,1997. *Design of Social Funds: Participation, Demand Orientation, and Local Organizational Capacity*. New York: World Bank.
- Norman, J. 2000. *Community participation*. How People Power Brings Sustainable Benefits to Communities, USDA Rural Development Office of Community Development. Northwest Regional Educational planning.

- Onderi. H. and Andrew Makori. 2012. Deferent perceptions, Challenges, Conflicts and tensions in the role of board of Governors (BOG) and Parent Teacher Association(PTA) in Sub-Sahara Africa: A case of Kenyan Secondary Schools. *Educational Research* (ISSN:2141-5161Vol.3(1),017-029. Accessed on January 17, 2013.
- Oppenheim.1996. *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement* Pinter publishers London.UK.
- Pamoja. 2005. Managing our school today, A practical guide on participatory school Governance. *Assessed on March 22,2012*.
- Shaffer, S.1994. *Participation for educational change: A synthesis of experience*. Paris UNESCO International Institute for Educational planning.
- Shamroc, R.A. 2002. *Fundamentals of educational research*, Meerut: New Agrawal Offset Printing Press.
- Schmitt, D.2003. *Gaining support for your School: Strategies for your community Involvement*. Geneva UNICEF.
- Stoops, et-al 2006. *A Hand Book of Educational Administration: A guide for the practitioner*. London: Macmillan publisher
- Seyoum Tefera,1996." Attempts at Educational Reform in Ethiopia: A Top-Down or a Bottom Up Reform? *The Ethiopia Journal of Education*. 16(1),1-37.
- Solomon Desta, L. Coppock, Getachew Gebru, Seyoum Tezera, and D. Amosha .2007. Building effective community participation and stakeholder partnerships to promote positive change in the southern Ethiopian rangelands. Research Brief o7-03-PARIMA. Global livestock collaborative Research support Program. University of California, Davis. 4pp.
- Sujatha, K. 2000. Education of Indian Scheduled Tribes: A Study of Community Schools in the District of Vishakhapatnam, Andhra. Pradesh. Paris: UNESCO pub.
- Swift-Morgan, F. 2006.What community participation in schooling means: Insight from Southern Ethiopia. *Harvard Educational Review* 76(3).
- Tekeste Negash. 2006. *Education in Ethiopia: From Crisis to Brink of Collapse* (NAI Discussion papers). Sweden: Nordic Africa Institute.
- Townsend ,T. 2004. Effective schooling for community. *Journal Education Reform* 3(2) 46-57.

- Uemura, M. 1999. *Community Participation in Education: what do we know? For effective schools and Teachers and the knowledge of Management System HDNED*, World Bank.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization).2002. *Educational Governance at local level towards achieving education for all*, Paris, UNESCO
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization). 2006. *Community Management at local level*. Paris. UNESCO.
- Winkler Donal R.1989. *Decentralization of Education series*. Geneva, France press.
- World Bank (2008). *Governance, management, and Accountability in secondary education in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington: The word Bank.
- Zenebe Baraki. 2006. *Community Participation and Mobilization in Education*. Addis Ababa: Alpha University College.

7. APPENDICES

7.1 APPENDIX I
Haramaya University
Postgraduate Program Directorate
College of Education and Behavioral Studies
Department of Educational planning and Management

Program: MA in school leadership

Questionnaire to be filled by preparatory school teachers and committees (KETB, PTA)

Objective of the questionnaire:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect primary data for a master's thesis entitled " The Status and Challenges of Kebele Education and Training Board Participation in the Management of Preparatory Schools in North Shoa Zone of Oromia Regional State." The accomplishment of this study is highly depending upon your cooperation and genuine responses to the questionnaire. Therefore, you are very kindly requested to read each items carefully and respond to the questions honestly and frankly.

General instruction

- No need of writing your name in the questionnaire.
- please follow each of the instructions when filling out the questionnaire.
- For question items that require your opinion or comments, please give short answers in the space provided.
- For questions items put (√) mark in front of your choice.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

PART I: Background of the respondent

1. Name of your school _____
2. Sex a) male b) Female
3. Age a) below 20 year b) 20-30 year
 c) 31-40 year d) 41-50 year
 e) 50 and above year
4. Level of education a) Less than grade 10 b) certificate
 c) diploma d) degree e) 2nd degree
5. Your current position a) Teachers b) KETB member
 C) PTA member
6. Total service a) 1-5 years b) 6-10 years
 c) 11-15 years d) more than 15 years

PART II

Instruction: the following are questions about practice of KETB members participation in management of preparatory schools place, for the questions which are found out the tables

chose your answer by putting (√) in the box in front your letters choice and for the items that require written answers use the blank space to write your answers corresponding to the questions and answer the question which are found in the tables by putting (√) in front of the question.

1. Issue related to current status of KETB members participation in management

1.1 Please, tick a "√" mark on the appropriate level of contributions 4=always 3=often 2=sometime 1=never at all

No	Item	Level of agreement			
		4	3	2	1
1	How often do the KETB members visit the school beyond the regular meeting time				
2	How often do the KETB members participate on management function				
3	How often do the KETB members give quick response to the problems encountered in the teaching learning process				
4	How often do KETB decision making of KETB members for complaints of principals and teachers				

1.2 how often KETB members participate in the school management ?

- A) always B) most the time C) sometimes D) very rarely
 E) not at all

1.3 If your answer for the above question is "rarely or not at all" what do you think the main reasons for them to not to participate in the school management please give the main reason.

1.4. What do think the possible solutions to participate the KETB members in the school management ?

2. Issue related to the key management functions that KETB participates in the school management

The following are management functions that KETB participates in the school management of preparatory schools, so, indicate your level of agreements according to the case of your locality by putting a tick "√" mark the scale value number. 5 =Strongly disagree 4=disagree 3= undecided 2=agree 1=strongly agree

2.1 KETB members' participation in planning

No	Item	Level of agreement				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The KETB members participate in planning,(the strategic plan of the school)					
2	The KETB members participate in planning,(the annual plan of the school)					

2.2 KETB members' participation in decision making

No	Item	Level of agreement				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Members of KETB identify problems and make decision to solve problems which are related to school					
2	Members of KETB participate in allocating and approving the school budget					
3	Members of KETB participate in decision how the school budget should be spent					
4	Members of KETB participate in controlling school property					

2.3 KETB members' participation in monitoring and evaluation

No	Item	Level of agreement				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Members of KETB monitor the implementation of the school plan					
2	Members of KETB participate in monitoring and evaluating the teachers performance					
3	KETB members evaluate the impact of community participation in students achievement					

2.4 If your rating is "strong disagree" or disagree " regarding the participation of KETB in management of preparatory schools please give three most important reasons.

3. The major challenges which affect participation of KETB members in school management

The following are the major factors affecting KETB members participation in the management of preparatory schools, so, indicate your level of agreements according to the case of your locality by putting a tick "√" mark the scale value number. 5 =strongly disagree 4=disagree 3=

undecided 2=agree 1=strongly agree

No	Item	Level				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	KETB members lack of confidence to participate on the School management.					
2	KETB members reluctance or lack of commitment for participation in the school management					
3	Lack of incentive for KETB members					
4	lack of knowledge of school board members in case of planning, organizing, decision making process					
5	inappropriate or shortage of time arranged for board meeting					

3.1 If there are any other challenges affecting the participation of KETB member's in the management of preparatory school, please specify them

3.2 Is there any socio culture factors hinders the participation of all society groups included in the KETBs? a/ yes b/ No

3.3 If your response in question No 3.2 is "yes" why?

4. What are the possible solutions to increase the KETB participation?

7. 2 APPENDIX II
Haramaya University
Postgraduate Program Directorate
College of Education and Behavioral Studies
Department of Educational planning and Management

Program: MA in school leadership

Interview question set for principals and supervisors

1. To what extent do KETB participate in the management of preparatory schools ?
which area do the participate?
2. Are there any training orientation given to KETB members how to carry out their
responsibilities? if yes where it adequate?
3. How do teachers , principals and supervisors view the contribution of KETB
members in the management of preparatory schools?
4. What improvement has been made due to the participation KETB on the
management of school?
5. What major problems encountered with KETB members participation in the
management of preparatory schools?

6. What possible solutions do you suggest to be taken to tackle the problems related to KETB members participation in the management of preparatory schools?

Thank you!

7.3 APPENDIX III
Haramaya University
College of Education and Behavioral Studies
Department of Educational planning and Management

Program: MA in school leadership

Gaaffilee koree (KETB, PTA) tiin guutama

Kun qo'annoo barnoota digrii 2ffaati. Kaayyoon isaa hirmannaan Miseensa koree Bordii Barnoota barnoota fi leenjii gandaa manneen barnootaa Qophaa'ina Godina Shawaa keessattii maalirra akka jiruu fi rakkoowwan hirmaachuudhaaf gufuu ta'aan xinxaaluuf yommuu ta'uu, galma ga'insa qo'annoo kanaaf ragaan isiin nu kennitan murteessaa waan ta'eef gaaffilee kennamansirritti hubachuun akka deebii nuu kennitan kabajaan ni gaafanna.

Odeeffannoo waliigalaa

- Maqaa keessan bareessuun barbaachisaa miti.
- Gaaffii filannoodhaaf deebii filachuun deebisi.
- Gaaffilee yaada keessan akka ibsitan gaafatamantiif deebii gababaa kennaa.
- Gaaffilee gabatee keessatti argamaniif immoo mallattoo (✓) kanaan agarsiisaa.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

Kutaa I: Odeefannoo namoota ragaa kennanii

1. Maqaa mana barumsaa keessanii _____
2. Saalaa a) dhiira b) durbaa
3. Umrii a) waggaa 20 gadi b) waggaa 20-30
c) waggaa 31-40 d) waggaa 41-50
e) Waggaa 50 and isaa ol
4. Sadarkaa barumsaa a) Kutaa 10ffaa gadi b) Sartifikeetii
c) Diplooma d) digrii e) digrii 2ffaa
5. Ga'ee hojii a) Barsiisaa b) miseensa Koree KETB
C) Miseensa koree PTA
6. Tajaajila a) waggaa 1-5 b) waggaa 6-10
c) waggaa 11-15 d) waggaa 15 fi isaa oli

Kutaa II

1. Haala hirmannaa miseensa koree KETB hojii bulchinsa M/B keessatti .

1.1 Dhimmoota armaan gadii ibsamaniif yaada kee mallattoo "√" kana ka'uun ibsi. 4=yeroo hunda 3=yeroo baay'ee 2=yeroo tokko tokko 1=gonkuma

L	Dhimmoota	Sad. waliigaltee			
		4	3	2	1
1	Miseensi koree KETB yeroo ammam sagantaa walga'iitiin ala mana barumsaa daawatu				
2	Miseensi Koreen KETB hammam hojii hoggansa mana barumsaa irraatti hirmaachaa jira				
3	Miseensi koree KETB hammaam mana barumsaa keessatti rakkoon haala baruu barsiisuu yoo muddate deebii arifachisaa kenna				
4	Miseensi koree KETB hammaam murtee kennu komii itti gafatamtotaa fi barsiisotaa irratti				

1.2 Miseensi koree KETB hammaam hojii bulchinsa irratti mana barumsaa keessatti

hirmaatu ?

A) yeroo hunda B) yeroo irraa caalaa C) Yeroo tokko tokko

D) yeroo baay'ee xiqqoo E) Gonkuma

1.3 Yoo deebiin kee gaaffii armaan olii irratti " yeroo baay'ee xiqqoo or gonkuma" sababni isaa gurguddoon maal jettee yaada hirmaannaan isaani bulchinsa mana barumsaa keessa dhabamuun. Sababole kana tarreesii.

1.4. Maal jettee yaaddaa furmaatni Miseensi koree KETB bulchinsa mana barumsaa irratti hirmachuu dabuu isaanitiif?

2. Dhimmota armaan gadii ibsamaniif yaada kee mallattoo "√" kana ka'uun ibsi.

1. Baay'ee irratti walii hin galu 2.walii hin galu 3.Iratan waligala 4.baay'een irratti waligala

2.1 Hirmannaan miseensota koree KETB qophii karoora tarsimoo fi waggaaM/B irraatti qaban ilaalchise

Lakk	Sad. waliigaltee

.	Idhimmoota	5	4	3	2	1
1	Miseensotni Koree KETB qophii karoora tarsimoo irratti ni hirmatu					
2	Miseensotni Koree KETB qophii karoora waggaa irratti ni hirmatu					

2.2 Hirmannaa miseensotaa KETB murtee kennu irretti qaban ilaalchisee

Lakk	Dhimmota	Sad. waliigaltee				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Miseensotni koree KETB rakoollee mana barumsaa adda baasuun adda baasuun furmata ni kennaa.					
2	Miseensotni koree KETB baajata M/B irratti ni murteessaa, ni to'ata					
3	Miseensotni koree KETB murtee haala baajatni M/B itti ba'uu qabuu irratti ni hirmatu					
4	Miseensotni koree KETB qabeenya mana barumsaa to'achuu irratti ni hirmaatu					

2.3 Hirmannaa miseensota koree KETB galma gahinsa karoora M/B members'

participation in monitoring and evaluation to'achuu irratti qaban

Lakk.	Dhimmoota	Sad. waligaltee				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Miseensotni koree KETB galma ga'insa karoora M/B ni to'atu					
2	Miseensotni koree KETB galma madallii barsiisotaa irraatti ni hirmatu, ni taasisu					
3	Miseensotni koree KETB hirmannaan Ummataa barattoota gahomsuu irratti malirra akka jiru ni madalu					

2.4 Deebiin kee baay'ee irratti waliihingaluu ykn irratti waliihingaluu yoo ta'e sababni isaa maal isitti fakata ?

3. Dhimmoota hirmannaa koree KETB irratti gufuu ta'aan ilaalchisee "√" kana ka'uun ibsi

1. Baay'ee irratti walii hin galu 2. walii hin galu 3. Iratan waligala 4. baay'een irratti waligala

Lakk.	Dhimmoota	Sad. waligaltee				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Miseensonni koree KETB hirmannadhaaf ofitti amanuu irraa dhabu.					
2	Hanqina qophaa'ummaa hirmannaa bulchinsa irratti miseensotni koree KETB M/B qaban					
3	Hanqina Faayidaa adda Miseensa Koree KETB					
4	Hanqina dandeetti koree miseensa KETB qaban					
5	Miseensi koree KETB mana barumsaa sagantaa dhabbataa walga'ii dhabuu					

3.1 Yoo dabalataa rakkoon biraa hirmannaa miseensoota koree KETB irratti dhibbaa fidu jiraatee tareessi.

3.2 Wantootni aadadhaan waliqabatan, kan hawaasni hundi koree KETB keessatti akka hin

hirmannee taasisu jira ? a/ Eyyee b/ mitii

3.3 Yoo deebiin kee gaaffii 3.2 "eyyee " ta'ee ,maaliif ?

4. 4. Hirmannaa miseensota koree KETB hojii bulchinsa M/B keessatti dabaluuuf furmaata ta'a kan jeettu maal fa'i?
