Research on Humanities and Social Sciences
ISSN 2224-5766 (Paper) ISSN 2225-0484 (Online)
Vol.13, No.17, 2023

Practices and Problems of Implementation of School Improvement Program in Government Secondary Schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone

Alemu Kibamo
Funamura high and preparatory school, south region, Ethiopia
* E-mail of the corresponding author:alex.kib13@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
The objective of this study was to assess the practices and problems of implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. For this purpose descriptive survey research design was employed. For the study 5 woredas and 8 secondary schools were included through simple random sampling. From these sample schools,175 teachers were selected by using simple random sampling, while 52 school improvement committee were selected by using availability sampling, 8 parent-teacher and students association coordinators,5 woreda education office experts and one zone education department experts and supervisors were included through purposive sampling. Questionnaires were used as main tool of data collection. pilot test was conducted. Interview was used to substantiate the data gathered through questionnaire. Document analysis was also part of data collection for the study. Frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, and independent sample t-test were employed to analyze quantitative data while narrative analysis approach was used to analyze qualitative data. The findings of the study showed that to solve teaching-learning problems and inbuilt supervision have not been conducted among colleagues to share experiences to one another, school leadership and management domain the leaders have made clear shared vision, mission and goal for teacher on students' achievement and school leaders commitment to improve students' achievement was found low; school environment domain, safe, stable and attractive for teaching and learning process, teachers and students have access to standard latrines with water designated for female and male students were unsatisfactory. Lack of awareness about the school improvement program among the school community, low level of stakeholders' participation to the program, low level of supervision towards monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, shortage of material resources, lack of follow-up and supervision on the implementation of the program and inadequate planning of school improvement plan were major problems of implementation of school improvement program. Therefore, it was could be recommended that schools improvement committee, supervisors, school leaders, woreda and zone education office to promote practical involvement of all stakeholders by creating adequate awareness and training to implement school improvement program effectively in schools, woreda, zonal education office and school management bodies need to provide the necessary school facilities, need to avail secondary schools with important financial, material and human resources and should timely supervise and support the school leaders before starting the implementation of school improvement program to achieve the intended objective of the program.
Keywords: education, leadership, schools
DOI: 10.7176/RHSS/13-17-03
Publication date: October 31st 2023

1. Background of Study

School improvement helps to create a learning environment that welcomes all learners. It enables teachers to be responsive to the diverse learning needs of students in their teaching learning approaches Hopkins (2005). School Improvement; moreover, is essential to enhance the involvement of parents and the community in school activities and to improve the effectiveness of the school management. Hopkins (2005) defined school improvement as "a distinct approach to educational change that enhances students' outcomes as well as strengthen the school's capacity for managing improvement initiatives".

Hopkins further elaborated that school improvement is about raising students' achievement through focusing on the teaching and learning process and those conditions which support it. Based on the above description of scholars and by scaling up the experience of other countries, Ethiopia has initiated to reform change to improve teaching-learning and school conditions of the country as the result school improvement program started in all schools of the country since 2007 by sitting strategies and the objectives of school improvement program.

School improvement is at the center of education reform and is perceived by many as a key to social and economic advance. It contributes to determining personal fulfillment and career paths of individual students and consequently engages the interests of parents and community members. It is an ever -present commitment of teachers and managers in schools. Policy makers and politicians at national and local levels have to devote much

time and effort to their search for better schools (MoE, 2010; Chi-Chi & Michael, 2014). This view indicates that school improvement is a change or reform which requires the schools to engage in a process that will help them to achieve their goals, so as to maximize the student achievement. This study therefore to assesses practices and problems of the school improvement program so as to determine the capacity of secondary schools to equip students with knowledge and skills that contribute to their success. School improvement is a central feature in student successes noted by many educational scholars nationally and internationally. Despite the apparent importance of school improvement program lack of experience and skills among school principals, low coordination of school community to implement the program and others.

Hopkins (2002) describes school improvement as a distinct approach to educational change that aims to enhance student outcomes as well as strengthen the school's capacity for managing change. Barth (1990) into defines school improvement as an effort to determine and provide, from within and without, conditions under which the students who inhabit schools will promote and sustain learning among them. From these definitions, it appears the purpose of school improvement is to impact outwardly on the relationship between the teaching and learning process and the conditions that support it.

Hargreaves (1994) and Hopkins (2001)expand that the change which should take place as a result of the school improvement effort should not merely reflect the implementation of policies, but rather should also reflect improvements or adaptations of practices which transform the learning process to achieve the maximum impact on students, teachers and schools. The school improvement plan encourages staff and parents to monitor students achievements and other factors such as environment that are known to influence students' success with up-to-date and reliable information about how students are performing, school are better able to respond to needs of students, teachers and parents. The desire of all parents is to have quality functional education programs for their children from the nursery school to the university level (Ojo, 2008). This is an indication of quality education that the society requires for their children.

Effective school improvement program minimizes wastage of educational resources by reducing class repetition, dropout and improving the learning capacity and academic achievement of students (MoE, 2006). The current government's commitment in expansion of general education seems encouraging, number of schools and enrollment alone do not indicate the progress of the education sector, with ensuring quality and efficiency (internal and external efficiency) this situation necessitates although investigation of the recently introduced SIP in terms of the domains, and selected indicators set out for implementation in selected secondary schools of Kambata Tambaro Zone. In addition, it provides quality of education by providing the necessary resources through the coordination of the community, non-governmental organizations, humanitarian agencies and religious organizations, in addition to assistance provided by the government (MoE, 2006). Besides, effective school improvement program minimizes wastage of educational resources by reducing class repetition, dropout and improving the learning capacity and academic achievement of students (MoE, 2006). This requires the effectiveness and commitment of all the stakeholders, particularly teachers and the school leadership. The above idea initiated the researcher to investigate the practices and problems of implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. It is expected that by carrying out this study teachers, principals, school representatives and education practitioners may gain a better understanding of how to implement successful and effective program that elevate the outcomes of the students, the schools and the nation at large.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Education reform and school improvement reform program in particular are mainly the responsibility of school leadership and management. Nevertheless, any public education reform program should be well planned and effectively implemented, and should get support from all the main stakeholders. Therefore, to implement the school improvement program, school leaders and school governing bodies need to have theoretical knowledge, skill and adequate experience in the areas of the school improvement components. Marishane (2011) states that a critical aspect of educational reform is linking the schools" internal structures, strategies, capacities, and processes in a coherent manner to advance student achievements in schools. In this case school improvement is, therefore, finding ways that will strengthen the management and leadership capacities of those working in schools to ensure that learners are provided with learning opportunities of a high quality (Leithwood, 2002 and Marishane, 2011).

In the present competitive market economy, the success of any education system depends on the quality of education service rendered. Based on this view, the Ministry of Education (MoE, 2008:9-10) shifted its focus to comprehensive quality improvement of education to cope with the demand of the workforce needed by the socio-economic system of the country. However, schools at all levels, particularly secondary schools, are facing challenges due to rapidly changing technology, and growing international and national competition for students and teachers.

Similarly, from KTZEO (2016-2018) Kembata Tembro Zone Education teaching learning core processes

three years Ethiopia General Education National Assessment Grade 10th students achievement analysis report showed that the most students result was below the standards. This is an indication that expansion has been prioritized over quality which need school improvement at large. This reality is prevailing in the current secondary school education system of Kambata Tebmbaro Zone (grades 9-10) secondary schools..

Despite school improvement changes taking place at secondary school level, the researcher feels that most school communities and stakeholders particularly in Kembata Tembro currently seem to be lacking effectiveness with regard to the school improvement program. The schools, therefore, perform below government expectations with respect to the achievement of secondary school improvement program goals. In this case, even though the secondary schools have made various attempts to improve the schools, there are some observed limitations that hamper the teaching learning process in the secondary schools. Therefore, the existing challenging practices need to be investigated so as to achieve effective implementation of school improvement program.

On the other hand, the school improvement program is the corner stone for all school improvement activities. Moreover, it can also be noted that the quality of school improvement program implementation largely depends upon the presence of adequately trained school leaders in the field of educational leadership and management. However, the current practices showed that educational leaders have no enough capacity to implement SIP in the study area. Thus, the absence of adequately trained school leaders in the field of educational leadership and management would add to the weak implementation of the school improvement program (MoE, 2012).

Therefore, based on the above information school improvement program at the school level lack of awareness in implementing the program, shortage of educational finance and limited support to the implementation of SIP are problems of school improvement in secondary schools indicate quality as one of the major problems of secondary schools (MoE, 2005).

SIP is a dynamic process that involves many stakeholders and resources as input, process, output, outcome, and impact. Thus, in order to ensure impacts of the effective and efficient implementation of the program, it is necessary to identify its strengths, weakness, threats and opportunities through research; and then to propose possible scenarios of retaining the achievements, for correcting the weaknesses problems for preventing possible threats and for harvesting the opportunities. The purpose of this study; therefore, was to examine the practices and problems of implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone.

1.3 Research Questions

To achieve the objectives of the study the following questions were taken in to account and examined in order to address the problem.

1) To what extent the domains of SIP implemented in secondary schools of Kembata Tembro Zone?
2) To what extent the stakeholders (principals, teachers, parents and students) contributed for the implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Kembata Tembro Zone?
3) What are the major problems that hamper the implementation of the school improvement program in the secondary schools of Kembata Tembro Zone?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

This study had both general and specific objectives

1.4.1 General Objective

The general objective of the study was to assess the practices and problems of implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone.

1.4.2 Specific Objectives

Based on the above general objective, the following were the specific objectives of the study.

- To identify and describe the extent to which the domains of SIP are implemented in secondary schools of Kembata Tembro Zone.
- To assess the extent to which the stakeholders contributed in implementing the school improvement program in secondary schools of Kembata Tembro Zone.
- To identify the major problems that hinder school improvement program implementation in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone.

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study has the following significances:

It may provide possible solutions for the problem encountered in the implementation of SIP in secondary schools. It may initiate other researchers to deal more about the existing problems in depth and reFplicate the study to other zones. It provides information for teachers, students, parents, and different level educational leader how SIP implementation is going on in secondary schools of the area under investigation; it provides school

principals, supervisors, teachers, students, parents, and education experts at Zone, Woreda and school level to increase their participation and performances in SIP implementation; it provides valuable contribution to enhance school community participation in schools 'program; it leads secondary schools to create conducive and better learning environments and finally, it may also serve as aspiring board for other researchers to carry out in-depth studies in the field.

1.6 Delimitation of the Study

This study was delimited to investigate the practices and problems of implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of KembataTembaro Zone**,** this is because of the researcher's long year services as teacher and school leader in the study area, and there by researcher better experience of its socio-cultural and geographical setting to select it for the study. The study was also delimited to assess the implementation of the major activities of school improvement program (SIP) such as preparation; self-enquiry, planning and evaluation phase of SIP in government secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone**.** Moreover, as mentioned earlier, this study focuses on investigating participation of teachers, SIC, supervisors, woreda and zone education department experts and parent, Teacher and student association coordinators in planning and implementing SIP, monitoring and evaluation. Participating this stakeholders because of the issue is directly concerned to the study. Other stakeholders were not the concern of this study in terms of school improvement program. In the study, the data gathering and sample was limited to five Woreda and 8 secondary schools (grades 9-10) only, out of 33 Government secondary schools in the Kembata Tembaro Zone.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

Any study cannot be free of a limitation and this study is not exceptional. The following were the major limitations encountered in the study. To getting Zone, Woreda education experts, and secondary school supervisors in their office for interview was difficult due to meeting and field works. Getting PTSA committee leaders to interview in each secondary school was also another difficult, because they live away from schools. However, the researcher was over comes the encountered problems by visiting repeatedly, the study considered only grades 9-10 secondary school improvement program implementation, Teaching-learning, stakeholder's contributions on implementing school improvement program, and about learning environment. This is due to time and resources constraints of the researcher in order to cover all grade level of the study. The researcher included school stakeholders in the sample of secondary schools by involving parent teachers' and student association Coordinators in grades 9-10 secondary schools.

1.8 Operational Definition of Key Terms

Leadership: is a process whereby an individual influences his/her subordinates to achieve common goals.
Practices: -performing school improvement program (SIP) activities.
School improvement program committee: - is a committee set up from teachers, supportive staff members, students, parents and local communities to lead the implementation of SIP.
School Improvement Program: is an educational program which includes major components like teaching and learning, management and leadership, learning environment, and community involvement.
School improvement: - is defined as systematic, sustained effort aimed at change in learning conditions and other related internal condition the ultimate aim of accomplishing educational goals more effectively.
Secondary school: is a schooling system offering a post elementary school program (from grade 9 -10). In Ethiopian context duration consists of two years of general secondary education.
Zone: is an administrative division managed by the regional government.

1.9 Organization of the Study

This thesis was organized in to five chapters. The first chapter was treated as the introductory part that deals with background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, and objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study, operational definitions of key terms and organization of the study. The second chapter discusses the review literature part of the study. In the third chapter, research design and methodology, data sources, population, sample and sampling techniques. Chapter four consists of data analysis techniques and analysis of gathered data were consisting the results of the study and the fifth chapter included the summary of major findings of the study, conclusions and recommendations of the study was presented. Finally appendixes and references were attached at the last part of the study.

2. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

The main purpose of the study was to examine the practices and problems of implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. Under this chapter the researcher explain about research methodology to accomplish the aim and the objectives of this thesis. The methods include

research design, research method, data sources, population, sample size and sampling techniques, instrument for data collection, validity and reliability of the study, procures of data collection, method of data analysis and ethical consideration.

2.1 Research Design

Based on a research question, explanatory research design was used in this study. The descriptive survey approach allows the researcher to gather data from relatively large number of respondents within short period of time with minimum cost. It also found to be helpful able and relevant information from a variety of implementation on the actual of the groups issue under investigation (Creswell, 2003).

According to Leedy, P.D;and Ormrod,J.E.(2005). descriptive survey research design involves acquiring information about one or more groups of people-perhaps about their characteristics, opinions, attitudes or previous experience by asking those questions and tabulating their answer. Therefore, the descriptive survey method was employed in this study for its importance to gather adequate and relevant data on the actual implementation of school improvement program in the area under investigation. In addition, in order to collect all valuable data from respondents and to come up with valid findings, qualitative data gathering method was also used as supplementary to the descriptive survey method so as to enrich the data obtained through questionnaires.

2.2 Research Method

This study used both qualitative and quantitative approach through collecting and analyzing data. The researcher initially used quantitative method through survey questionnaires, while he also used semi-structured interviews to substantiate the quantitative data. There are some rationales to use mixed methods approach concurrently for this study. First, using such method is advantageous to examine the same phenomenon from multiple perspectives (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007). Second, mixed method approach important to build upon the strength that exists between quantitative and qualitative methods in order to understand a given phenomenon than is possible using either quantitative or qualitative methods alone (Creswell, 2003).

2.3 Sources of Data

The study used both primary and secondary sources of data. The primary sources of data were secondary school teachers, SIC (principals and vice principals, unit leaders and department heads), supervisors, PTSA, Zone Education department and Woreda Education Office Experts. In addition, interviews and questionnaire developed by the researcher to obtain information on the practices and problems of implementation of school improvement program was also part of primary source. The secondary sources of data were policy documents, school improvement reports, relevant periodicals and minutes. Besides, Zone, schools and Woreda educational offices plans and documents were used as data source.

2.4 Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

The target populations of the study were the Zone education department and Woreda Education Office Experts, supervisors, principals, teachers and parent-teacher and student association (PTSA) coordinators. In this study the researcher believed they were the right source of information on the implementation of school improvement program. In Kembata Tembaro Zone there are 7 woreda and 3 administrative towns, with total of 33 governmental secondary schools. For this study 5 Woredas namely, Doyogena, Kachabera, Hadro Tunto Zuria woredas, Shinshicho Administrative town and Hadaro Administrative town were selected by using simple random sampling techniques which was the best way to get representative samples and to have every subject equal chance to be selected.

In the selected Woredas and town administration there are 13 government secondary schools out of which 8 schools were selected by simple randomly sampling. These government secondary schools (9-10) include: Doyogena, Amacho wato, Hobechheka, Lesho, Metoma zeraro, Hadero, Donga Tunto and Chacho.

In selected schools, there are 250 teachers and 52 SIC members (principals, vice principals, unit leaders and department heads). Out of these, 70% (175) of the teachers, and 100% (52) of the school improvement committee were selected to be the participants of this study. In addition to this, 5(100%) of internal supervisors, 8(20%) of PTSA coordinators, 5(100%) Woreda Education office and 1(25%) Zone Education department Experts were included in the study. In order to select samples from target population, the researcher used purposive sampling for teachers, availability for school improvement committee supervisors and woreda education office experts and purposive sampling for parent teacher student association and Zone Education department.

Table 1: List of Schools, Population and Sampling Techniques of Respondents

SN	Sampled Schools	Teachers			SIC			PTSA			Supervisors			WEO experts			ZED experts		
		T.P	S	%	T.P	S	%	T.P	S	%	T.P	S	%	T.P	S	%	T.P	S	%
1	Doyogena	34	24	**70**	7	7	100	5	1	20	1	1	100	2	1	50			
2	Amachowato	22	15	**70**	6	6	100	5	1	20									
3	Hobecheeka	28	20	**70**	6	6	100	5	1	20	1	1	100	2	1	50	4	1	25
4	Lesho	23	16	**70**	6	6	100	5	1	20									
5	Metomazeraro	43	30	**70**	8	8	100	5	1	20	1	1	100	2	1	50			
6	Hadero	56	39	**70**	7	7	100	5	1	20	1	1	100	2	1	50			
7	Donga Tunto	27	19	**70**	6	6	100	5	1	20	1	1	100	2	1	50			
8	Chacho	17	12	**70**	6	6	100	5	1	20									
Total		**250**	**175**	**70**	**52**	**52**	100	40	8	**20**	**5**	5	**100**	**10**	**5**	**50**	4	1	25
Sampling Techniques		**Simple Random**			**Availability**			**Purposive**			**Purposive**			**Purposive**			**Purposive**		

Note: WEO=Woreda education office, ZED=Zone education Department, T.P=Total Population, S=Sample, %=Percentage and PTSA=Parent teacher and students association

2.5 Data collection Instruments

This part explains the diverse instruments were used to collect data in the study. The selection of data collection techniques is based on the scope of the study and to attain a complete picture of the problem under study. These are questionnaires, interviews, and documents from zone education, Woreda education offices and schools as data collection tools. Then raw data were used as an input for processing that was collected from questionnaire and interviews as a primary data and secondary data were collected from documents for data analysis and interpretation.

2.5.1 Questionnaires

The questionnaires were distributed to teachers and SIC. This study used questionnaires to collect data for school improvement committee and teachers. Questionnaires were structured with closed and open ended type. Kothari (2004) stated that there is no specific rule whether to use a two-point scale, three-point scale or scale with more point. In practice, three to seven points' scales are generally used for the simple reason. It also helps the researcher to obtain genuine data for effective accomplishment of the study. Likert scale with close-ended question and also open-ended questions were prepared to collect data because it provides freedom for respondents to fill in a given space in detail ways with loot restriction where as close ended question is restricted by a short make response.

In addition to this, open-ended questionnaires were employed in order to give opportunity to express their feelings, perceptions, problems and intensions related to the teachers' participation in school management. Open-ended questions enable respondents to write a free response in their own terms, to explain and qualify their responses and avoid the limitations of pre-set categories of response (Louis, 2005:264). The close ended items were formulated in five point likert scale (very high =5, high =4, moderate=3, low=2 and very low=1) or (strongly agree =5, agree =4, moderate=3, disagree=2 and strongly disagree=1) and open-ended items were provided for the respondents to freely express their ideas. The questionnaires had two categories: the respondents' personal characteristics and items relevant to the issue under investigation. The student researcher computed the quantitative data using mean item scores ranging from 1.0-5.0, with higher scores indicating high response score and lower scores indicating low response of the respondents.

2.5.2 Interviews

The interview gives the needed information face to face. Thus; with this assumption semi-structured questions were used to collect deep information on issues related to the Practices and problems of implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. The interview questions were prepared in Amharic. The interview was conducted with supervisors and PTSA committee coordinators, zone education department and Woreda Education office experts.

2.5.3 Document Analysis

Secondary data were collected from zonal education departments and woreda educational offices, and sample schools which are relevant to study but those educational policy based documents are collected from ministry of education web site. This technique was preferred because of its ability to provide supplementary information and flexibility. The study exercise researcher had made attempts to make a review of the relevant written documents about the school improvement program and the meeting minutes for school improvement program.

2.6 Pilot Study/test

2.6.1 Validity of the Instrument

In this study, survey items, and the items about the background information were reviewed for content and clarity by experts in the field. For example, one faculty members from Educational Planning and Management Department of Woilata Sodo University reviewed those survey questionnaires to ensure that the instruments comprehensively cover the domain or items that it purports to cover. Feedbacks on the instruments were also solicited from the student researcher's advisor. Finally, all accepted comments and feedbacks were included in the final version of the instruments.

Regarding trustworthiness of the study, since the participants of the study were teachers, SIC, supervisors, PTSA, woreda education office and zone education department experts' researcher believes that depending on their response lends credence to the results of the study. Moreover, since the participants were not forced by anyone to participate in the study, such situation can increase the trustworthiness of their response. Moreover, four out of participants of the interview were invited to review the accuracy of their response, and the interpretations of the emerged themes.

2.6.2 Reliability of the Instrument

To ensure its reliability, the student researcher pilot tested all of the survey tool or instrument designed for this study. The pilot test was conducted on 5 SIC (principals, unit leaders and department heads) and 20 teachers of Funamura secondary school that were excluded from the actual sample of the study. Ensuring their confidentiality and anonymity, the student researcher asked the participants to complete the questionnaires and to provide feedback thereafter. Using the data collected for the pilot study, the student researcher checked the reliability of the instruments by using the Cronbach's alpha test.

As Table 2 shows the results of Cronbach's coefficient alpha is satisfactory (between 0.78-0.96), indicating questions in each construct are measuring a similar concept. As suggested by Cronbach (cited in Tech-Hong & Waheed, 2011), the reliability coefficients between 0.78-0.96 are generally found to be internally consistent.

Table 2: Reliability test results with Cronbach's alpha

No	Items Type	No of items	Reliability coefficient
1	Teaching learning Domain	7	0.78
2	Leadership and management Domain	7	0.84
3	Safe, stable and conducive environment domain	7	0.85
4	Community and parental participation	5	0.96
5	Extent of Stakeholders Involved in Implementation of SIP	10	0.86
6	Major problems that encountered effective implementation of school improvement program	12	0.82
Overall Reliability Coefficient			**0.85**

2.7 Procedure of Data Collection

After including all comments to the survey questions, the researcher pilot tested them. Then, after getting permission letter from the Kembata Tembaro Zone education department, to conduct a study in schools of the zone, the student researcher made contact with SIC, teachers, supervisors, PTSA and Woreda education office experts to inform them about the purpose of the study and to distribute the questionnaires in selected secondary schools in their respective areas. The student researcher personally distributed the questionnaire for the respondents. Moreover, the student researcher personally conducted all of the interview participants and made interview in their work place.

2.8 Method of Data Analysis

In this study, both qualitative and quantitative data analysis techniques were employed. The quantitative data obtained through questionnaires were edited, categorized, tallied, and tabulated. The data, then, were analyzed using appropriate descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentage, mean, standard deviation and inferential statics like independent sample t-test to analysis research questions one and two. In addition researcher used independent sample t-test to identified significance between two groups of respondents. Quantitative analysis was done through software called Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 20.

The qualitative data gathered through open-ended questionnaire, interviews and document review were described thematically as supplementary evidence in addition to the discussions of quantitative data. The data were analyzed using content analysis approach. Finally, conclusions were drawn from the major findings and possible recommendations from the identified problems were forwarded to the appropriate stakeholders.

2.9 Ethical Considerations

Taking the severity of the ethical considerations in mind, this study was done with highest importance placed on ethics, confidentiality, and anonymity. In this study, confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents were emphasized to protect their privacy and the dignity (Cohen et al., 2007). Thus, on the cover page of the survey questionnaire (see Appendix-A), the student researcher clearly presented how to protect confidentiality and anonymity of the participants; informing them that involvement in the study is voluntary; the involvement is free of any intended risk; and their names and the names of their schools would be kept anonymous.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter dealt with presentation, analysis and interpretation of data collected through questionnaire, interview and document analysis. The subjects of the study were teachers, principals, supervisors, school improvement committee members (SIC), woreda education office experts and zone teaching-learning process core coordinator.

3.1 Response Rate of the Quantitative Data

In this study, the total of **227** respondents were selected and invited to complete the questionnaires. From these numbers, **52** SIC, **175** teachers, of them were properly completed and submitted usable questions, thereby generating a return rate of **96.9** percent.

Table 3: Questionnaire Return Rate

SN	Respondents	Sample Size	Response Rate	Return Rate %
1	Teachers	175	170	97.1
2	SIC	52	50	96.1
Total		227	220	96.9

As it can be seen in Table 3, out of the 175 questionnaires distributed to the teachers, 170 (97.1%) returned and filled correctly while the rest 5(2.9%) of teachers' responses were rejected because their responses were incomplete. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) a response rate of 60% is good and a response rate of 70% or more is even better for social research. While questionnaires distributed to the SIC, 50(96.1%) of them were returned and filled correctly while 2(3.9%) of SIC' responses were rejected because their responses were incomplete. Thus in the following section presentation, analysis and interpretation of data were presented in the following sub-sections corresponding to the basic research questions and characteristics of respondents.

3.2 Characteristics of the Participants

By describing characteristics of the respondents, it is possible to know some background information about the sample population who participated in the study. Results in Table 4 show the general characteristics (sex, age, education qualification, work experience and current position). The data collected on the characteristics of the respondents are presented in the Table 4 below.

Table 4: The Respondents' Characteristics

SN	**Items**	**Variables**	**Respondents Type**			
			Teachers (N=170)		**SIC (principals, unit leaders and department heads) (N=50)**	
			F	%	F	%
1	Sex	A) Male	146	85.9	37	74.0
		B) Female	24	14.1	13	26.0
		Total	170	100	50	100
2	Age	A) 21-25	37	21.8	7	14.0
		B) 26-30	106	62.3	24	48.0
		C) 31-35	16	9.4	13	26.0
		D) 36-40	6	3.5	4	8.0
		E) > 40	5	2.9	2	4.0
		Total	170	100	50	100
3	Education Qualification	A) Diploma	2	1.2	5	10.0
		B) 1st Degree	162	95.3	41	82.0
		C) 2nd Degree	6	3.5	4	8.0
		D) Grade 5-8	-	-	-	-
		E) Grade 9-12	-	-	-	-
		Total	170	100	50	100

4	Work Experience in Teacher/Leadership	A) 1-5	52	30.6	15	30.0
		B) 6-10	72	42.3	23	46.0
		B) 11-15	31	18.2	7	14.0
		C) 16 and above	15	8.8	5	10.0
		Total	170	100	50	100
5	Your current Position	A) Principal	-	-	8	16.0
		B) V/Principal	-	-	15	30.0
		D) Unit Leaders	11	22.0	-	-
		E) Department Heads	16	32.0	-	-
		Total	27	54.0	23	46.0

As can be seen from item 1, Table 4, in relation to sex distribution of teachers 146(85.9%) of them were male and 24(14.1%) of female. This result showed that lower number of female teachers who involve in school improvement program in implementation in Kembata Tembaro Zone. On the other hand, 37(74.0%) of SIC were male and 13(26.0%) of them were female. From this, one can realize that the number of females in the SIC were much lower than males sample respondents i.e. were dominated by males. This showed that in both groups the number of female respondents was less than their male counter parts.

As it can be seen from item 2, Table 4, in relation to age structure, 37(21.8%) of teachers and 7(14.0) of SIC were in the age category were between 21-25 years, 106(62.3%) of teachers and 24(48.0%) of SIC were between 26-30 years; 16(9.4%) of teachers and 13(26.0%) of SIC were between 31-35 years old and only 6(3.5%) of teachers and 4(8.0%) of SIC were between 36-40 years old. The rest 5(2.9%) of teachers and 2(4.0%) of SIC were 40 years and above years old. This shows that majority of teachers and SIC is in active or working age group. Thus, it is possible to claim that the majority of respondents were in the required to implement school improvement program.

As indicated in the item 3, Table 4, regarding the educational qualification of the respondents, 2(1.2%) of teachers and 5(10%) of SIC were diploma holders, 162(95.3%) of teachers and 41(82.0%) of SIC were first degree holders, while 6(3.5%) of teachers and 4(8.0%) of SIC were MA/Msc degree holders.

As it can be seen in item 4, Table 4, indicates that the service year as teacher/leadership or work experience of the respondents 52(30.6%) of teachers and 15(30%) of SIC belongs to experience years ranging from 1-5, 72(42.3%) of teachers and 23(46%) of SIC belongs to the range of 6-10 years' experience, 31(18.2%) of teachers and 7(14 %) of SIC belongs to the range of 11-15 years' experience. Whereas remaining 15(8.8%) of teachers and 5(10%) of SIC belongs to the years' experience of 16 and above years' experience. This result showed that the majority of teachers and SIC had less work experience on current position or has less than 10 years' experience. Therefore, at this experience level teachers are expected to be well induced and would have enough experience to be responsible for their job.

As can be seen from item five in Table 4 in relation to current work position of school leaders 8(16%) of them were main principals and 15(30%) of vice principals; 11(22%) of unit leaders and 16(32%) of them were department heads.

3.3 Implementation of Four Domains of School Improvement Program

As indicated in review of related literature there are four domains or focus areas for school improvement program (MoE, 2006) which are supposed to enhance students' achievement and ultimately improves quality of education. This part discusses the major four domains of school improvement program activities. These four domains namely; teaching-learning domain, school leadership and management domain, safe and healthy school environment and community involvement domain had been treated based on the selected items that represent the successful implementation of SIP in each school domains. Accordingly, the SIP has four domains in which every domain links to each other and aims at improving students' learning outcomes.

3.3.1Teaching and Learning Domain

Table 5: Teaching and Learning Domain of SIP

SN	ITEMS	Respondents Type		Rating					Independent sample t-test				
				SDA	DA	M	A	SA	Mean	SD	Aggregate Mean	t-value	p-value
1	Based on learning differences of students teachers have given planned tutorial for female and low achievers	Teachers (N=170)	N	53	64	28	17	8	2.19	1.12	2.15	.410	.683
			%	31.2	37.6	16.5	10	4.7					
		SIC (N=50)	N	17	19	7	5	2	2.12	1.11			
			%	34	38	14	10	4					
2	Text books have been evaluated by teachers to enrich the curriculum	Teachers (N=170)	N	55	59	27	18	11	2.24	1.19	2.25	-.097	.923
			%	32.3	34.7	15.9	10.6	6.5					
		SIC (N=50)	N	15	20	6	5	4	2.26	1.22			
			%	30	40	12	10	8					
3	Action research has been conducted by teachers to solve teaching-learning problems	Teachers (N=170)	N	45	69	29	15	12	2.29	1.15	2.29	-.031	.975
			%	26.5	40.6	17.0	8.8	7.0					
		SIC (N=50)	N	13	21	7	6	3	2.30	1.16			
			%	26	42	14	12	6					
4	Inbuilt supervision has been conducted among colleagues to share experiences to one another	Teachers (N=170)	N	64	49	27	18	12	2.19	1.25	2.23	-.433	.665
			%	37.6	28.9	15.9	10.6	7.0					
		SIC (N=50)	N	15	16	9	7	3	2.28	1.16			
			%	30	32	18	14	6					
5	Teachers give compressive home works, assignments and project works for students	Teachers (N=170)	N	62	44	28	21	15	2.31	1.31	2.30	.056	.955
			%	36.5	25.9	16.5	12.3	8.9					
		SIC (N=50)	N	14	22	4	5	5	2.30	1.26			
			%	28	44	8	10	10					
6	Teachers frequently give timely feedbacks for students about their academic performances	Teachers (N=170)	N	56	59	26	17	12	2.23	1.21	2.29	-.634	.527
			%	32.9	34.7	15.3	10	7.0					
		SIC (N=50)	N	16	14	9	8	3	2.36	1.25			
			%	32	28	18	16	6					
7	Continuous assessment has been practiced as the result, students repetition rate rapidly decreased	Teachers (N=170)	N	41	48	36	28	17	2.60	1.28	2.66	-.573	.567
			%	24.1	28.2	21.2	16.5	10					
		SIC (N=50)	N	10	16	9	8	7	2.72	1.34			
			%	20	32	18	16	14					

Key: SDA= Strongly Disagree, DA= Disagree, **M**= Moderate, A=Agree and **SA**= Strongly Agree. M=Mean, **SD**- is standard deviation DA= Disagree (1.0-2.33), M= Moderate, (2.34-3.66) and A-Agree (3.67-5.0).

Table 5 deals regarding to learning differences of students' teachers have given planned tutorial for female and low achievers. As it can be seen from item 1, Table 5, 117(68.8%) of teachers and 36(72%) of SIC reported that the teachers didn't plan to provide support for females and lower achiever students, while 25(14.7%) of teachers and 7(14%) of SIC rated on the issue is agree. In the same way, 28(16.5%) of teachers and 7(14%) of SIC said that the teachers planned to support females and lower achievers is moderate. Correspondingly, the mean score of teachers (M=2.19, SD=1.12) and that of SIC (M=2.12, SD=1.11) with aggregated mean 2.15 indicated that the teachers planned to support females and lower achievers is disagree. On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=.410, P>0.05) of showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. In general, the response of both respondents on the issue is that the teachers planned to support females and lower achievers are inadequately.

As it can be seen from item 2, Table 5, 114(67%) of teachers and 35(70%) of SIC reported that the text books have been evaluated by teachers to enrich the curriculum is disagree, while 29(17.1%) of teachers and 9(18%) of SIC rated the text books have been evaluated by teachers to enrich the curriculum is agree. Similarly, 27(15.9%) of teachers and 6(12%) of SIC said that the text books have been evaluated by teachers to enrich the curriculum is moderate. Then again, the mean score of teachers (M=2.24, SD=1.19) and that of SIC (M=2.26, SD=1.22) with aggregated mean score 2.29 indicated that the text books have been evaluated by teachers to

enrich the curriculum is disagree. In the same way, the calculated t-test value (t=-.097, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. In general, the response of both respondents on the issue is that the text books have been evaluated by teachers to enrich the curriculum is unsatisfactory.

As it can be seen from item 3, Table 5, 114(67.1%) of teachers and 34(68%) of SIC reported that action research has not been conducted by teachers to solve teaching-learning problems, while 27(15.8%) of teachers and 18(36%) of SIC rated the action research has been conducted by teachers to solve teaching-learning problems. Correspondingly, 29(17.0%) of teachers and 7(14%) of SIC said that action research has been conducted by teachers to solve teaching-learning problems is moderate. In the same way, the mean score of teachers (M=2.29, SD=1.15) and that of SIC (M=2.30, SD=1.16) with the average mean score 2.29 indicated that action research has been conducted by teachers to solve teaching-learning problems is disagree. On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=-.031, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that action research has been conducted by teachers to solve teaching-learning problems is inadequate. One interview participant of supervisor indicated that:

> *Supervisors agreed that there is a gap in providing support for teacher to use teaching aids and to promote active-learning and continuous assessment which in turn affects the effectiveness of school improvement program. Thus, there is the need of supporting and monitoring the teachers' inbuilt supervision to enhance their performance and still needs more consideration for greater success of school improvement program implementation.*

On the same issue another interview PTSA asserted that:-

> *Members confirm that the idea that teacher responded as school grant funds spent for items that would improve the performance and quality of education like repairing classrooms and furniture, buying reference books etc.*

As it can be seen from item 4, Table 5, 113(66.5%) of teachers and 31(62%) of SIC reported that inbuilt supervision didn't conducted among teachers to share experiences to one another, while 30(17.6%) of teachers and 10(20%) of SIC rated on the similar issue is agree. Similarly, 27(15.9%) of teachers and 9(18%) of SIC said that inbuilt supervision experience sharing one to another is moderate. In the same way, the mean score of teachers (M=2.19, SD=1.25) and that of SIC (M=2.28, SD=1.16) with aggregated mean score 2.23 showed that the inbuilt supervision experience sharing trends in school one another is disagree. Then again, the calculated t-test value (t=-.031, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that inbuilt supervision has been not conducted among teachers to share experiences to one another.

Table 5, item 5, 106(62.4%) of teachers and 36(72%) of SIC reported that the teachers give compressive home works, assignments and project works for students is disagree, while 36(21.2%) of teachers and 10(20%) of SIC rated on the similar issue is agree. Correspondingly, 28(16.5%) of teachers and 4(8%) of SIC said that teachers support students to give assignment, homework and project is moderate. Also, the mean score of teachers (M=2.31, SD=1.31) and that of SIPC (M=2.30, SD=1.26) with aggregated mean score 2.30 indicated that the teachers support students to give assignment, homework and project is disagree. On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=-.056, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. This is can be concluded that the teachers support for students give inadequate assignment, homework and project.

Table 5, item 6, 115(67.6%) of teachers and 30(60%) of SIC reported that teachers frequently give timely feedbacks about students academic performance is disagree, while 29(17.0%) of teachers and 11(22%) of SIC rated on the above similar issue is agree. On the contrary, 26(15.3%) of teachers and 9(18%) of SIPC said that teachers frequently give timely feedbacks about students academic performance is moderate. Also, the mean score of teachers (M=2.23, SD=1.21) and that of SIC (M=2.36, SD=1.25) with the average mean score 2.29 showed that the teachers frequently give timely feedbacks about students academic performance is disagree. Then again, the calculated t-test value (t=-.634, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. This is can be concluded that the teachers frequently give timely feedbacks about students academic performance is insufficient. One of the interview participants of supervisor indicated that:

> *The school level work lack of provide appropriate feedback to the intermediates in order to come up with improvement. This in turn directly affects the effectiveness of school improvement program in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. Thus, as the result of fail to assess students' performance based on continuous assessment principles like giving home work, class work, group work, and field work and provide immediate feedback to the intermediate they also resulted with the failures of modifying approaches of teaching.*

As it can be seen from item 7, Table 5, 89(52.3%) of teachers and 26(52%) of SIC disagreed that school

continuous assessment has been practiced in order to reduce the students repetition, while 45(26.5%) of teachers and 15(30%) of SIC rated on the similar issue is agree. On the contrary, 36(21.2%) of teachers and 9(18%) of SIC said that continuous assessment has been practiced in order to reduce the students repetition is moderate. On the other hand, the mean score of teachers (M=2.60, SD=1.28) and SIPC (M=2.72, SD=1.34) indicated that continuous assessment has been practiced in order to reduce the students repetition is moderate. On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=-.573, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the continuous assessment has been practiced in order to reduce the students repetition is inadequate. Document analysis showed that:

> *Almost all teachers are still used the traditional test to measure their students' performance rather assessing the students' performance during homework, class work, group work and project work through they are aware of and even know through different capacity building training organized by the school and government about how students are evaluated and measured using different assessing mechanisms.*

Teaching learning domain is the major determinant of students' achievement that indicates what is going in the classroom. Not much powerful and sustainable change happens in teaching learning process unless it happens in class rooms (Earl, 2003). This domain focuses on the actual interaction between teachers and learners.

3.3.2 School Leadership and Management Domain

Table 6: School Leadership and Management

SN	Items	Respondents Type		Rating					Independent sample t-test				
				SDA	DA	M	A	SA	Mean	SD	Aggregate mean	t-value	p-value
1	The leaders have made clear shared vision, mission and goal for teacher on students' achievement	Teachers (N=170)	N	53	64	28	17	8	2.32	1.30	2.27	.465	.643
			%	31.2	37.6	16.5	10	4.7					
		SIC (N=50)	N	13	19	8	6	4	2.22	1.24			
			%	26	38	16	12	8					
2	School leaders have striven high commitment to improve students' achievement	Teachers (N=170)	N	46	74	24	19	7	1.90	1.10	2.12	-1.91	.057
			%	27.0	43.5	14.1	11.2	4.1					
		SIC (N=50)	N	12	21	9	5	3	2.35	1.39			
			%	24	42	18	10	6					
3	SIP implementation has been consistently, monitored by principals	Teachers (N=170)	N	52	67	26	16	9	2.12	1.31	2.01	.985	.326
			%	30.6	39.4	15.3	9.4	5.3					
		SIC (N=50)	N	14	26	6	4	-	1.90	1.21			
			%	28	52	12	8	-					
4	Strategies have been set at school level to implement SIP effectively	Teachers (N=170)	N	57	64	28	12	9	2.39	1.17	2.21	.169	.866
			%	33.5	37.6	16.5	7.0	5.3					
		SIC (N=50)	N	13	25	5	5	2	2.03	1.27			
			%	26	50	10	10	4					
5	Involving stakeholders in SIP planning	Teachers (N=170)	N	52	64	29	16	9	2.49	.816	2.42	.737	.462
			%	30.6	37.6	17.0	9.4	5.3					
		SIC (N=50)	N	13	19	5	8	5	2.35	.875			
			%	26	38	10	16	10					
6	Involving stakeholders in SIP monitoring and evaluation	Teachers (N=170)	N	56	63	24	19	8	1.90	1.10	2.12	-1.91	.057
			%	32.9	37.0	14.1	11.2	4.7					
		SIC (N=50)	N	15	21	6	6	2	2.35	1.39			
			%	30	42	12	12	4					
7	Involving stakeholders in SIP sustainability	Teachers (N=170)	N	54	60	34	17	5	2.12	1.31	2.01	.985	.326
			%	31.8	35.3	20	10	2.9					
		SIC (N=50)	N	12	23	7	5	3	1.90	1.21			
			%	24	46	14	10	6					

Key: SDA= Strongly Disagree, DA= Disagree, **M**= Moderate, A=Agree and **SA**= Strongly Agree. M=Mean, **SD**- is standard deviation DA= Disagree (1.0-2.33), M= Moderate, (2.34-3.66) and A-Agree (3.67-5.0).

As it can be seen from Table 6, item 1, 117(68.8%) of teachers and 32(64%) of SIC reported that the leaders don't made clear shared vision, mission and goal for teacher on students' achievement, while 25(14.7%) of teachers and 10(20%) of SIC indicates that the leaders have made clear shared vision, mission and goal for teacher on students' achievement is agree. In additional, 28(16.5%) of teachers and 8(16%) of SIC said that the leaders have made clear shared vision, mission and goal for teacher on students' achievement is moderate. Also, the mean score of teachers (M=2.32, SD=1.30) and SIC (M=2.22, SD=1.24) with average mean score 2.27 show that the leaders have not made clear shared vision, mission and goal for teacher on students' achievement. Then again, the calculated t-test value (t=.465, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. In general, the response of both respondents indicated that the leaders don't make clear shared vision, mission and goal for teacher on students' achievement.

As it can be seen from item 2, Table 6, 120(70.5%) of teachers and 33(66%) of SIC disagreed that school leaders have striven high commitment to improve students' achievement, while 26(15.3%) of teachers and 8(16%) of SIC rated school leaders have striven high commitment to improve students' achievement is agreed. Similarly, 24(14.1%) of teachers and 9(18%) of SIC said school leaders have striven high commitment to improve students' achievement is moderate. On the other hand, the mean score of teachers (M=1.90, SD=1.10) and with total mean score 2.12 shows that disagreed on the issues and SIC (M=2.35, SD=1.39) indicated that the school leaders have striven high commitment to improve students' achievement is moderate. Also, the calculated t-test value (t=-1.91, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue.

As it can be seen from item 3, Table 6, 119(70%) of teachers and 40(80%) of SIC disagreed that the school improvement program implementation has been consistently, monitored by principals, while 25(14.7%) of teachers and 4(8%) of SIC agreed about the school improvement program implementation has been consistently, monitored by principals. On the contrary, 26(15.3%) of teachers and 6(12%) of SIC said that school improvement program implementation has been consistently, monitored by principals is insufficient. On the other hand, the mean score of teachers (M=2.12, SD=1.31) and SIC (M=1.90, SD=1.21) with average mean score 2.01 indicated disagreed that the school improvement program implementation has been consistently, monitored by principals. Similarly, the calculated t-test value (t=.985.01, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the school improvement program implementation has been consistently monitored by principals is unsatisfactory.

As it can be seen from Table 6 item 4, 121(71.1%) of teachers and 28(76 %) of SIC disagreed that strategies have been set at school level to implement SIP effectively, while 21(12.3%) of teachers and 7(14%) of SIC rated that the strategies have been set at school level to implement SIP effectively. On the contrary, 28(16.5%) of teachers and 5(10%) of SIC said that the strategies have been set at school level to implement SIP effectively is moderate. Also, the mean score of teachers (M=2.39, SD=1.17) with aggregated mean score 2.21 show that moderate on the issue and SIC (M=2.03, SD=1.27) disagreed that strategies have been set at school level to implement SIP effectively. On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=.169, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Interviewed supervisor pointed out that:

> *In order to effective implementation of SIP to create awareness of stakeholders, government should provide increased amount of financial, work should be done to motivate teachers, schools should be free from political bias and laboratory should be complete with all the necessary materials is the major strategies of to implement school improvement program".*

Table 6, item 5, 116(68.2%) of teachers and 24(48%) of SIC reported that don't involving stakeholders in SIP planning, while 25(14.7%) of teachers and 13(26%) of SIC rated involving stakeholders in SIP planning. On the contrary, 29(17.0%) of teachers and 5(10%) of SIC said that moderate involving stakeholders in SIP planning. Similarly, the mean score of teachers (M=2.49, SD=.816) and SIC (M=2.35, SD=.875) with average mean score 2.42 indicated that involving stakeholders in SIP planning is moderate. Then again, the calculated t-test value (t=-.737, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, the data shows that the involving stakeholders in SIP planning are inadequate.

As it can be seen from item 6, Table 6, 119(69.9%) of teachers and 36(72%) of SIC reported that stakeholders don't participate in SIP monitoring and evaluation, while 27(15.9%) of teachers and 8(16%) of SIC agreed that stakeholders involving in SIP monitoring and evaluation is agreed. Similarly, 24(14.1%) of teachers and 6(12 %) of SIC said that stakeholders involvement was moderate in SIP monitoring and evaluation. On the contrary, the mean score of teachers (M=1.90, SD=1.10) perceived that disagreed on the issue and SIC (M=2.35, SD=1.39) and with average mean score 2.12 indicated that involving stakeholders inadequately in SIP monitoring and evaluation. On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=-1.91, P<0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue.

Table 6, item 7, 114(67.1%) of teachers and 35(70%) of SIC disagreed that involving stakeholders in SIP sustainability, while 22(12.9%) of teachers and 8(16%) of SIC agreed that involving stakeholders in SIP sustainability. Correspondingly, 34(20%) of teachers and 7(14%) of SIC said that inefficiently involving stakeholders in SIP sustainability. On the other hand, the mean score of teachers (M=2.12, SD=1.31) and SIC (M=1.90, SD=1.21) with aggregated mean score 2.01 showed that disagreed in involving stakeholders in SIP sustainability. On the contrary, the calculated t-test value (t=.985, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, the data shows that the inadequately involving stakeholders in SIP sustainability.

In general, the leading and managing domain is considered with communicating a clear vision for a school and establishing effective management structures. Leaders set directions, guide the school community alignment of its purpose and practice.

3.3.3 Safe and Healthy School Environment Domain

Table 7: Safe and Healthy School Environment

SN	Items	Respondents Type		rating					Independent sample t-test				
				SDA	DA	M	A	SA	Mean	SD	AggregaMean	t-value	p-value
1	The school physical environment safe, stable and attractive for teaching and learning process	Teachers (N=170)	N	50	46	48	16	10	2.45	1.23	2.39	.319	.750
			%	29.4	27.0	28.2	9.4	5.9					
		SIC (N=50)	N	13	16	11	6	4	2.33	1.21			
			%	26	32	22	12	8					
2	Teachers and students have access to standard latrines with water designated for female and male students	Teachers (N=170)	N	33	42	65	18	12	2.58	.999	2.49	.792	.430
			%	19.4	24.7	38.2	10.6	7.0					
		SIC (N=50)	N	9	24	13	3	1	2.40	.994			
			%	18	48	26	6	2					
3	The school has standardized library with recent reference materials	Teachers (N=170)	N	45	61	42	17	5	2.61	1.01	2.50	1.01	.310
			%	26.5	35.9	24.7	10	2.9					
		SIC (N=50)	N	10	19	15	4	2	2.40	1.03			
			%	20	38	30	8	4					
4	Students have exercise practical works in laboratory on the science subjects	Teachers (N=170)	N	49	52	42	20	7	2.41	1.26	2.37	.921	.358
			%	28.8	30.6	24.7	11.8	4.1					
		SIC (N=50)	N	14	16	16	2	2	2.34	1.32			
			%	28	32	32	4	4					
5	Computers are available as required in the standard for students	Teachers (N=170)	N	56	67	24	15	8	2.47	1.26	2.45	.974	.331
			%	32.9	39.4	14.1	8.8	4.7					
		SIC (N=50)	N	9	17	18	4	2	2.43	1.31			
			%	18	34	36	8	4					
6	Pedagogical centers are fully functional to support teaching learning process	Teachers (N=170)	N	45	56	42	15	12	2.22	1.39	2.04	2.06	.040
			%	26.5	32.9	24.7	8.8	7.0					
		SIC (N=50)	N	7	19	16	5	3	1.86	1.14			
			%	14	38	32	10	6					
7	Principal are able to resolve conflict arising in the school	Teachers (N=170)	N	42	50	49	19	10	2.41	1.19	2.06	4.97	.000
			%	24.7	29.4	28.8	11.2	5.9					
		SIC (N=50)	N	7	14	17	7	5	1.72	1.86			
			%	14	28	34	14	10					

Key: SDA= Strongly Disagree, DA= Disagree, **M**= Moderate, A=Agree and **SA**= Strongly Agree. M=Mean, **SD**- is standard deviation DA= Disagree (1.0-2.33), M= Moderate, (2.34-3.66) and A-Agree (3.67-5.0).

Table 7, item 1, 96(56.4%) of teachers and 29(58%) of SIC reported that the school physical environment not safe, stable and attractive for teaching and learning process, while 26(15.3%) of teachers and 10(20%) of SIC said that the school physical environment became safe, stable and attractive for teaching and learning process. On the contrary, 48(28.2%) of teachers and 11(22%) of SIC indicates that the school physical environment safe, stable and attractive for teaching and learning process is moderate. Similarly, the mean score of teachers (M=2.45, SD=1.23) and that of SIC (M=2.33, SD=1.21) with aggregated mean score 2.39 indicated that the school physical environment safe, stable and attractive for teaching and learning process is moderate. In the same way, the calculated t-test value (t=.319, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the school physical environment safe, stable and attractive for teaching and learning process is insufficiently.

As it can be seen from item 2, Table 7, 7544.1%) of teachers and 33(66%) of SIC reported that teachers and

students have no access to standard latrines with water designated for female and male students, while 30(17.6%) of teachers and 8(16%) of SIC agreed that the teachers and students have access to standard latrines with water designated for female and male students. In the same way, 42(24.7%) of teachers and 24(48%) of SIC said that teachers and students have access to standard latrines with water designated for female and male students is moderate. On the other hand, the mean score of teachers (M=2.58, SD=.999) and SIC (M=2.40, SD=.994) with average mean score 2.49 indicated teachers and students have access to standard latrines with water designated for female and male students is moderate. On the contrary, the calculated t-test value (t=-.792, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, the response of both respondents on the issue show that teachers and students have access to standard latrines with water designated for female and male students are inadequate.

As it can be seen from item 3 Table 7, 106(62.4%) of teachers and 29(58%) of SIC reported that the school has no standardized library with recent reference materials, while 22(12.9%) of teachers and 6(12%) of SIC rated the school has standardized library with recent reference materials. On the contrary, 42(24.7%) of teachers and 15(30%) of SIC said that the school has standardized library with recent reference materials is moderate. Similarly, the mean score of teachers (M=2.61, SD=1.01) and SIC (M=2.40, SD=1.03) with aggregated mean score 2.50 indicated that the school has standardized library with recent reference materials is moderate. Correspondingly, the calculated t-test value (t=1.01, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, the school has moderate standardized library with recent reference materials. Document analysis showed that;

> *"Generally, document review identified that school don't appropriately implement activities according strategic plan, students national examination achievement result was low, proper and induction course of the CPD also not adequately implemented, school lack of standardized laboratories', libraries, ICT room, internet, and pedagogical centers as well as insufficiently discussed on students discipline problem". In addition on school minutes of meeting showed that meetings are not regularly held.*

Table 7 item 4, 101(59.4%) of teachers and 30(60%) of SIC indicates that students have not exercise practical works in laboratory on the science subjects, while 27(15.9%) of teachers and 4(8%) of SIC reported that the students have exercise practical works in laboratory on the science subjects. On the other hand, 42(24.7%) of teachers and 16(32%) of SIC said that the students have moderate exercise practical works in laboratory on the science subjects. On the other hand, the mean score of teachers (M=2.41, SD=1.26) and SIC (M=2.34, SD=1.32) with average mean score 2.37 indicated that the students have exercise practical works in laboratory on the science subjects is moderate. On the contrary, the calculated t-test value (t=.921, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents about the students have exercise practical works in laboratory on the science subjects is inadequate. One interview participant of PTSA heads indicated that:

> *Most of their schools were not fulfilled with standardized internet connection, laboratory equipment's and other facilities other than classrooms. They implied that are challenged with budget shortage to fulfill the necessities, they always look for community participation and disturb student to bring some community contribution fee from their parent. This in turn directly affects the effectiveness of school improvement program implementation.*

Table 7, item 5, 123(72.3%) of teachers and 26(52%) of SIC reported that computers are not available as required in the standard for students, while 23(13.1%) of teachers and 6(12%) of SIC indicates that the computers are available as required in the standard for students**.** On the contrary, 24(14.1%) of teachers and 18(36%) of SIC said that computers are available as required in the standard for students is moderate. On the other hand, the mean score of teachers (M=2.47, SD=1.26) and SIC (M=2.43, SD=1.31) with aggregated mean score 2.45 indicated that computers are available as required in the standard for students is moderate. Similarly, the calculated t-test value (t=.974, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the computers are available as required in the standard for students are not satisfactory.

Table 7, item 6, 101(59.4%) of teachers and 26(52%) of SIC indicates that pedagogical centers are not fully fictional to support teaching learning process, while 27(15.6%) of teachers and 8(16%) of SIC reported that the pedagogical centers are fully fictional to support teaching learning process**.** On the contrary, 42(24.7%) of teachers and 16(32%) of SIC said that the pedagogical centers are fully fictional to support teaching learning process is moderate. Also, the mean score of teachers (M=2.22, SD=1.39) and SIC (M=1.86, SD=1.14) with average mean score 2.04 indicated that disagreed about the pedagogical centers are fully fictional to support teaching learning process. On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=2.06974, P<0.05) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue.

Table 7, item 7, 92(54.1%) of teachers and 21(42%) of SIC indicates that the principal are unable to resolve conflict arising in the school, while 29(17.1%) of teachers and 12(24%) of SIC reported that principal are able to

resolve conflict arising in the school**.** Similarly, 49(28.8%) of teachers and 17(34%) of SIC said that principal are able to resolve conflict arising in the school is moderate**.** In the same way**,** the mean score of teachers (M=2.41, SD=1.19) indicates that moderate on the issue and SIC (M=1.72, SD=1.86) with aggregated mean score 2.06 showed that disagreed about the principal are able to resolve conflict arising in the school**.** Similarly, the calculated t-test value (t=4.97, P<0.05) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue.

Generally, safe and conducive learning environment describes the promotion of positive and respectful relationships which are stable, welcoming and inclusive. In safe and conducive learning environments students willingly engaged and participate in the broad range of learning opportunities.

3.3.4 Community and Parental Involvement Domain

The following table presents about the community and parental participation such as, parents have involved in decision making concerning issues related to sip implementation, PTSA members have actively participated in the school improvement planning and management, parents used to discuss with teachers on students learning progress.

Table 8: Community and Parental Participation

SN	Items	Respondents Type		Rating					Independent sample t-test				
				SDA	DA	M	A	SA	Mean	SD	Aggregate. Mean	t-value	p-value
1	PTSA members have actively participated in the school improvement planning and management	Teachers (N=170)	N	48	64	33	17	8	1.83	1.05	1.88	.532	.595
			%	28.2	37.6	19.4	10	4.7					
		SIC (N=50)	N	13	14	13	8	2	1.94	1.39			
			%	26	28	26	16	4					
2	Parents have involved in decision making concerning issues related to SIP implementation	Teachers (N=170)	N	44	67	29	21	9	2.95	1.25	2.61	2.81	.005
			%	25.9	39.4	17.0	12.3	5.3					
		SIC (N=50)	N	12	13	16	7	2	2.27	1.44			
			%	24	26	32	14	4					
3	Parents used to discuss with teachers on students learning progress	Teachers (N=170)	N	50	64	30	17	9	2.58	.812	2.51	.680	.497
			%	29.4	37.6	17.6	10	5.3					
		SIC (N=50)	N	12	14	14	7	3	2.45	.825			
			%	24	28	28	14	6					
4	Community has provided financial and material support for SIP implementation	Teachers (N=170)	N	50	48	49	14	9	2.39	1.17	2.21	.169	.866
			%	29.4	28.2	28.9	8.2	5.3					
		SIC (N=50)	N	10	19	18	2	1	2.03	1.27			
			%	20	38	36	4	2					
5	School management board participation is high in SIP implementation	Teachers (N=170)	N	48	60	30	22	10	2.60	1.44	2.61	-.126	.900
			%	28.2	35.3	17.6	12.9	5.9					
		SIC (N=50)	N	12	18	9	6	5	2.63	1.48			
			%	24	36	18	12	10					

Key: SDA= Strongly Disagree, DA= Disagree, **M**= Moderate, A=Agree and **SA**= Strongly Agree. M=Mean, **SD**- is standard deviation DA= Disagree (1.0-2.33), M= Moderate, (2.34-3.66) and A-Agree (3.67-5.0).Significance level=0.05 Significant at $p < 0.05$, not significant at $p > 0.05$.

Table 8, item 1, 114(65.8%) of teachers and 27(54%) of SIC indicates that PTA members have not actively participated in the school improvement planning and management, while 25(14.7%) of teachers and 10(20%) of SIC reported that the PTA members have actively participated in the school improvement planning and management**.** On the other hand, 33(19.4%) of teachers and 13(26%) of SIC said that PTA members moderately participated in the school improvement planning and management**.** Also, the mean score of teachers (M=1.83, SD=1.05) and **SIC** (M=1.94, SD=1.39) average mean 1.88 showed that disagreed the PTA members have actively participated in the school improvement planning and management**.** In the same way, the calculated t-test value (t=-.532, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the PTSA members have not actively participated in the school improvement planning and management.

Table 8, item 2, 111(54.4%) of teachers and 25(50%) of SIC indicates that the parents have not involved in decision making concerning issues related to SIP implementation**,** while 30(17.6%) of teachers and 9(18%) of SIC reported that the parents have involved in decision making concerning issues related to SIP implementation**.** In the same way**,** 29(17.0%) of teachers and 16(32%) of SIC said that parents have inadequately involved in decision making concerning issues related to SIP implementation**.** On the contrary, the mean score of teachers (M=2.95, SD=1.25) indicates that insufficient on the issue and SIC (M=2.27, SD=1.44) with aggregated mean score 2.61 indicated that disagreed the parents have involved in decision making concerning issues related to SIP implementation**.** On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=-2.81, P<0.05) showed that there is statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. One interview participant of PTSA coordinator indicated that:

> *"In fact there is community participation in providing positive ideas for better performance of schools and also support in labor activities/planning to some extent. However, participation through the contribution of money and materials was low though it differs from school to school. Majority of the interview respondents supported the above ideas of community participation for school improvement".*

As it can be seen in Table 8, item 3, 114(67.0%) of teachers and 26(52%) of SIC indicates that parents used to discuss with teachers on students learning progress, while 26(15.3%) of teachers and 10(20%) of SIC reported that parents used to discuss with teachers on students learning progress**.** In the same way**,** 30(17.6%) of teachers and 14(28%) of SIC said that parents were not frequently to discuss with teachers on students learning progress**.** On the other hand, the mean score of teachers (M=2.58, SD=.812) and SIC (M=2.45, SD=.825) with average mean score 2.51 showed that the parents used to discuss with teachers on students learning progress is moderate**.** In the same way, the calculated t-test value (t=.680, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, the data shows that the parents used to discuss with teachers on students learning progress is inadequate.

Table 8, item 4, 98(57.6%) of teachers and 29(58%) of SIC reported that the community has not provided financial and material support for SIP implementation, while 43(13.5%) of teachers and 3(6%) of SIC reported that the community has provided financial and material support for SIP implementation**.** In the same way**,** 49(28.9%) of teachers and 18(36%) of SIC said that the community has provided financial and material support for SIP implementation is moderate**.** On the other hand, the mean score of teachers (M=2.39, SD=1.17) indicates that moderate on the issue and SIC (M=2.03, SD=1.27) with average mean score 2.21 showed that disagreed the community has provided financial and material support for SIP implementation. Similarly, the calculated t-test value (t=-.169, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue.

As it can be seen in Table 8, item 5, 108(63.5%) of teachers and 30 (60%) of SIC reported that school management board participation is high in SIP implementation, while 32(18.8%) of teachers and 11(22%) of SIC reported that school management board participation is high in SIP implementation**.** In the same way, 30(17.6%) of teachers and 9(18%) of SIC said that school management board participation is moderate in SIP implementation**.** On the other hand, the mean score of teachers (M=2.60, SD=1.44) indicates that moderate on the issue and SIC (M=2.63, SD=1.48) with average mean score 2.61 indicated disagreed about the school management board participation is high in SIP implementation. Similarly, the calculated t-test value (t=-.126, P>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. It is possible to conclude that the school management board participation is low in SIP implementation.

In general, the community involvement domain describes the development quality, ongoing, community partnerships and networks. Schools are responsive to community expectations, suitable environment for learning, school administration and community participation.

3.4 Extent of Stakeholders Involved in Implementation of SIP

School leaders make the school conducive and participatory environment for SIP implementation and participatory environment for SIP implementation. The following table indicated that the extent of stakeholders to the implementation of SIP.

Table 9: Extent of stakeholders' involvement in implementation of school improvement program

SN	Items	Respondents Type				t-value	p-value
		Teachers (N=170)		SIC (N=50)			
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	School leaders frequently evaluated performance and discussed with teachers on the program implementation outcomes	1.84	1.04	2.53	1.56	-3.00	.003
2	Extent of parent contribution in fund raising activities in school	2.46	1.04	2.30	1.10	.108	.914
3	Extent of school improvement committee to monitoring and evaluating of the implementation of SIP	2.47	1.26	2.43	1.31	.974	.331
4	School leaders are actively engaged in coordinating stakeholders and school improvement committee for the preparation of SIP	2.19	1.38	2.80	1.60	-2.53	.012
5	There is strong work team among stakeholders to implement the SIP	2.52	1.43	2.22	1.37	1.42	.156
6	School leaders had set clear goals, vision and mission in light of SIP	2.45	.825	2.58	.812	.680	.497
7	Involvement of stakeholders in formulating SIP plan	1.90	1.10	2.35	1.39	-1.91	.057
8	Strategic plan of the school was prepared based on self-evaluation	2.11	1.29	3.81	1.27	-8.62	.000
9	Participation of stakeholders in SIP implementation	2.49	.816	2.35	.875	.737	.462
10	School leaders make the school conducive and participatory environment for SIP implementation	2.39	1.17	2.03	1.27	.169	.866

Key: L= Low (1.00-2.33), M= Moderate (2.34-3.3.66) H= High (3.67-5.5.0) VH= Very High (4.50-5.00). M- is mean, SD- is standard deviation, t-is independent sample t-test and P-value. Significance level=0.05 Significant at $p < 0.05$, not significant at $p > 0.05$.

Table 9, item 1, respondents were asked to show their level of agreement of the extent to which the school leaders frequently evaluate performance and discuss with teachers on the program implementation out comes. Accordingly, the calculated mean scores of the respondents were (M=1.84, SD=1.04) and (M=2.53, SD= 1.56) of teachers and SIC respectively. This indicates that SIC response was moderate and teachers' respondents responded low response to the item. In addition to this, the calculated t-test value (t=-3.00, and $p<0.05$) shows that there is statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, it showed that school leaders did not frequently evaluate performance and discuss with teachers on the program implementation impacts. The data collected from document review reveals that in all sampled schools three years school improvement plans were developed by the school leaders. Besides, their activities do not involve key stakeholders and self-evaluation of schools and prioritizing problems. However, MoE (2006) suggested that school self-evaluation is the starting point to draft school improvement plan, as it gives direction to what issues should be addressed first and followed based on the priority given by school leaders, students, parents and teachers. Similarly, an interview held with supervisors depicted that,

> *Schools did not carry out self-evaluation to prepare and evaluate its impacts of school improvement program. Only school principals prepare and present for approval by school committee at the beginning of the years and report its outcomes without evaluation.*

Therefore, this showed that there is no school self-evaluation during preparation of strategic plan in sample schools. Hence, it is clear that inadequate self-evaluation in SIP planning was taken as one of the major constraints that affects implementation of SIP.

Item 2 of the Table 9, respondents were asked about the extent of parent contribution in fund raising activities in school. In this regard, the mean score of total respondents fall between (M=2.46, SD=1.04) of teachers and (M=2.30, SD= 1.10) of SIC. This indicating both teachers and SIC respondents' rated low response to the item regarding the extent of parent contribution in fund raising activities in school. This is proved by calculated t-test value t=.108, and P-value is greater than 0.05. This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between teachers' and SIC' responses. Therefore, one can realized that the extent of parent

contribution in fund raising activities in school was low. Moreover, one interview PTSA said,

School improvement planning can only lead to genuine and profound change if schools have at least a minimum level of resources to work with. Without such resources, the school improvement program could become de-motivating. This can be improved when parents and local communities actively participating in school improvement planning and implementation.

Table 9, item 3, indicates that the opinions of respondents on the extent of school improvement committee to monitoring and evaluating of the implementation of SIP. As seen from the data, for all of the items listed the mean responses were found between (M=2.47, SD= 1.26) of the teachers and SIC (M=2.43, SD=1.31). This indicates that both teachers and SIC responded at low level. It was seen that there is no statistically significance difference between the two groups of respondents, on the extent of school improvement committee to monitoring and evaluating of the implementation of SIP; the t-test value was employed (t= .974, p>0.05). Thus, it is possible to say that teachers and SIC in each sample schools have similar perceptions on the extent of school improvement committee to monitoring and evaluating of the implementation of SIP.

Table 9, item 4, indicates that the opinions of respondents on the extent of school leaders are actively engaged in coordinating stakeholders and school improvement committee for the preparation of SIP. As seen from the data, for all of the items listed the mean responses were found between (M=2.19, SD=1.38) of the teachers and (M=2.80, SD=1.60) of the SIC. This indicates that teachers' respondents responded at low and SIC responded at moderate level. It was seen that there was statistically significance difference between the two groups of respondents, on the extent of school leaders were actively engaged in coordinating stakeholders and school improvement committee for the preparation of SIP; the t-test value was employed (t= -2.53, p<0.05). Thus, it is possible to perceive that teachers and SIC in each sample schools have different perceptions on the extent of school leaders were actively engaged in coordinating stakeholders and school improvement committee for the preparation of SIP. Therefore, it showed that school leaders were not effectively and efficiently engaged in coordinating stakeholders and school improvement committee for the preparation of SIP.

As it can be seen in Table 9, item 5, the respondents were requested how much work team created among stakeholders to implement the SIP. In this regard, the calculated mean of teachers (M=2.52, SD=1.43) and SIC (M=2.22, SD=1.37). This reflects that teachers' respondents replied medium and principals' respondents were rated low item. On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=1.42, p>0.05) reflects that there is no statistically significant difference between teachers' and SIC responses. Therefore, from this one can realized that there are weak ties of working team among stakeholders to implement the SIP.

Table 9, item 6, indicates that the opinions of respondents on the extent of school leaders had set clear goals, vision and mission in light of SIP. As seen from the data, for all of the items listed the mean responses were found between (M=2.45, SD= .825) of the teachers and SIC (M=2.58, SD=.812). This indicates that teachers' respondents responded at low and SIC responded at medium level. It was seen that there was no statistically significance difference between the two groups of respondents, on the extent of school leaders had set clear goals, vision and mission in light of SIP; the t-test value was employed (t= .680, p>0.05). Thus, it is possible to perceive that teachers and SIC in each sample schools have different perceptions on the extent of school leaders had set clear goals, vision and mission in light of SIP. Therefore, it can be concluded that school leaders had not yet clear goals, vision and mission in light of SIP. In the situation where school leaders had no clear goals, vision and mission, it might be difficult to schools to address the objectives of school improvement program and to implement it because implementation needs clear goals, vision and mission.

Table 9, item 7, respondents were asked to show their level of agreement the extent to which the listed activities were carried out during the planning of school improvement program. Accordingly, the calculated mean scores of the respondents were (M=1.90, SD=1.10) and (M=2.35, SD=1.39) of teachers and SIC respectively. This indicates that both teachers and SIC respondents responded low response. In addition to this, the calculated t-test value (t=-1.91, p>0.05) showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. It showed that involvement of stakeholders in formulating SIP plan was not reached the needed level. On the issue, one woreda education office expert's member respondent said,

> *Schools work need the participation of all stakeholders in the school plan, but most of the time school plan is prepared by school principals. Therefore, the school mission and vision is not visible to all stakeholders and the intended students' outcome and ethical-centered activities are not achieved without the participation of stakeholder. Due to this, participation becomes weak between school and society.*

Item 8, Table 9, respondents were asked about the extent of school improvement plan of the school was prepared based on self-evaluation. In this regard, the mean score of total respondents fall between (M=2.11, SD=1.29) of teachers and (M=3.81, SD=1.27) of SIC. This indicating teachers' response was low and SIC 'respondents rated high response to the item school improvement plan of the school was prepared based on self-evaluation. This is proved by calculated t-test value t= -8.62, and p-value is less than p-value=0.05. This shows that there is statistically significant difference between teachers' and SIC responses on the issue.

Table 9, item 9, the respondents were requested how much participation of stakeholders in SIP implementation. In this regard, the calculated mean scores of the respondents were (M=2.49, SD=.816) and (M=2.35, SD= .875) of teachers and SIC respectively. This indicates that both teachers and SIC response was low item. In addition to this, the calculated t-test value (t=.737, p>0.05) shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two respondents on the issue. Therefore, this showed that participation of stakeholders in SIP implementation was low. On the issue, one of the interviewed zone teaching-learning process core coordinator point out that,

> *The reason is why low involvement of stakeholders specially parents and community, not willing to come to school is not only because of the principal makes less effort. Some principals in collaboration with supervisors were sometimes trying to invite parents and the community to school specifically by writing legal letters for each individual, but the majority does not respond the response on time except few of them because the school plans were not participatory.*

As it can be seen in Table 9, item 10, the respondents were requested how much school leaders make the school conducive and participatory environment for SIP implementation. In this regard, the calculated mean of teachers (M=2.39, SD=1.17) and SIC (M=2.03, SD=1.27). This reflects that both teachers and SIC respondents were rated low item. On the other hand, the calculated t-test value (t=.169, and p>0.05) reflects there is no statistically significant difference between teachers' and SIC responses. Therefore, from this one can conclude that school leaders did not make the school conducive and participatory environment for SIP implementation. According to one supervisor's during interview;

> *School cannot succeed without the support of the parents and community. It is therefore essential for the school principal to develop good relations with parents especially. Parents and communities cannot provide the necessary support for learning without a good understanding of what the school actually does. Thus, the school should*
> *communicate regularly with the community, and should receive both positive and negative feedback at regular intervals.*

3.5 Major Challenges Hindering the Implementation of SIP

The implementation of SIP might be challenged due to various reasons in this respect, Fullan (2001:89-90) has noted that when a new initiative is introduced undoubtedly, it will create difficult to both individuals and institutions. Thus, for success of the program it needs to consider challenging factors prior to the implementation of the program. As to Anderson (1992:84) among others reluctant to change happens due to lack of awareness on the purpose of the intended change, lack of knowledge and skills needed to make the change, and the belief that the changes will not make any difference to their students.

In addition to this some of the problems identified by Khosa (2009) include; many schools are dysfunctional, and are not transforming time, teaching, physical and financial resources in learning outcomes, next curriculum delivery is poor; teachers do not complete the curriculum, and pitch their teaching on their level of interest than those demanded by the curriculum. Besides, district educational official's support and monitoring processes are inadequate and not effective. In general, these review of related literature, several factors are likely to affect the effective implementation of SIP. In line with this two groups of respondents, secondary school teachers and principals were asked to indicate to what extent those listed in below table affect the implementation of SIP. Accordingly, the respondents provided their responses in the way summarized in the following table.

Table 10: Challenges hindering the implementation of school improvement program (SIP)

SN	Items	Respondents Type					
		Teachers (N=170)		SIC (N=50)		Aggregate Mean	Rank
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	Lack of awareness about the school improvement program among the school community	4.00	.587	3.20	1.07	3.60	12th
2	Shortage of material resources to implement SIP	3.76	.727	3.67	1.10	3.71	7th
3	Absence of collaboration among stakeholders	3.37	1.37	2.89	1.48	3.13	16th
4	Absence of self-evaluation at the end of each academic year	3.90	1.15	3.60	1.24	3.75	6th
5	Lack of follow-up and supervision on the implementation of school improvement program	4.07	.828	3.62	1.35	3.84	3rd
6	Teachers resistance to the program	3.49	1.46	3.67	1.33	3.58	13th
7	Inability of the school leadership to coordinate efforts for the program implementation	3.58	1.28	3.96	1.11	3.77	5th
8	Inadequate professional support from woreda education office	3.70	1.33	3.88	1.18	3.79	4th
9	Lack of adequate training for stakeholders	2.92	1.58	3.44	1.24	3.18	15th
10	Low stakeholders involvement in SIP implementation	3.70	1.18	3.68	1.19	3.69	9th
11	Poor performance of school improvement committee	3.60	1.29	3.80	1.26	3.70	8th
12	Poor performance of follow-up supervisors on SIP implementation	3.54	1.30	3.05	1.50	3.29	14th
13	Insufficient school facilities	3.80	1.18	4.07	1.01	3.93	1st
14	Lack of financial resource to implement SIP	3.90	1.20	3.44	1.06	3.67	10th
15	Inadequate planning of SIP	3.82	1.16	3.41	1.41	3.61	11th
16	Lack of teachers commitment to implement SIP	3.74	1.11	3.99	1.08	3.86	2nd

As it can be seen in table 10, teachers rated as lack of follow-up and supervision on the implementation of school improvement program (M=4.07, SD=.828), lack of awareness about the school improvement program among the school community (M=4.00, SD=.587), lack of financial resource to implement SIP (M=3.90, SD=1.20), absence of self-evaluation at the end of each academic year (M=3.90, SD=1.15), inadequate planning of school improvement plan (=3.82, SD=1.16), insufficient school facilities (M= 3.80, SD=1.18), shortage of material resources to implement SIP (=3.76, SD=.727), lack of teachers commitment to implement SIP (M=3.74, SD=1.11), inadequate professional support from woreda education office (M=3.70, SD=1.33), low stakeholders involvement in SIP implementation (M=3.70, SD=1.18), poor performance of school improvement committee (M=3.60, SD=1.29), inability of the school leadership to coordinate efforts for the program implementation (M=3.58, SD=1.28), poor performance of follow-up of the supervisors on program implementation (M=3.54, SD= 1.30), teachers' resistance to the program (M=3.49, SD=1.46), absence of collaboration among stakeholders (M=3.37, SD=1.37) and lack of adequate training for stakeholders (M=2.92, SD=1.58) were major challenges hindering the implementation of school improvement program in their respectively order. In addition supervisors during interview pointed out that;

> *"Lack of adequate finance is the major factors that affect SIP implementation; since the school grant budget allocated for schools was not adequate to run effective schools improvement process. Lack of school stakeholder commitment is also the critical problem that negatively affects SIP implementation."*

On the other hand school improvement committee (SIC) respondents rated that insufficient school facilities (M=4.07, SD=1.01), lack of teachers commitment to implement SIP (M=3.99, SD=1.08), inability of the school leadership to coordinate efforts for the program implementation (M=3.96, SD=1.11), inadequate professional support from woreda education office (M=3.88, SD=1.18), poor performance of school improvement committee (M=3.80, SD=1.26), low stakeholders involvement in SIP implementation (M=3.68, SD=1.19), teachers resistance to the program (M=3.67, SD=1.33), shortage of material resources to implement SIP (M=3.67, SD=1.10), lack of follow-up and supervision on the implementation of school improvement program (M=3.62, SD=1.35), absence of self-evaluation at the end of each academic year (M=3.60, SD=1.24), lack of adequate training for stakeholders (M=3.44, SD=1.24), lack of financial resource to implement SIP (M=3.44, SD=1.06), inadequate planning of SIP (M=3.41, SD=1.41), lack of awareness about the school improvement program

among the school community (M=3.20, SD=1.07), poor performance of follow-up of supervisors on SIP implementation (M=3.05, SD=1.50), lack of strong collaboration among stakeholders (M=2.89, SD=1.48) were reported as major challenges hindering the implementation of school improvement program in their respective order.

Therefore both teachers and SIC respondents reported as insufficient school facilities, lack of teachers commitment to implement sip, lack of follow-up and supervision on the implementation of school improvement program, inadequate professional support from woreda education office, inability of the school leadership to coordinate efforts for the program implementation, absence of self-evaluation at the end of each academic year, shortage of material resources to implement SIP, poor performance of school improvement committee, low stakeholders involvement in sip implementation, lack of financial resource to implement SIP, inadequate planning of SIP, lack of awareness about the school improvement program among the school community, teachers resistance to the program, poor performance of follow-up supervisors on SIP implementation, lack of adequate training for stakeholders and absence of collaboration among stakeholders were reported as major challenges hindering the implementation of school improvement program.

Finally, qualitative data collected from Woreda Education office experts through interview and open ended questions reported that shortage of financial resources is the most determinant factors that affect SIP implementation; since the school grant budget allocated for schools was not enough to keep effective schools improvement process and it was not managed well. Besides, the respondents reported that lack of commitment of teachers is the critical one that negatively affects SIP implementation.

Through open ended questions respondents asked to describe additional challenges that hinder the proper implementation of SIP. In response to this, teachers reported that due to shortage of time and lack of inviting concerned bodies to participate in all issues in school plans. Regarding the ability of school committee to play their role in implementing SIP indicates that some of SIC members coordinate well; whereas some of them lack ability and interest to work collaboratively since they are mostly devoted on their private work. This may be due to lack of awareness creation about the role and responsibility of school improvement committee. In addition, respondents complained that resource allotment to SIP implementation is not enough and community participation to support schools in implementation of SIP program was low.

4. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the summary of major findings, conclusion and recommendation. The major purpose of the study was to investigate the practices and problems of implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone. To achieve the purposes of the study, the researcher guided by the following research questions:

1) To what extent the four domains of SIP implemented in secondary schools of Kembata Tembro zone?
2) To what extent the stakeholders (Principals, Teachers, Parents and Students) contributed for the implementation of school improvement program in secondary schools of Kembata Tembro zone?
3) What are the major problems that hamper the implementation of the school improvement program in the secondary schools of Kembata Tembro zone?

Finally, the researcher used descriptive statistics; including frequency distribution, mean, and standard deviation to analyze the quantitative data and researcher also used inferential statistics an independent sample t-test. Setting the alpha level of significance at five percent (α=0.05), to determine whether groups of scores are significantly different, all collected quantitative data were analyzed using version 20 of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The content analysis (inductive) approach was also used to analyze the qualitative data.

4.1. Summary of Major Findings

On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of the collected data in chapter four, the following major findings are drawn:

1) Analysis of the teachers and school improvement committee demographic data demonstrated that majority 146(85.9%) and 24(14.1%) of them were male respectively; had less than six years of experience in the teaching profession; and only a few of them had second degree in different subject areas.
2) Implementation of the SIP the following activities were not well performed: teachers provision tutorial for female and low achievers, text books have been evaluated by teachers to enrich the curriculum, action research has been conducted by teachers to solve teaching-learning problems, inbuilt supervision has been conducted among colleagues to share experiences to one another, teachers give compressive home works, assignments and project works for students, teachers frequently give timely feedbacks for students about their academic performances respondents rated low.
3) Low performance was also revealed regarding school leadership and management domain that the leaders providing clear direction shared vision, mission and goal for teacher on students' achievement, striven high

commitment to improve students' achievement and SIP implementation has been consistently monitored by principals.

4) Concerning the school environment domain, such as availability of safe, stable and attractive for teaching and learning process, teachers and students have access to standard latrines with water designated for female and male students, adequate teachers guides for all subjects in school and computers are available as required in the standard for students and principal are able to resolve conflict arising in the school were performed low/ unsatisfactory
5) Findings showed that stakeholder's involvements in SIP implementation was low this is due to the lack of school leaders frequently evaluated performance, contributions of school improvement committee in coordinating monitoring and evaluation is low, lack of strong work team among stakeholders to implement the SIP, principals were not actively engaged in improving learning conditions and learning outcomes and lack of teachers regularly discuss with each other.
6) As study indicated that the community and parental involvement domain, parents have involved in decision making concerning issues related to SIP implementation parents used to discuss with teachers on students learning progress with aggregated mean (M=2.51) and community has provided financial and material support for SIP implementation the average mean score (M=2.21) study respondents rated low.
7) The study showed that there was low involvement of stake-holders (teachers, students and parents) in the planning and implementation of SIP plan. The responsibility of planning was remaining in the hands of school principals.
8) The study indicated that the low stakeholder's involvements in SIP implementation, this is resulted due to the lack of school leaders frequently evaluated performance and discussed with teachers on the program implementation outcomes with its mean score results (M=2.18), lack of parent contribution in fund raising to enhance SIP activities and to improve students' academic achievement (M=2.38), lack of monitoring and evaluating of the programs by school improvement committee and its calculated mean score was (M=2.45), school
principals were not actively engaged in coordinating stakeholders activities that related to SIP (M=2.49), lack of strong work team among stakeholders to implement the SIP (M=2.37), school were not actively engaged in improving teaching-learning conditions and teaching-learning outcomes rather than following and evaluating administrative issues (M=2.62) and lack preparing school strategic plan based on self-evaluation (M=2.96).
9) The result of study showed that stakeholders gave low attention on its planning and implementation of the school improvement program (M=2.31).
10) The study revealed the that lack of awareness about the school improvement program among the school community (M=3.60), low level of stakeholders' participation to the program (M=3.69), low level of supervision towards monitoring and evaluation mechanisms (M=3.79), shortage of material resources to implement SIP(M=3.67), lack of follow-up and supervision on the implementation of the program (M=3.84), inadequate planning of SIP (M=3.61), inadequate professional support from woreda education office (M=3.79) and lack of teachers commitment to implement SIP (M=3.86) were identified as major challenges that hinder the effective implementation of SIP.

4.2. Conclusions

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

The nature of school improvement program implementation required outstanding planning which could be achieved through collective efforts of all school stakeholders; it is found out that the school improvement program planning process lacks good self-assessment, and the participation of those who have a stake in schools. From this it can be safely concluded that the school improvement committee were not contributing significantly in the planning and implementation of school improvement program. On the other hands, in the school improvement program guidelines, it is stated that school improvement program during the planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of school improvement program. Therefore, the study can conclude that practice of implementation of SIP was not adequate.

The contribution of stakeholders in SIP implementation the lack of school leaders' frequently evaluated performance, low contributions of school improvement committee in coordinating monitoring and evaluation, lack of strong work team among stakeholders to implement the SIP. On the other hand, secondary school leaders were preparing non-collaborative SIP plan which is

prepared without the participation of stakeholders and a SIP plan which is prepared without undergoing adequate assessment with stakeholders may face great challenges during its implementation. Therefore, from the finding, it is possible to conclude that stakeholders of Kembata Tembaro Zone were not effective in making adequate preparation before planning to manage SIP.

Finally, from the finding concluded that insufficient school facilities, lack of teachers commitment to

implement sip, lack of follow-up and supervision on the implementation of school improvement program, inadequate professional support from woreda education office, inability of the school leadership to coordinate efforts for the program implementation, absence of self-evaluation at the end of each academic year, shortage of material resources to implement SIP, poor performance of school improvement committee, low stakeholders involvement in sip implementation, lack of financial resource to implement SIP, inadequate planning of SIP, lack of awareness about the school improvement program among the school community, teachers resistance to the program, poor performance of follow-up supervisors on SIP implementation, lack of adequate training for stakeholders and absence of collaboration were major problems that hinder the effective implementation of SIP in secondary schools of Kembata Tembaro Zone.

4.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were drawn.

1) **Creating the Necessary Awareness**
   - ❖ It is better to recommend to schools, woreda and zone education office to provide adequate practical training program to support the implementation of school improvement program, it should be supported by technical, financial and material inputs by concerning bodies, therefore, it is advisable to woreda and zone education office, cluster supervisors, PTSA to provide the necessary technical, financial and material support for effective implementation of SIP.
2) **Promoting the involvement of stakeholders**
   - ❖ It is advisable to schools SIC, supervisors, school leaders, and woreda and zone education offices to promote practical involvement of all stakeholders by creating adequate awareness to implement SIP effectively.
3) **Providing the necessary school facilities**
   - ❖ It is better to recommend to schools, woreda and zonal education office and school management bodies to provide the necessary school facilities before starting the implementation of SIP to achieve the intended objective of the program.
4) **Monitoring, evaluation and supporting**
   - ❖ To alleviate the challenges encountered school leaders in implementing SIP, it is advisable that external supervisor, Woreda and zonal Education Offices in collaboration with the Regional Education Bureau need to give sustainable training to fill the skill gaps of school leaders. They also need to avail secondary schools with important financial, material and human resources. Beside, Woreda and Zonal Education Offices in collaboration with REB should timely supervise and support the school leaders.
5) **Developing the culture of collaborative planning**
   - ❖ It is to recommend that educational experts of woreda and zone education office supervisors, principals, teachers and any other researchers, who has interested should conduct a research in the area to draw the possible solutions for the internal and external challenges that encounter the practices of SIP in secondary schools.
6) **Suggest possible solutions for SIP Problems**
   - ❖ The findings showed that various problems encountered the implementation of SIP implementation. Therefore, it is recommend that woreda and zonal education experts, principals, teachers and researchers should suggest possible solutions for the problems that encounter the implementation of SIP in secondary schools.
7) **Providing adequate training for stakeholders**
   - ❖ In order to implement SIP in line with the frame work Zonal Education Departments and WEO should provide sufficient training for all stakeholders to implement school improvement program effectively.
   - ❖ This study is not the final solution to solve the problems of SIP implementation of the study area, so the researcher recommends further researches.

References

Abebe, Wonde (2012).School Management Decision Making in Ethiopian Government Schools: Evidence from Young Lives School Survey. Young Lives Working Paper no. 86.

ACT (2009).School Improvement Framework: Better School…Better Futures Raising Quality and Achievement Excellence in ACT Public Schools Retrieved on Nov.11, 2010 from W. W. W.det.act.gov.et.

ACT government (2004).School Improvement Framework: Guide Lines for School Improvement Sydey: Education Youth and Family Services.

Aggarwal, J.C. (1996). Theory and Principles of Education: Philosophical and Sociological Basis of Education (10thed); New Delhi: Vikas Publishing Pvt. Ltd.

Amare, A. & Temesgen, E. (2002).Education in Ethiopia: A development Perspective. The Ethiopian Journal of Education, Volumm XXII (2), 101-107.

Amare, A.Girma.L Arega, m.(2009). Enhancing school effectiveness through educational Research in garje zone secondary school: challenges and prospects.Educational research and development, volume 31(5)1-34.

Anderson (1992). An educator's guide to school management skills. Pretoria: Van Schaik

Arcaco, F. (1997). Improving School Leadership Volume 1: Policy and Practice**,** Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

Ayalew, Silesh. (2009).Secondary School Teacher Deployment in Ethiopia: Challenges and Policy options for redressing the Imbalances. Journal of Educational Research Addis Ababa University, pp. 1-9.

Barnes, H. (2004).Sustainable School Improvement: A partnership between the State, the private Sector and Civil Society. Retrieved on Nov.16, 2010 from www.jet.otga.za.

Barth, R. (1990). Improving Schools from Within: Teachers, Parents and Principals Can Make a Difference. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Barth, R. (2006). Relationships within the School House. Educational Leadership, 63(6): 8-13. Bass, B. (2010). The Bass Hand Book of Leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Applications. New York: NY: Simon & Schuster.

Best and Khan (2006). Research in Education (10th ed.). New Delhi: V.K. Barta at Peart Offset Press Pvt. Ltd.

Bishop, G (1995).Curriculum Development .Hong Kong Macmillan Education Ltd.Countries.London:Casell.

Chaltu Ibrahim (2015). An Assessment Practices and Challenges of School Improvement Program Implementation in Selected Secondary Schools of West Hararge Zone. AA Universty,Ethiopia.

Chi- Chi, J. & Michael, w. (2014). School Improvement: International Perspectives. Beijing: Beijing University.

Clark, K. & Starr, L. (2007).). Educational Leadership and Management: Theory, Policy, and Practice. South African Journal of Education, 27(3): 319-406.

Cohen, L. Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007).Research Methods in Education (6th ed.). London: Rout ledge.

Creswell, J.W. (2003). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches. (2nd ed.). California: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J.W. (2009). Research Design: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Research Approaches.(3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J.W. (2012). Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research. (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River RJ: Pearson Education.

Creswell, J.W., & Plano Clark. (2007). Research design; Qualitative, Quantities and mixed methods Approaches (3r Ed.).Los Angeles: SAG Publication, Inc.Delhi; SAGE Publications.

Demmok, C. (2000).Designing the Learning-Centered School: Across Cultural Perspective.

Derbessa, D. (2009). Prospects and Challenges of Achieving the Millennium Development Educationa1 Goa1s in Ethiopia: Where does Ethiopia Stand on EFA Goals? The Ethiopian Journal of Education, Addis Ababa University, pp 1-12.

Derebssa, D. (2008). Quality of Teaching and Learning in Ethiopian Schools: Tension between Traditional and Innovative Teaching Learning Approaches.

Dereje Hofosha (2012). The Implementation and Challenges of School Improvement Program in Government Secondary Schools of Oromia Special Zone surrounding Finfine.

Dodd, A. and Kontal, J. (2002).How Communities Build Stronger School Stories, Strategies and Promising Practices for Educating every Child.\

Durke C. (1999). *Reframing and Reform Perspectives on Organization, Leadership and School change.* New York: Longman Publishers.

Earl. Goldman, F. and Auoli, R (2003).Manitoba School Improvement. Retrieved on Oct.29, 2010, http://www Pace Work org.

EIC, (2000).School Improvement Planning: A Hand Book for Principals Teachers and School Council's extracted from http://eie.edu.gov.on.ca.On 21 August 2009.

Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia., 1994.Education and Training Policy. Addis Ababa Flamer Press

Frew Amsale. (2010). Practices and Challenges of Implementing School Improvement Program in Primary Schools o Jimma City Administration. Unpublished Senior Essay.Addis Ababa University.

Fullan, M.(2001). The New Meaning of Educational change: London Cassell.

Gay, L.R, Mills and P.Airasian (2009). Educational Research (9thEd).New Jersy:

Gay, R. (1992). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis application*. 6th Ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Hargreayes, A. (1994). Changing Teachers, Changing Times: Teachers' Work and Culture in the Post Modern Age. London: London: Cassel.

Harris R. Alma, E. and Lambert, W. (2003).Building Leader ship Capacity for Improvement. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Harris, A. (2002). School Improvement: What's in It for Schools? London: Routledge Flamer Press.

Harris, A. (2005).Instructional Leadership and school Improvement. Effective Leadership for School Improvement London: Rouledge Falmer.

Hopkins, D. (2001). The Past, Present, and Future of School Improvement: Towards the Third Age. Educations Research Journal, Volume 27(4), 459 475.
Hopkins, D. (2004). School Improvement for Real (Eds.). London: Rouledge Falmer.
Hopkins, D. (2005). The Practice and Theory of School Improvement: International Handbook of Educational Change. London: Spring International Handbooks of Education.
Hopkins, D. (2011). International Leadership in School Improvement. Nottingham: Faculty of Education University of Nottingham.
Hulpia, J. and Valck, B. (2004). The Role of Teachers, Schools, and Communities in Quality Education: A Review of the Literature. AED Global Education Center.
ICDR (1999).Teachers Education Hand Book: Addis Ababa: ICDR.
Issac & Michael. (2005). Education Research: An Introduction 4th Ed.
Jeilu Oumar, (2010). Strategic and School Improvement planning. Addis Ababa University.
Khosa G. (2009). Sustainable School Improvement: Apartnership between the State, the private Sector and Civil Society.Retrieved on Nov.16,2010 from www.jet.otga.za.
Kothari (2004).Research Methodology Methods and Techniques :New Age International(P) Ltd, Publishers.
Kruger.A.G. (1996).School Management: International and External environment. Pretoria .University of South Africa.
Kumar, R. (2005). Research Methodology. A step-by-step Guide for Beginners, 2nd ed. New
Lambert, L. and Harris, A. (2003). Building Leadership Capacity for School Improvement. London: Open University.
Leedy,P.D;andOrmrod,J.E.(2005).Practical research planning and design(8thEd).New Jersey:Pearson Prentice Hall
Leithwood, K. (2002). Organizational Conditions to Support Teaching and Learning. In Hawley, W. &Rollie, D. (Eds.). The Keys to Effective Schools. Thousand Oaks: CA: Corwin Press.
Lunenburg, G. and Ornstein, C (1991).Educational Administration Concept and Practices: New York Wads Worths,Inc.
Mackb G. (2006). *The Intelligent School*, London: Paul Chapman.
Marishame, RN (2013). Project Management in Education: Brining the School Community on Board in R1 Nico Botha.2013.Finical Management and leadership in Schools Pinelands : Pearson.
Marishane, RN. & Botha, RJ. (2011). School Leadership in a Changing Context: A Case for School Based Management. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
Mesele Senbet (2011). Current Practices and challenges of School Improvement Program in Some Selected Primary Schools of Sodo ZuraWoreda in Wolyita Zone. Senior Essay Addis Ababa University (Unpublished).
Michael, NE. (2004). Educational Leadership and Administration. Michigan: University of Michigan sage Publication.
Ministry of Education (1994, June 1). Transitional Government of Ethiopia: Education and Training Policy. Addis Ababa: Ministry Of Education.
Ministry of Education (1995). *The school improvement program (Blue print) Addis Ababa, Ministry of Education.*
Ministry of Education (1998). Education Sector Development Program I (ESDP 1). Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education. Ministry of Education (2002, September 11). Education Sector Development Program 11 (ESDP). Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
Ministry of Education (1999). General Education Quality Improvement Program /GEQIP/.Program Document. Addis Ababa
Ministry of Education (2005, August 1). Education Sector Development Program (ESDP III) Action Plan. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
Ministry of Education (2006, October 1). Education Sector Development Program Action Plan III (ESDPIII). Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
Ministry of Education (2007). Teachers development program in Ethiopia (Blue Print). Addis Ababa:
Ministry of Education (2007).The school improvement program (Blue Print). Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
Ministry of Education (2008).Education Statistics Annual Abstract. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education Printing Press.
Ministry of Education (2010a). School Improvement Program Guidelines Final Draft. Improving the quality of Education and Student Results for All Children at primary and Secondary Schools.
Ministry of Education (2010b).Education Sector Development Program 1V (ESDP 1V). Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education Printing Press. .
Ministry of Education (2012). School Improving Primary Education in Ghana: An Impact Evaluation.

Washington: The World Bank.
Ministry of Education (2014).Classroom Assessment Manual: Primary and Secondary Teachers. Addis Ababa: National Educational Assessment and Examinations Agency.
Morgan, J.S (2006). What community participation in schooling means: Insights from southern Ethiopia‖ Harvard Educational review, 76(3).
Mugenda, O. M. & Mugenda, (2003).Research Method. Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis. New York. Longman.
Ojo, L.B. (2008). Leadership roles of school administrators and challenges ahead in post-primary institutions in Nigeria, Euro Journals Publishing Inc.
Orodho and Kombo (2000), Techniques of Writing Research Proposal and Reports.Nairobi: Masola Publishers.
Plan International(2004).The School Improvement Program.Retrieved from:http://www.plan.international.org.
Plan international Sudan (2006). End term evaluation of school improvement project. Khartoum.
Scheerens, J. (2013).the use of Theory in School Effectiveness Research Revised.School effectiveness and school improvement. An international Journal of Research Policy and Practice, 24(1):1-3 8.
Shaeffer, S. (ed) (1994). Partnership and Participation in Basic Education: A Series of Training Module and Case Studies Abstract for Educational Planners and Managers. Paris: UNESCO International Institute of Educational Planners.
SNNPR (2012).General Education Quality Assurance Package Community Mobilization Manual .Hawassa (Unpublished Training Material).
Southworth, Geoff. (2004). Primary School Leader ship Context: leading small, medium And Large Sized Schools. London: Rutledge Farmer. St. George Printing Press.p14-15.
Stoll, L. and Fink, D. (1996).Change our School: Linking Some Effectiveness and School Improvement Buckingham: Open University Press.
Tech-Hong A. & Waheed, Z. (2011). The reliability coefficients internally consistent. New York: Academic Press.
Teet, E., Taylor, H and & Starr, L (2003). Collaborative partnership in Community Education : The Journal of Education Policy 18(1), pp. 37-51.
UNESCO, (1995).*Review of Education Sector Analysis* in Ethiopia education. Paris
UNESCO. (2005). EFA Global Monitoring Report of 2005:Qua1ity Education for A11. Paris:
USAID/CSPP (Community–School program) (1998). Community Mobilization for Education and Health. Addis Ababa: Training manual.
Wisconsin (1985). Department of public instruction in Klousmeier, 1985:6.
World Bank, (1994). Final Report: Post-Approval Quality at Entry/Quality of Supervision
World Bank (1995). Priorities and Strategies for Education. Washington: Green Wood Printing Press.
World Bank (2004).Improving Primary Education in Ghana: An Impact Evaluation. Washington: The World Bank.
Yalew Endawek, (1998) Yememeher Meseretawi Merhowechina Ategebaber (basic principles of research and its practice). Addsis Ababa, Nigd printing press.