

Practices and Challenges of Implementing School Improvement Program in Primary Schools of Addis Ababa City Administration

Derese Simegnew Alehegn

dereseenkopa@yahoo.com

QUEENS COLLEGE

Ethiopia, Addis Ababa, 56196, Addis Ababa

Abstract: *The school improvement program, in the primary schools of Addis Ababa city administration was launched by the year 2007/2008. Regarding the preparation of the program, the educational leadership found in the town has provided an awareness creation programs to those key stakeholders and tried to avail the necessary human material and financial resources to the effective implementation of the program. As a result, a relatively adequate number of teachers were assigned to run the teaching and learning activities in the schools. However, there were in adequate and insufficient number of supportive staff to support the instructional process, insufficient provision of necessary educational materials and lack of budget. In general the primary schools were not well equipped to the reasonable level that they can implement SIP effectively. To sum up the preparation made by both the school leadership and JCEO was poor and not satisfactory. It is hardly possible to the primary schools to achieve the goals of SIP, unless such problems are aggressively acted up on. Before planning the school improvement plans, most schools were conducted a self-enquiry in order to determine their level of performance concerning the four domains of SIP. The self-enquiry was conducted using the national and local standards to analyze students' results. Using local standards as a basis to determine the performance level of schools might be deceiving to schools as it could not give them their real picture of performance in relation to other schools which were functioning the town as well as in the country. More over, the self-enquiry should be conducted in a continuous fashion (MoE;2002). This helps schools to revise their plan in relation to the newly existing situations as well as to re consider those issues that were over looked previously. However, in most primary schools of the town self-enquiry was carried out in irregular manner. As a result primary schools of the town were ill prepared in improving the academic performance of students as their self-enquiries were not only based largely on local standards but also they were conducted irregularly.*

Keywords:- Implementing, School, Improvement, Primary Schools

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM AND ITS APPROACH

This chapter deals with background of the study, statement of the problem objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, research design and methodology, operational definitions of key terms and organization of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

Education is a work of preparing a generation for life aiming at helping human being in solving problems ranging from day to day activities to complex social, economic and political challenges. It is an endeavor that develops skill and capacity, eradicates harmful practices and enhances science and technology (MoE, 1991). Schools play a central role in the realizing these purposes of education, as they are institutions where the formal teaching and learning activity takes place. Hence, what is going on in schools could imply the performance of an education system. In this regard, Macbeth said that, "improving the micro-efficiency of the school has been viewed as a means of addressing some of the Macro problems of the state and society (Cited in Harris, 2005). On the other hand, what is going on in the larger educational system and the external environment highly affects schools' performance (Ayalew, 1991).

Since the early 1980's educators around the world have been faced with continual and dynamic changes both in their schools and in those systems that are in support of them. Such a merciless change at schools makes the multiplicity of complex educational demands to be the responsibility of teachers and administrators (Telford, 1996). Such increasingly competitive environment in which schools operate forced them to raise standards and to improve the quality of their service (Harris, 2005). More over, more than ever before, there is the need to engage in new ways of thinking about educational problems and ways through which schools can make needed and desired improvements. As a result, school systems through out the world have become subject to wide ranging reform programs. Consequently, many countries introduced huge reforms to their education systems to keep their schools effective. Among the reforms introduced School improvement programs is the major one (Carlson, 1996: Dimmock,1993).

Many writers define school improvement program in different ways. Barnes, for example, defines school improvement as a process of changing specific practices and policies in the way these changes help to improve the teaching and learning process (cited in MoE, 2007). In order to change specific practices and policies, people who are engaged in the school improvement program should have the knowledge of those factors within schools that may be changed to produce higher quality of schooling and they should be clearly informed as to what conditions out-side the level of the school are necessary to the improvement (Dimmock, 1993). In this regard, it must be noted that since schools differ in shape, size, structure, culture, political environment and other dimensions, we can not have single universally accepted school improvement approach that works in all educational systems and settings. Hence, different countries have developed different school improvement approaches that suit their educational problems (MoE, 2007).

Accordingly, in Ethiopia, the MoE had introduced a school improvement program. According to the MoE's school improvement program blue print document (2007), the timely and the basic aim of the program is improving students' academic achievement through creating conducive teaching and learning environment and with active involvement of parents in the teaching learning process. Whenever such new programs are introduced to the given educational system and they began to be implemented, it is worthy to assess the implementation process so as to identify the strengths and weaknesses in the implementation process. The assessment, not only enables schools and educational leaders to identify the strengths and weakness in the implementation of the school improvement programs, but also provides them with an insight of what measures to be taken to improve the weaknesses and to expand their strengths as well. This in turn helps schools to make best out of the implementation of the programs. Therefore, making an assessment of practice and challenges in implementing SIP justified to be essential.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In the year 2007 the MoE introduced the General Education Quality Assurance Package to the education system of our country. The package consists of different programs. The school improvement program is one of the components in the package. The program has got four domains. Namely: parent-community and school relations, Teaching and Learning, school Leadership and Administration and Crating conducive Teaching and Learning Environment. Now a day the SIP is being implemented in all schools of the country. There are however always expected challenges, whenever new programs such as SIP are being introduced and implemented. These challenges may stem from different sources. First of all, the fact that new insights fail to get put in to practice because they conflict with deeply held internal images of how the world works, images that limit us familiar ways of thinking and acting can be the major one. Resisting change can be considered as the nature of human being which appears that, no one is free from. Neither noted scientists nor students playing on school play grounds (Senge in Carlson, 1996). Secondly, in poor countries there are financial, social, and technical constraints that put forward undesired influence towards the implementation of new programs. In Ethiopia too the presence of such constrains is inevitable, hence affect the implementation of SIP.

Documents of the FDRE Ministry of Information revealed that Ethiopia is suffering from problem of implementation capacity in all sectors, public or private. The education sector as a part of the larger government machinery is also expected to face such problems. These problems might impede the implementation of projects and programs in the sector. The Addis Ababa city administration as part of governmental structure cannot be free from such implementation capacity problems. Hence, the implementation of SIP in the schools of the city administration faces several challenges. The researchers own experience too reveals that, there were several problems that have been affected the implementation of SIP in the city.

Despite those factors discussed above, there were no enough studies conducted on the area of SIP because of the novelty of the case. As far as SIP is concerned the researcher comes across these studies are considered to give insights on the practice and challenges of implementing SIP, the solutions recommended by the studies may not be feasible for all localities, because solutions for the same problems lies in different cultural, political, social and economical forces. In this regard Sodhi, described as follows:

The national systems of education are just like national experimental laboratories dealing with similar problems. The solution of these problems lies in different nations in cultural condition, current political and social aims, and economic forces. ...So for the solution of these problems it becomes necessary to understand these traditions, forces and objectives that work behind the education scene (1983:9).

The above explanation of Sodhi justifies the importance of studying the same problems, even within a given nation differently.

In lights of the above discussion it becomes more important to assess how the school improvement program is actually being implemented and to identify factors that impede school improvement activities in primary schools in Addis Ababa city cultural, political, social and economic contexts. On the basis of this, the study was designed to answer the following basic questions:

- To what extent the school improvement program activities are actually being implemented in government primary schools of Addis Ababa city administration?
- What are the factors that affected school improvement practices in primary schools?
- What are the possible solutions/measures/ that should be taken to tackle the challenges?

1.3 Objective of the Study

The study had the following objectives.

1.3.1 General Objective

Identifying the extent to which SIP activities were being implemented in primary schools and those factors that impede the implementation process were the general objective of this study.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The study was also attempt to address the following specific objectives

1. To identify the extent to which SIP activities are being implemented in primary schools.
2. To point out those major factors those impede school improvement activities in primary schools.
3. To suggest the possible measures that should be taken to solve the prevailing problems that the SIP implementation faces.

1.4 Significance of the Study

In the educational world at present time there is a rent less change at both school and system level (Telford, 199). Hence, if schools to remain as competent as possible in such dynamic world, they need to improve the quality of their outcomes. In the educational systems where school improvement program was being implemented it was useful to study how the program was being implemented and identifying those major factors that affected the implementation of the program. On the basis of this, the researcher believes that the study will have the following importance.

1. It may provide with information for educational officials and primary school principals on how SIP activities are being implemented in the primary schools.
2. In might enable educational officials and school principals to identify the weaknesses and strengths observed in implementing SIP and in turn to take corrective measures.
3. It might provide educational official and principals an insight on the solutions for prevailing problems.
4. It might serve OEB as a basis in its attempt of getting best out of the implementation of SIP.
5. It might also serve as a basis for other researchers in conducting scientific inquiry on the area under investigation.

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

Even though SIP was being implemented in all schools of the country, the study was delimited to focus on primary schools of Addis Ababa city administration for the purpose of manageability. In this city administration, there were about 13 government primary schools (1-8) and from this total, 6 (46%) of the schools were the focus of the study.

The school improvement program in primary schools can have a various dimensions. To make the study more manageable, the study focused on how SIP activities were being planned, implemented and evaluated in primary schools in relation to the MoE SIP implementation manual.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

The study would be more fruitful, if it included all teachers found in all primary schools of the town. However, due to time and financial constraints the student researcher was forced to focus only on some of the schools and some of the teachers. Consequently, the study might lack to generate sound findings that could address the overall SIP activities in the town.

1.7 Research Design and Methodology

1.7.1 The Research Methodology

The objective of the study was to identify the extent to which SIP activities were being implemented in the primary schools and to point out those factors that impede the implementation of SIP activities. In this regard a descriptive survey method is potentially suitable to assess the existing situation and practices. Hence, descriptive survey method was applied in the study. The use of the method was rationalized for its aptness in describing the existing practices and problems.

1.7.2 Sources of Data

Primary as well as secondary sources of data were used in the study. The primary sources of data were city administration educational officials and experts, primary school principals, teachers and school SIP committee members. The decision to use these subjects as a source of data was based on the expectation that they have a better exposure and information about the implementation of SIP activities in primary schools.

City administration education offices' and school documents such as SIPC minuets, school plans, planning and evaluation formats as well as reports were consulted as secondary sources of data. The data obtained from these sources believed to strengthen the data obtained through questionnaires.

1.7.3 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

As mentioned in this paper there were about 13 government primary schools in Addis Ababa city administration. From the total of 13 schools 6 (46%) of them were taken as a sample. In these sample schools, there were 30 SIP committee members (6 students, 6 principals, 6 PTA/KETMB members and 12 teachers). 30 (100%) of them were taken as a sample purposively. The selection of the committee members decided on the expectation that these subjects were actively engaged in the planning implementing and evaluating of SIP activities in their respective schools.

In the sample primary schools, there were about 384 teachers of which 196 of them were males and the rest 188 were females. From the total number 384 teachers, 72 (20%) of them were taken as a sample. To keep respective proportions in terms of sex and number across the sample schools, teachers were selected by stratified random sampling techniques. Accordingly, 37 of male and 35 female teachers were included in the sample.

In Addis Ababa City Administration Education Office level there was a committee organized to support the implementation of SIP in schools. Because of their relatively high exposure and information about the implementation of SIP, all the four members of the committee were taken as a sample

1.7.4 Instruments of Data Gathering

In order to get the desired information for the study, questionnaire, and interview and document analysis were employed. For schools SIP committee members and teachers set

of questionnaire were prepared. For the purpose of getting data of various types, the questionnaires included both open-ended and closed-ended items. Interview was conducted with the city education officials who were the members of SIPC. Besides, the document analysis was made to strength the data obtained through questionnaire.

1.7.5 Procedures of Data Gathering

The questionnaire, which was prepared in English language, was translated in to “Amharic” for the purpose of clarity. The distribution and collection of the questionnaires was done with the researcher and some of his informed colleagues. The researcher gave orientations to his subjects about the purpose the study and how to fill the questionnaire items carefully with reasonable attentions. The questionnaires, after filled by the subjects of the study, were checked for completion at the field. Regarding the interview, unstructured interview questions were prepared beforehand and presented to the educational officials on one to one basis. During the interview the researcher took notes so as to record the responses of the officials. Moreover, checklist for document analysis was prepared and some selected documents that were related to SIP were analyzed.

1.7.6 Methods of Data Analysis

To get the collected data ready for analysis the already checked questionnaires were tailed and organized in to tables. To analyze the organized data and arrived at conclusions, percentage and mean score were employed. Percentage as a statistical tool was selected because not only it is easy but also helps to determine the extent to which SIP activities are being implemented. The mean value was used to determine those major factors that significantly affected the implementation of SIP. Based on the results of the percentage and mean obtained, analysis and interpretation of each item was made under each table. The data obtained through the interview and the document analysis analyzed and interpreted along with their counterpart items in the questionnaire.

CHAPTER TWO

PRESENTATION, ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter consists of the presentation and analysis of data. In this section, general characteristics of the sample population, school readiness to implement school improvement program and respondents opinion about the performance of the main school domains, some challenge that affect SIP would have been discussed.

3.1 Issues Related to the Preparation made in the SIP

Here under are issues related to the awareness creation programs facilitated by the school leadership to promote the awareness of the key stakeholders regarding SIP.

Table- 2 Awareness Creation Programs Provided to key Stakeholders

No	Items	Responses	Respondents									
			Teachers		Principals		Students		PTA/KETM B		Total	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Did the school leadership provided awareness creation programs	Yes	66	92%	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%	84	93%
		No	6	8%		0%		0%		0%	6	7%
		DKN		0%		0%		0%		0%	0	0%
2	Goals and objectives of SIP clearly communicated	Yes	52	72%	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%	70	83%
		No	6	8%		0%		0%		0%	6	7%
		DNK	8	11%		0%		0%		0%	8	10%

In the table 2 above respondents were requested to indicate their perception about the awareness creation programs facilitated to key stakeholder regarding the school improvement program. In this regard, in item 1 of the table2, the vast majority, 84 (93%), of respondents described that, the school leadership had provided them adequate orientation regarding school improvement program. This shows that, the school leadership had exerted a tremendous effort to raises the awareness of key stakeholders regarding school improvement program.

In item 2 of the same table, respondents were asked whether the objectives and goals of SIP were clearly communicated to the key

stakeholders in the orientations or not. Accordingly, 83% (70) of respondents showed that, the objectives and goals of school improvement program were clearly communicated to the key stakeholders during the orientations. This might show that, the human caliber that is expected to highly involve in the implementation of school improvement program had gained a necessary understanding and awareness about the program, which in turn might help it to have a commitment for the implementation.

3.1.1 The Provision of Necessary Resources

Here under respondents' perception regarding the issues related to the provision of necessary resources to the effective implementation of SIP are presented.

Table-3 The Provision of Necessary Resources

No	Items	Respondents	Responses					Frequency	Variance	Mean score
			V. High	High	Moderate	Low	V. Low			
1	Adequate number of teachers were employed?	Teachers	12	16	42	2	0	90	312	3.47
		Students	2	3	1	0	0			
		Principals	0	1	2	3	0			
		PTA/KTMB	0	0	5	1	0			
		Total	14	20	50	6	0			
2	Adequate number of non-teaching staff were employed?	Teachers	2	8	26	26	10	90	232	2.58
		Students	0	3	2	1	0			
		Principals	0	0	2	0	4			
		PTA/KTMB	0	4	0	2	0			
		Total	2	15	30	29	14			
3	Necessary educational materials were provided	Teachers	4	16	30	22	0	90	270	3
		Students	0	3	2	0	1			
		Principals	0	1	1	4	0			
		PTA/KTMB	0	0	6	0	0			
		Total	4	20	39	26	1			
4	Sufficient budget was allocated to the program	Teachers	4	16	30	20	2	90	242	2.39
		Students	0	1	2	1	2			
		Principals	0	1	2	0	3			
		PTA/KTMB	0	2	3	1	0			
		Total	4	20	37	22	7			

(key : \bar{x} =4.5-5.00=very high; 3.50-4.49=high; 2.5-3.49= medium; 1.5-2.49=low; 0.5-1.49 very low)

In the table 3 above respondents were asked to rate the extent to which necessary educational resources were fulfilled by the school leadership to the effective implementation of school improvement program. Accordingly, the weighted mean scores were calculated by putting the scores in to a matrix. Each of the items showing different levels of perceptions like very high, high, medium, low and very low were given values (1-5). Very high scored 5, high scored 4, medium scored 3, low scored 2, and very low scored 1.

In item 1 of table 3 respondents were asked to indicate their perception regarding the adequacy of the number of teachers employed in the primary schools. Accordingly, the mean scores of respondents fall between 2.50 and 3.49. That is, it was indicated by the majority of respondents that the number of teachers assigned in the primary schools for the teaching and learning activities was an average. However, the data from document analysis shows that, the teacher-student ratio in the primary schools of Addis Ababa town was about 1:30, which was above the standard of MoE. This is due to the large number of teachers who were qualified to teach only few periods in a week. However, this might be a good opportunity for the JCEO that it has sufficient number of teachers for the effectiveness of school improvement program.

In item 2 of table 3, respondents were asked to indicate their perception regarding the number of non-teaching staff employed in the primary schools. Consequently, the mean scores of the total respondents found to be in between 2.50 and 3.49 indicating an average number of non-teaching staff members employed in the primary schools. This might show that, most primary schools had no enough supportive staff. Consequently, most teachers and principals might be enforced to discharge additional administrative responsibilities and to spent their time on non-academic routine matters. Which in turn might hinder principals from providing educational and instructional leadership, which is supposed to be their central role in schools. Besides, teachers also might be enforced to spend some of their time in non-academic issues that might deter them from focusing on improving students’ academic performance as well as behavioral development.

In item 3 of the table, respondents were asked about the availability of necessary educational materials for SIP. In this regard, the mean score of total respondents fall between 2.50 and 3.49 showing an average level of the availability of necessary instructional materials. This shows that even though the school leadership had made an effort to provide necessary educational materials, it was not as a required level.

In addition to this, the data obtained from the interview with the educational officials shows that, even though the office has attempted to provide some necessary educational materials to primary schools, they were not sufficient to the demands of the schools in implementing the program. Effective implementation of the program demanded the availability of various educational materials such as books, laboratory chemicals and etc. In this regard, the primary schools in the town seem to be poorly positioned to implement such a complex program as school improvement.

Item 4 of table 3 reveals the perception of respondents concerning the budget allotted to the implementation of SIP. Accordingly, the mean score of the total respondents fall between 1.59 and 2.49. That is, it was indicated by the majority of respondents that the amount of budget allotted to the implementation of the program was low. Besides, the data from the interview with the educational officials indicated that, schools in general and primary schools in particular were suffering from shortage of budget especially before the allocation of school grants in 2000 E.C. In the situation where there is inadequate and insufficient financial resource, it might be difficult to primary schools to address the objectives of school improvement program.

Table –4 Duties and Responsibilities of SIPC Members

No	Items	Responses	Respondents									
			Teachers		Principals		Students		PTA/KTMB		Total	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Do you know your duties and responsibilities in the school improvement program	Yes	60	83%	5	83%	6	100%	4	67%	75	83%
		No	12	17%	1	17%	0	0%	2	33%	15	17%
2	If your answer to item 1 is no what do you think the reasons might be?											
	1. not clearly informed	1	8	67%	0	0%	0		2	100%	10	67%
	2. not being provided with in written form	2	0	0%	0	0%	0		0	0%	0	0%
	3. ambiguous and not clear	3	0	0%	0	0%	0		0	0%	0	0%
	4. others	4	4	33%	1	100%	0		0	0%	5	33%

In item 1 of table 4, respondents were asked whether or not they know their responsibilities in the school improvement program. Hence, the vast majority of total respondents (83%) pointed out that they knew their duties and responsibilities in the SIP.

This shows that, the majority of teachers, principals, students and PTA/KETMB members were well informed about their respective duties and responsibilities, that they know what they are expected to perform in the SIP. This might be a promising situation to the educational leadership found in the town as it gained a collection of people who are aware of their duties and responsibilities in the implementation of the program at hand.

In item 2 of the table 12% of total respondents who did not know their duties and responsibilities in the school improvement program were requested to indicate the possible reasons for their ignorance of the duties and responsibilities ascribed to them. Accordingly, 8(67%) of them indicated that they failed to know their duties and responsibilities because they were not clearly informed and the rest (33%) of them indicated that they were not in the schools that they are recently working. As compared to the total number of respondents even though their number seems to be small to affect the implementation of the program, it is good to have them aware of their duties and responsibilities so as to gain maximum results. In this regard, there was a gap of information in some of the teachers, principals and PTA/KETMB to be filled by the educational leadership if the program is to be successful.

3.2 Issues Related to the Self-Enquiry

In the following section respondent's responses regarding the self-enquiry will be presented and analyzed.

Table- 5 Self-Enquiry

No	Items	Responses	Respondents									
			Teachers		Students		Principals		PTA/KTMB		Total	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Did your school conducted self enquiry?	Yes	60	83%	5	83%	6	100%	6	100%	77	86%
		No	12	17%	1	17%		0%	0	0%	13	14%

In the table 5 above respondents were requested whether or not their schools conducted self-enquiry. Accordingly, 77(86%) of them replied that, their schools were conducted self-enquiry while the rest 13(14%) of them said that, their schools did not conduct self-enquiry. In addition to these, the data obtained from the interview and document analysis shows that, all the primary schools were conducted a self-enquiry before planning their school improvement plans. Self-enquiry is one of the basic constituent of the school improvement program on which school plan should base on. In this regard all the primary schools had exerted an effort to conduct a self-enquiry and in turn created a favorable basis on which the school improvement plan might base on.

Table 6 Activities Related to self-enquire

No	Items	Respondents	Responses					Frequency	Variance	Mean
			V.High	High	Moderate	Low	V.Low			
1	Students results were analyzed based on national standards	Teachers	22	25	7	5	1	77	307	3.99
		Students	1	2		2				
		Principals	1	3	2					
		PTA/KTMB	3	1	2					
		Total	27	31	11	7	1			
2	The self enquiry was conducted on a continuous fashion	Teachers	17	25	8	5	5	77	270	3.41
		Students			2	2	1			
		Principals		3	2	1				
		PTA/KTMB			3	3				
		Total	17	28	15	11	6			
3	Achievements and experiences of other	Teachers	24	15	19		2			
		Students	4	1						

1	Schools were investigated	Principals		2		4		77	304	3.95
		PTA/KTMB	3	1	2					
		Total	31	19	21	4	2			
4	The perception of key stakeholders were properly recorded and analyzed	Teachers	6	38	8	6	2	77	283	3.68
		Students	2	1	1	1				
		Principals		3	3					
		PTA/KTMB	1	3	2					
		Total	9	45	14	7	2			
5	PTA and KETMB members were actively involved in the self-enquiry	Teachers	20	15	19	3	3	77	286	3.71
		Students	2	1	1	1				
		Principals		4	1	1				
		PTA/KTMB	1		5					
		Total	23	20	26	5	3			
6	All the four domains were effectively evaluated	Teachers	7	37	12	3	1	77	293	3.81
		Students	2	2	1					
		Principals		3	3					
		PTA/KTMB	2	3	1					
		Total	11	45	17	3	1			

(key : \bar{x} =4.5-5.00=very high; 3.50-4.49=high; 2.5-3.49= medium; 1.5-2.49=low; 0.5-1.49 very low)

In the table 6 items that are related to the practice of self-enquiry were presented and respondents were requested to show their agreement to the extent to which those activities were carried out during the self-enquiry. Accordingly, the weighted mean scores were calculated by putting the scores in to a matrix. Each of the items showing different levels of perceptions like very high, high, medium, low and very low were given values (1-5). Very high scored 5, high scored 4, medium scored 3, low scored 2, and very low scored 1.

In item 1 of the table, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement on the extent to which students' results were analyzed based on national standards. Consequently, the mean score of the total respondents fall between 3.5 and 4.49 indicating high agreement of respondents regarding the issue. Besides, the data obtained through document analysis shows that, in all primary schools even though national standards were used to analyze students' results during the self-enquiry, local or school based academic results were also complementarily used with national standards. In this case, low performance of schools on the eyes of national standards might lead them to use school based (class-room) results to analyze students' results with the intention of defending one's own performance. However, knowing one's own performance on the basis of national standards provide a relatively strong base than that of a performance indicator which is derived based on school's itself standards.

In item 2 of table 6, respondents were requested to indicate the level of their agreement regarding the notion that the self-enquiry was conducted in a continuous fashion. Accordingly, the mean score of the total respondents fall between 2.5 and 3.49. That is, the majority of respondents indicated that an attempt made by the school leadership to conduct self-enquiry in a continuous fashion was an average. This might show that the self-enquiry conducted in most primary schools was irregular and unsustainable. As a result the primary schools might fail to revise their plan and reconsider those issues that were over looked previously.

In item 3 of the table, respondents were asked to indicate as to what extent the experiences and achievements of other schools were

investigated during the self-enquiry. Accordingly, the mean score of the total respondents fall between 3.5 and 4.49 indicating high agreement of respondents. This could possibly imply that, the primary schools had an opportunity to learn from the weaknesses and strengths of other schools and had a benchmark for their own school improvement plans.

In table 6, item 4 shows that, the extent to which the perception of key stakeholders were properly recoded and analyzed. Accordingly. The mean score of the total respondents found in between 3.5 and 4.49. This indicates, the majority of respondents confirmed that the perception of key stakeholders were properly recorded and analyzed during the self- enquiry. This shows that, the primary school leadership had made an attempt to record and analyze the perception of the key stakeholders. This might enabled the school leadership to get the attention and commitment of key stakeholders, as their stakes were included in the school improvement program.

In item 5 of table 6, respondents indicated their agreement regarding the involvement of PTA/KETMB members in the self-enquiry process. Consequently, even though the mean score of the total respondents lie between 3.5 and 4.49, the mean score of PTA/KETMB members fall between 2.5 and 3.49 indicating their average participation in the self- enquiry. Besides, the data obtained from the interview shows that, there was a weakness by the side of primary schools’ leadership in getting the active involvement PTA\KETMB members during the self-enquiry process. This might imply the primary schools leadership’s failure in considering the role of PTA/KETMB members’ role in the self-enquiry. As a result of this the PTA/KETMB members might not be involved strongly in the other aspects of school improvement program.

In item 6 of table 6, respondents were asked to show their perception as to what extent the four domains of SIP were evaluated during the self-enquiry. To this end, the mean score of the total respondents found in between 3.5 and 4.49 indicating the four domains of SIP were evaluated effectively. However, the data obtained from the document analysis reveals that, in most schools even though an attempt was made to evaluate all the four domains of school improvement program, due emphasis was provided to some of the domains while the rest were not thoroughly examined. It is, perhaps, up to the schools SIP committee to decide on which domain to focus more, however this kind of decision can only be arrived at after long and thorough investigation of the statuses of these domains. Hence, focusing on the four domains during the self-enquiry is very essential. However, from the data showed above, we can see that there was a gap in assessing all the four domains of school improvement program. Form this we may infer that, schools might lack to have strong and correct school improvement plan.

3.3 Issues Related to Planning of the School Improvement Plan

Table-7 A three years strategic plan of primary schools

No	Items	Responses	Respondents									
			Teachers		Students		principals		PTA/KTMB		Total	
1	Did your school has developed a three years strategic plan	Yes	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
			64	88.9	6	100	6	100	6	100	82	91%
		No	8	11.1		0		0		0		8

In the table 7, respondents were asked to indicate whether or not their schools have developed a three years strategic plan. Regarding this, the vast majority of (91%) respondents replied that, their school had developed a three years strategic plan. Only 9%(8) of respondents replied that, their school had not developed a three-year strategic plan. Besides, all the sample schools (6) were found to have a three years strategic plan during the document analysis. This shows that, all the primary schools found in the town might have developed a three years strategic plan document for the school improvement program

Table -8 Activities Related to the Planning of SIP

No	Items	Respondents	Responses					Freque	varian	Mean
			V. High	High	Moderate	Low	V. Low			
1	The school plan was approved by SIP committee	Teachers	24	33	7			82	348	4.24
		students	3	2		1				
		principals	1	5						
		PTA/KTM B	3	1	2					
		Total	31	41	9	1				
2	All the stakeholders were involved in the approval of the plan	Teachers	8	34	21	1		82	311	3.79
		students	2	2	1		1			
		principals	1	3	2					
		PTA/KTM B	3	1	2					
		Total	14	40	26	1	1			
3	The school's previous performance was thoroughly evaluated	Teachers	23	15	20	6		82	310	3.78
		students	1	2	1	1	1			
		principals		4	2					
		PTA/KTM B	1	2	3					
		Total	25	23	26	7	1			
4	Action plan for each of the the four domains were designed	Teachers	12	29	21	2		82	310	3.78
		students	1	2	2	1				
		principals		4	2					
		PTA/KTM B	2	2	2					
		Total	15	37	27	3				

(Key: \bar{x} =4.5-5.00=very high; 3.50-4.49=high; 2.5-3.49= medium; 1.5-2.49=low; 0.5-1.49 very low)

In the table 8, 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 weighted mean scores were calculated by putting the scores in to a matrix. Each of the items showing different levels of perceptions like very high, high, medium, low and very low were given values (1-5). Very high scored 5, high scored 4, medium scored 3, low scored 2, and very low scored 1.

In item 1 of the table, respondents were asked to show their perception as to what extent the school plan was approved by the SIPC. Accordingly, the mean score of the total respondents fall between 3.5 and 4.49. This might show that the SIPC in the primary schools were in a relatively good position to discharge the duties and responsibilities entrusted to them. This in turn might help the school leadership to have a collective leadership that could share its burden.

In item 2 of the table, respondents showed their agreement concerning the involvement of key stakeholders in the approval of school improvement plan. Hence, the mean score of total respondents is calculated to be in between 3.5 and 4.49. This might show that stakeholders were provided with an opportunity to involve in the approval of the school plan by the school leadership. Moreover, the data obtained from the interview with educational experts shows that, even though most schools invited stakeholders for discussions on the approval of school improvement plan, some of them were unable to attend such discussion

sessions. This shows that, even though stakeholders were provided with the opportunity to involve in the approval of the plan, the involvement of key stakeholders were not as expected which might be due to lack of willingness.

Regarding the evaluation of the schools' previous performance, the mean score of total respondents fall between 3.5 and 4.49 indicating high effort exerted by the school leadership to assess the school's previous performance. This could show that, while planning the school improvement plan, schools were tried to evaluate their previous performance. In this regard, primary schools might be in a better position to include strategies that can enable them to improve the weaknesses and to firm up the strengths observed during the previous performance of schools.

In item 4 o the table, respondents were asked about the development of action plans for each of the four domains. Accordingly, the mean score of total respondents ($x=3.78$) indicated that the majority of respondents highly agreed that an action plan had developed for each of the four domains. Moreover, the data obtained through document analysis shows that, schools had developed an action plan for each of the four domains in a single document. This might imply that, schools had created advantageous position in order to treat each of the four domains.

Issues Related to the Implementation of SIP

Table-9 Activities Related to the Implementation of SIP

No	Items	Responses	Respondents					Frequency	Variance	Mean
			V.High high	Moderate	Low	V.Low				
1	The existing ways of doing things were tuned to the new plan	Teachers	20	48	4	0	0	72	379	4.21
		Students	3	3			0	6		
		principals	1	4	1			6		
		PTA/KTMB	2	2	2			6		
		Total	26	57	7	0	0	90		
2	The school provided a progress report on the implementation of SIP to the key stakeholders	Teachers	19	23	22	8		72	332	3.69
		Students		3	2		1	6		
		principals		4	2			6		
		PTA/KTMB		4	2			6		
		Total	19	34	28	8	1	90		
3	The school communicated the implementation of SIP to the community.	Teachers	22	25	19	4	2	72	338	3.76
		Students		5			1	6		
		principals		2	4			6		
		PTA/KTMB		2	4			6		
		Total	22	34	27	4	3	90		
4	PTA and KETMB members provided adequate assistance and support to the implementation of the plan	Teachers	25	35	7	5	0	72	362	4.02
		Students	2	3	1			6		
		principals				6		6		
		PTA/KTMB	5	1				6		
		Total	32	39	8	11	0	90		
5	City administration education office was providing proper guidance and support to the implementation of the program	Teachers	12	12	2	45	1	72	276	3.06
		Students	1	3			2	6		
		principals	4	2				6		
		PTA/KTMB	2	2	2			6		
		Total	19	19	4	45	3	90		

(key : $\bar{x}=4.5-5.00$ =very high; $3.50-4.49$ =high; $2.5-3.49$ = medium; $1.5-2.49$ =low; $0.5-1.49$ very low)

Items in the table 9 are mainly related to the activities to be carried out during the implementation of school improvement program. Accordingly, the weighted mean scores were calculated by putting the scores in to a matrix. Each of the items showing different levels of perceptions like very high, high, medium, low and very low were given values (1-5). Very high scored 5, high scored 4, medium scored 3, low scored 2, and very low scored 1.

Accordingly, under item 1, the majority of respondents indicated that, they agree with the notion that the existing ways of doing things were tuned to the new plan (x=4.21). This might show that, in the primary schools the old and existing ways of performing things were modified and changed in to new ways in accordance with the schools’ new plan. Consequently, there might not be a confusion of work.

In item 2 of table 9, respondents were asked to indicate their perception about the schools’ capability in providing a progress report to the key stakeholders regarding implementation of SIP. Accordingly, the mean score total respondents fall between 3.5 and 4.49. That is, the majority of respondents highly agree that the schools were capable enough to provide a progress report to the key stakeholders. This might helped the school leader ship in creating a sense of responsibility by the stakeholders in the implementation of school improvement program.

In item 4 of table 9, total respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement regarding the assistance and support provided by the PTA and KETMB to the effectiveness of SIP. Accordingly, the mean score of the total respondents fall between 3.4 and 4.49. That is, the majority of respondents indicated the assistance and support provided by PTA/KETMB members to be high. This shows that, the PTA/KETMB were able to provide adequate support and assistance to the effective implementation of the program. From this one may conclude that, primary schools found in the town had a relatively good backing from the community representatives.

In item 5 of the table, the mean score of the total respondents found to be 3.06 regarding the guidance and support provided by JCEO to the implementation of SIP. This shows that the majority of the respondents confirmed that the support of JCEO was a moderate. In addition, the data obtained from the interview revealed that, the office had been tried to assist and support primary schools in implementing SIP in a continuous and need- based fashion. This implies that, even though the city administration education office had attempted to provide support and guidance to the implementation of the program it was not to the level that could be realized and appreciated by all the stakeholders.

3.5 Monitoring and Evaluation of SIP

Table-10 Activities Related to the Monitoring and Evaluation of SIP

No	Items	Response	Respondents									
			Teachers		Students		principals		PTA/KTM B		Total	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Did the school SIP committee conducted monitoring and evaluation on the implementation of the program	Yes	58	81%	5	83%	5	83%	6	1	74	82%
		No	5	7%	1	17%	1	17%		0	7	8%
		D N K	9	13%		0%		0%		0	9	10%
2	How frequently	Weekly	5	9%	1	20%	0	0%	1	17%	7	9%
		Monthly	15	26%	2	40%	1	20%	2	33%	20	27%
		Quarterly	29	50%	1	20%	4	80%	3	50%	37	50%
		6 month	9	16%	1	20%		0%		0%	10	14%
		Other		0%		0%		0%		0%	0	0%
3	Did the school staff carried out discussion	Yes	55	76%			6	100%			73	81%
		No	5	7%				0%			5	6%
		DKN	12	17%				0%			12	13%
4	How frequently	Weekly	16	29%			0	0%			16	25%
		Monthly	6	11%			6	100%			12	19%
		Quarterly	19	35%				0%			19	33%

		6 month	4	7%				0%		4	7%	
		Other	10	18%				0%		10	16%	
5	Did the city administration education office conducted monitoring and evaluation	Yes	62	86%	5		6		6	79	88%	
		No	7	10%	1					8	9%	
		DKN	3	4%						3	3%	
6	How frequently	Always	20	32%	3		4		4	31	39%	
		Sometime	20	32%						20	25%	
		Rarely	22	35%	2		2		2	28	35%	
7	The school's capability to modify its plan based on the information obtained through monitoring and evaluation	Very high	0	0%	1	17%		0%		0%	1	1%
		High	7	10%	2	33%	6	100%	1	17%	16	18%
		Moderate	21	29%	1	17%		0%	1	17%	23	26%
		Low	16	22%	2	33%		0%	2	33%	20	22%
		Very low	28	39%		0%		0%	2	33%	30	33%

(Key; DKN- don't know)

Table 10 consists of activities that are related to monitoring and evaluation of school improvement program. Accordingly in item 1, respondents were asked whether or not the school SIP committee carried out monitoring and evaluation regarding the program. In this regard, the majority (82%) of respondents pointed out that SIP committee had carried out monitoring and evaluation regarding the implementation of school improvement program. This shows that the SIP committees of the schools were made an effort to assess the strengths and weaknesses observed in the program on effect. This in turn might provided the committee to get a necessary information that helped to revise and modify its plan.

In item 2 of table 10, those respondents, 82%(74), who provided a positive response (yes) to the item 1 were further asked to indicate the frequency of the monitoring and evaluation. Consequently, the majority (50%) of them replied that, SIP carried out monitoring and evaluation once in a quarter, 27% (20) of them said monthly, 14% (10) of them said it is conducted once in a half year and only 9%(7) of them said that, monitoring and evaluation was carried out on a weekly basis. This shows that, the average time in which monitoring and evaluation was carried out by SIP committee was once in a three month. Monitoring and evaluation can be carried out in different times based on the type of information required. Besides, monitoring refers to continuous follow up of the programs implementation in order to identify problems and to make important modifications where as evaluation mainly concerned with evaluation of the success or failure of the program. Here, monitoring can be considered as a continuous evaluation while evaluation could be a summative aspect. In this regard the time gap of monitoring and evaluation adopted by SIP committee was a relatively wider in that the committee could not provide timely and immediate solutions to even simple problems the implementation of the program faces.

In table 10 item 3 shows, respondents perception on the existence of staff discussion regarding school improvement plan. Accordingly, 76%(55) of teacher respondents replied "yes" while the rest 34% (17) of them said "no". Besides, all (6) of the principals replied "yes" to the question. This shows that, there were discussion sessions for the staff regarding the implementation of school improvement program carried out in schools. This might imply that, the staff had get an opportunity to share the experience of others and to have a say in the implementation of the program.

In item 4 of table 10, those respondents who responded "yes" to the item 3 were asked to indicate the frequencies of the staff discussions. Accordingly, 33%(19) of the said that, discussions were carried out on a quarterly basis while 19%(12), 25%(16), 7%(4) and 16%(10) of them replied on a monthly, weekly, half-year and on yearly basis respectively. This shows that, staff discussion carried out in primary schools on school improvement lacked uniformity in terms of their schedule. Moreover, a quarter was an average schedule for the majority of staff discussions. This imply that, primary schools found in the town were not following the schedule provided by MoE SIP frame work as it suggests a monthly staff discussion on issues of school improvement program.

In item 5 of table 10, respondents were asked whether or not city administration education office carried out monitoring and evaluation. Consequently, the majority (88%) of respondents indicated that, the office carried out monitoring and evaluation. In addition to this, in item 6 of the table, of 88% of respondents 39%(31) of them said that, the office always conducted monitoring and evaluation while 25%(31) and 35%(28) of them revealed that, the office carried out monitoring and evaluation sometimes and rarely respectively. From this we can infer that, the office carried out monitoring and evaluation regarding school improvement program on sometimes basis. In order to ensure the effective implementation of the program the office needed to provide closer support and assistance to the primary schools. To do so, the schedule of monitoring and evaluation which was adopted by the office, a sometimes basis, might not be sufficient.

In item 7 of the table, respondents were asked to rate the schools' capability to modify its plan based on the information provided by monitoring and evaluation. Accordingly, 33%(30) of them rated the school's capability as a very low, where as 22%(20) and 26%(23) as a low and moderate respectively. This shows that, the school's capability of revising and modifying plan was found to be low. Since the very purpose of monitoring and evaluation is to made possible and necessary adjustments and modifications on the plan based on the information gained, primary school's leadership seem to had a weakness in this regard.

3.6 Major Challenges that Affected the Implementation of SIP

Table-11 Challenges that Affected the Implementation of SIP

NO	Items	Responses					Mean value
		Very high	High	Moderate	Low	Very low	
		No	No	No	No	No	
1	Turn over and shortage of man power	10	16	12	20	32	2.47
2	Difficulty of understanding SIP guideline	10	16	34	13	17	2.88
3	Resistance of the program from teaches	7	7	11	21	44	2.02
4	Resistance of the program from students	9	23	6	15	37	2.47
5	Resistance of the program from the community	8	0	16	25	41	1.99
6	Lack of necessary awareness, attitude and practical involvement in SIP implementation students	18	17	18	14	23	2.92
7	Lack of necessary awareness, attitude and practical involvement in SIP implementation teachers	6	16	14	10	44	2.22
8	Lack of necessary awareness, attitude and practical involvement in SIP implementation community	14	14	21	11	30	2.68
9	Insufficient budget	32	12	25	12	9	3.51
10	Lack of school facilities	19	22	29	10	10	3.33
11	Large and overcrowded class-size	8	21	22	19	20	2.76
12	Lack of rewards for those who deserved it	13	21	28	14	14	3.06
13	Lack of qualified principals	14	20	24	19	13	3.03
14	Lack of trained teachers' for special need education	33	21	16	11	9	3.64
15	Limited support from city administration education office	9	35	7	25	14	3.01
16	Limited support from the KETMB	8	35	21	20	6	3.21
17	Limited support from the community	9	30	24	6	21	3.00

(Key : \bar{x} =4.5-5.00=very high; 3.50-4.49=high; 2.5-3.49= medium; 1.5-2.49=low; 0.5-1.49 very low)

In table 11 about 17 problems that were considered to affect the implementation of SIP were presented and respondents were asked to rate the extent to which these factors affect the implementation of the program in their schools. Accordingly, the responses provided by respondents were calculated by using mean scores as statistical tools.

In this regard problems such as: lack of trained teachers for special need education and insufficient budget for the program were identified to be a very high problems. Lack of school facilities ($X=3.33$), limited support from the KETMB ($X=3.21$), lack of qualified principals ($x=3.03$), limited support of the city administration education office ($X=3.01$) was found to be high factors that affected the implementation of the program. Moreover, limited support from the community ($X=3.00$), lack of necessary awareness and practical involvement of students in the implementation of SIP ($X=2.92$), difficulty of understanding SIP guidelines ($X=2.88$), large and overcrowded class size (2.78), lack of necessary awareness and practical involvement of the community (2.68) were identified to be moderate factors. This shows that, the major challenges that affect the implementation of SIP in the primary schools were lack of trained special need teachers, insufficient budget, lack of school facilities limited support of the community, lack of necessary awareness and practical involvement of students in the implementation.

CHAPTER THREE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Summary

The study was intended to examine the practices and challenges of implementing school improvement program in primary schools of Addis Ababa town. In order to realize the purpose of the study three basic questions were raised. The basic questions were:

- To what extent do the school improvement program activities were being practiced in primary school
- What are the major challenges that affected the implementation of SIP in primary schools
- What measure should be taken to the problems that SIP has been faced in primary schools

Accordingly, 90 copies of questionnaires were distributed to 72 primary school teachers 6 principals, 6 students' representatives 6 PTA/KETMB members (members in the SIP committee) and interview was carried out with 4 of the Addis Ababa city education office educational experts to gather information on the practices and challenges of school improvement program. Furthermore, document related to SIP such as strategic plan, SIP committee minuetts, school portfolios and other documents were consulted to enrich the data obtained through questionnaires and interview.

The data obtained were analyzed using percentage and mean value as a statistical tool. Hence, the following major findings and conclusions were made based on the analysis.

1. From the total of 94 respondents, 55(59%) of them were males while the rest 39(41%) were females. Moreover, the ratio of female principals accounted only 17%(1) of the total number of principals
2. The age of the majority of all respondents (75%) were found to be above 31 years, that they were likely to have a rich experience of life in general and teaching profession in particular.
3. The majority of respondents, that is 83% teachers, 67% of principals, 17% PTA/KETMB members and 25% educational experts were diploma holders while 11 (8)teachers 33%(2) of principals, 75%(3) of the educational experts were graduated with first degrees. Which shows the majority of teachers were qualified to teach in primary level according to the standards set by MoE.
4. The majority of (85%) of teachers, principals and educational experts have been served for more than 11 years that they have a relatively better and deep understanding of their profession and several programs implemented in their schools including SIP.
5. Regarding the awareness creation programs before the implementation of SIP, 93%(84) of the total respondents pointed out that the school leadership had facilitated the awareness creation program for the key stakeholders (teachers, students, PTA/KETMB members). Moreover, 83% (70) of the above positively responded respondents indicated that, the goals and objectives of school improvement program were clearly communicated in the awareness creation programs. This implies that, the human caliber that was expected to highly involve in the SIP was equipped with a necessary understanding and awareness of the program.
6. The majority of all respondents rated the number of teachers engaged in teaching and learning activities of primary schools as an average ($x=3.47$). Besides, the data obtained from document analysis shows that, the teacher student ratio in the primary schools of Addis Ababa town was about 1:3 which was above the standards set by MoE. This implies that, the

teaching staff as a necessary precondition for the implementation of SIP existed to be an opportunity for the realization of the objective of SIP.

7. The majority of respondents ($x=2.58$) indicated that, the number of non-teaching (supportive) staff members as a medium. This shows that, most of the primary schools had no enough supportive staff members. Consequently, most primary school teachers and principals were expected to hold some other additional administrative duties.

8. The majority of respondents labeled the provision of necessary educational materials as an average ($x=3.00$). This signifies that, even though the educational leadership in the town had made an effort to provide necessary educational materials, it was not as a desired level. Consequently, primary schools were not in a strong position regarding the availability of instructional materials so as to implement such a complex program as SIP.

9. It was indicated by the majority of respondents that the amount of budget allotted to primary schools was low ($x=2.69$). Moreover, the data obtained from the interview with educational experts indicated that schools found in the town in general and primary schools in particular were suffering from shortage of budget especially before the allocation of school grants in 2009. Currently, even though schools were provided with school grants they were not capable to utilize the grants for the effective implementation of SIP

10. The vast majority (83%) of all the respondents pointed out that, they were aware of their duties and responsibilities regarding the implementation of SIP in their respective schools. This implies that, the human resource (factor) which was expected to carryout the SIP was clear about its duties and responsibilities, which might help it to discharge its duties and responsibilities accordingly.

11. The data obtained through document analysis showed that, during the self-enquiry both national standards and local (school-based) standards were used to analyze students' results. Using local (school based standards) might not provided schools with their actual picture of performance.

12. The majority of respondents pointed out that self-enquiries conducted in the primary schools were not continuous and regular as they should have been

($x=3.41$). This might imply that, primary schools may fail to revise and modify their enquiry based on new events and previously over looked instances.

13. The majority of PTA/KETMB members pointed out that their participation during the schools' self-enquiry was not as a desired level ($X=3.00$).

14. The vast majority, 91%(82), of all respondents as well as the data obtained through document analysis confirmed that, primary schools had developed a three-year strategic plan. Moreover, the school improvement committee members approved the school plan. However, even though most schools had facilitated discussions for the key stakeholders in the approval of the plan, some of the stakeholders were unable to attend such discussion sessions.

15. Significant number all respondents indicated that, the support and guidance provided by the city education office was low ($x=3.06$), inadequate and insufficient to the implementation of the program.

16. The significant majority of total respondents (83%) pointed out that, the school SIP committee had carried out formal monitoring and evaluation regarding the implementation of the program. The average time on the basis of which the school SIP committee undertaken the monitoring and evaluation was once in a quarter of a year (50%). In this regard, the schedule for monitoring and evaluation which was adopted by the school SIP committee was relatively wider in which the committee could not provide timely and immediate solutions to the problems that require timely and immediate solutions.

17. The significant majority (76%), of total respondents pointed out that there were staff discussions facilitated by the school leadership regarding the implementation of SIP. In addition to these, 33%(19), 7%(4) and 16%(10) of respondents pointed out that staff discussion were conducted in a quarterly, 6 months and yearly basis respectively. This implies, in the majority of schools there were no uniformity regarding staff discussions. Moreover the average time for staff discussion was on a quarterly basis that was below the standard provided by MoE in the school improvement program framework document (2002).

18. The significant majority of total respondents (88%) confirmed that, the city administration education office had carried out monitoring and evaluation of the

program of 88% of total respondents (88%), 39%(31), 25%(31) and 35%(28) of them said that, the office carried out the monitoring and evaluation always, sometimes and rarely respectively. This implies that, the office had no uniform schedule for monitoring and evaluation.

19. The majority of respondents, that is, 33%(30) and 22%(20) of them indicated that, the schools capability in modifying its plan on the basis of the information gained through monitoring and evaluation was low and very low respectively. This shows that, primary schools were not in a good position to get advantage of monitoring and evaluation through modifying its plan based on the feedback provided.

20. Regarding the challenges that affected the implementation of school improvement program, lack of trained special need teachers, insufficient budget, lack of school facilities, limited support from the community lack of necessary awareness and practical involvement of students were found to be the major challenges.

4.2 Conclusions

In light of the findings stated above the following conclusions are drawn.

1. The school improvement program, in the primary schools of Addis ababa city administration was launched by the year 2007/2008. Regarding the preparation of the program, the educational leadership found in the town has provided an awareness creation programs to those key stakeholders and tried to avail the necessary human material and financial resources to the effective implementation of the program. As a result, a relatively adequate number of teachers were assigned to run the teaching and learning activities in the schools. However, there were in adequate and insufficient number of supportive staff to support the instructional process, insufficient provision of necessary educational materials and lack of budget. In general the primary schools were not well equipped to the reasonable level that they can implement SIP effectively. To sum up the preparation made by both the school leadership and JCEO was poor and not satisfactory. It is hardly possible to the primary schools to achieve the goals of SIP, unless such problems are aggressively acted up on.

2. Before planning the school improvement plans, most schools were conducted a self-enquiry in order to determine their level of performance concerning the four domains of SIP. The self-enquiry was conducted using the national and local standards to analyze students' results. Using local standards as a basis to determine the performance level of schools might be deceiving to schools as it could not give them their real picture of performance in relation to other schools which were functioning the town as well as in the country. More over, the self- enquiry should be conducted in a continuous fashion (MoE;2002). This helps schools to revise their plan in relation to the newly existing situations as well as to re consider those issues that were over looked previously. However, in most primary schools of the town self-enquiry was carried out in irregular manner. As a result primary schools of the town were ill prepared in improving the academic performance of students as their self-enquiries were not only based largely on local standards but also they were conducted irregularly.

3. The involvement of PTA/KETMB the self-enquiry process is so crucial, as it could provide the community representatives to raise the community interest on schools and to express what sort of schools do the community wants to have. However, in the primary schools of Addis Ababa city Administration the involvement of PTA and KETMB members in the self-enquiry of schools seem to be overlooked. Consequently, the school plans failed to consider the interest of the community or they might contradict with the interests of the community. Thus, this in turn might make the community to be align from schools or become against schools. Unless such situations are immediately solved, schools might become isolated from the community.

4. Agreement on plans and their objectives of stakeholders increases the applicability of them. Accordingly, if school plans are to be more effective and fruitful need to be approved by the involvement of key stakeholders. However, in the Addis Ababa city primary schools the willingness of key stakeholders in the approval of school plans were found to be low. This was mainly due to the unwillingness of stakeholders and partly due to the incapability of school leadership in facilitating different workshops, seminars and panel discussions.

5. According to be MoE school improvement framework document (2000), staff discussion is expected to be carried our once in two weeks. However, in most primary schools of Addis Ababa city administration staff discussion were held on quarterly basis. This not only contradicts with the direction provided by MoE but also inhibit the staff members from getting adequate assistance and support from the school leadership and to share their experiences as they had no enough time of discussion session. Because they had only 4 sessions for staff discussion within a year. Such a situation in turn might make teachers not to respond to the program actively. In such circumstances it might be hardly possible to the school leader ship to draw the commitment of teachers towards the implementation of SIP.

6. Monitoring and evaluation is a key managerial function to ensure the effective implementation of programs and projects. Besides, there should be formal and well organized monitoring and evaluation program so as to improve weaknesses and maintain observed strengths of a given program. Particularly, when new programs are introduced in schools the school

leadership as well as the city administration office should be in closer distant of teachers to give due support and guidance. To do so, there should be well organized and properly scheduled monitoring and evaluation both in the school and city level. However, there was no organized and properly scheduled monitoring and evaluation process made to assess and support the implementation of school improvement program in the Addis Ababa city administration primary schools. If any it was haphazard, not properly planned and professionally executed. In addition to these, the schools' capability of modifying their plan on the basis of feedbacks provided after the monitoring and evaluation was insufficient and requires kind of modification.

7. The major problems that affected the effective implementation of SIP in Addis Ababa city administration primary schools were; lack of trained special need teachers, insufficient budget and lack of school facilities, limited support of the community, lack of necessary awareness and practical involvement of students in the program were the major ones. These problems were emanated from various factors. For example, lack of necessary awareness and practical involvement might be due to schools leadership incapability in designing awareness creation programs that could address the age and the educational level of students. Similarly, limited support from the community was be due to the schools leadership failure in involving the community representatives and the community at large in key areas of the schools. in addition to these, the JCEO also failed to assign teachers trained for special needs education.

4.3 Recommendations

The findings and conclusions of the study show that there are some areas of SIP that critically need interventions. Hence, the researcher forwarded the following recommendations hoping that they could provide an insight on how the problems will be addressed.

1. As the resources are very much crucial for the realization of goals of SIP, the city education office in collaboration with school leadership need to avail a reasonable number of administrative primary schools. Moreover, so as to address the shortage of budget, the school leadership and the city education office should create an income generation mechanisms rather than relying absolutely on budgets allocated from the government. This can be done through creating strong school and community relationship.
2. The city education office should provide a city level standard in consideration with the national standards that can be used as a basis for self-enquiry for all the primary schools.
3. The city education office in collaboration with primary school leadership needs to design a strategy to ensure sustainable participation of the community members. This can be done through creating awareness creation programs such as seminars, workshops and etc. Simultaneously, the leadership capability of principals should be promoted in a way that they can be capable of mobilizing the community for the realization of goals of SIP.
4. The school leadership should create a strong awareness creation program so as to get the involvement of key stakeholders in all activities of SIP. Seminars, work shops and various discussions should be used in this regard.
5. School principals should facilitate staff discussion as per the time provided by the school improvement framework of MOE. In this regard, the SIPC and the city education office should make strong follow-up as to how and when the staff discussions are being carried out in the primary schools.
6. The city education office should create and maintain a properly scheduled and organized formal monitoring and evaluation. In order to provide adequate support and guidance to the primary schools, activities should be evaluated through checklists that were provided to schools before hand so as to show. Schools the major areas in which they must focus. If any lack of expert in the city education, the monitoring and evaluation can be done by classifying schools and assigning a group of experts to formally follow up schools.

REFERENCES

- Ayalew Shibeshi (1991) **Approaches to Educational Organization and Management(I)**. Addis Ababa: AAU Printing Press.
- Carlson, V.R (1996) **Reframing and Reform Perspectives on Organization, Leadership and School change**. New York: Longman Publishers.
- Chaman, J (1993)“**Leadership, School Based Decision Making and School Effectiveness**” in Dimmock, C et al (eds) **School Based Management and School Effectiveness**. New York: Routledge.
- Dimmock, C and et al (1993) **School-based Management and School Effectiveness**. New York: Routledge.
- Harris, A. (2005) **Teacher leadership and school improvement**. In Harris, A. et al. (Eds.), *Effective leadership for school improvement*. London: routledge falmer.
- Hopkins, D (2002) **Instructional Leadership and School Improvement**, in Harris, A et al, eds, **Effective leadership for school**

improvement. London, Routledge Falmer.

Hopkins, D (2005) **Instructional Leadership and School Improvement.** in Harris, A et al, eds, **Effective leadership for school improvement.** London: Routledge Falmer.

Hopkins, D. (2005) **Instructional leadership for school improvement.** In Harris, A. et al. (Eds.), **Effective leadership for school improvement.** London: Routledge falmer

Husen,T. and Postlwaite,N.(Eds.) (1994) **The international encyclopedia of education**

(2ndEd). Oxford : Elsevier science Ltd.

Leithwood, K. and Steinbach, R. (1993) **The consequences for school improvement of different.** In Dimmock, C (Eds.), **school based management and school effectiveness.** London: Routledge.

MoE (1994) **Ethiopian New Education and Training Policy.** Addis Ababa: St. George Printing Press.

O’Nail, H. et al. (1995) **International perspectives on educational reform and policy implementation.** London :The falmer press

Plan international Egypt. (2007) **School improvement program.** End term evaluation.

Cairo; NCFERD.

Plan international Sudan. (2006) **End term evaluation of school improvement project.**

Khartoum.

Raja, W. (2003) **Globalization and challenges for education.** NewDelhi: SHIPA Publications.

Reynolds,D (1993) **“Linking School Effectiveness Knowledge and School Improvement Practice”** in Dimmock, C et al (eds) **School-based management and school effectiveness.** New York, London: Routledge.

Sodhi,T (1983) **A Text Book of Comparative Education** (3rd ed). New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

Telford, H (1996) **Transforming School Through Collaborative Leadership.** London, Washington DC: The Falmer Press.