



Assessing The Perceptions, Practices And Challenges Of School Improvement Program In Secondary Schools: A Case Of Kabridahar Administrative Town

Mulugeta Asnakew Tadesse, College of social sciences and humanities and department of English language and literature.
Bishar Ahmed Yusuf, College of dryland agriculture and department of Rural development and agricultural extension.

Article Info

Received: December 05, 2025

Accepted: December 08, 2025

Published: January 02, 2026

***Corresponding author:** Mulugeta Asnakew Tadesse, College of social sciences and humanities and department of English language and literature.

Citation: Mulugeta Asnakew Tadesse, Bishar Ahmed Yusuf. (2026). "Assessing The Perceptions, Practices and Challenges of School Improvement Program in Secondary Schools: A Case of Kabridahar Administrative Town". International Journal of Business Research and Management 4(1); DOI: 10.61148/3065-6753/IJBRM/060.

Copyright: © 2026. Mulugeta Asnakew Tadesse, This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract:

The purpose of this study was assessing the perceptions, practices and challenges of school improvement program in government secondary schools in kabridahar town. A descriptive research design involving quantitative and qualitative data analyses approaches were employed. The participants of the study were teachers, principals, School Board, PTA members, Student Councils, and Officials from kabridahar town Education Office. Data were gathered through questionnaires, interviews and FGD. The selection of sample teacher respondents was carried out using simple random sampling technique; whereas school boards, principals, vice principals, Educational Officers, SIC and members of PTA were selected by using purposive sampling technique. The data were collected through questionnaire, interview, and FGD. Data from questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Additionally, t-test was also used to measure the relationship of teachers and other respondents' responses to some variables of the study. On the other hand, data from interview, and FGD were analyzed qualitatively based on the thematic analysis. The findings of the study revealed that, the extent of teachers, Leaders and parents participation in planning and practicing SIP was low; the mechanism through which monitoring and evaluation were practiced to support SIP implementation was not in position to effectively run SIP. In addition, most of the activities across the four domains were implemented at moderate level. Hence, from the result of the study the overall implementation of SIP was moderate. Lack of having properly prepared plan for SIP implementations, lack of proper understanding of SIP at school level, weak monitoring and evaluation system of SIP, lack of leadership capacity, different organs of the school not properly understanding their role in SIP, lack of sufficient stakeholders involvement in SIP and giving less attention for SIP were major factors that negatively affect SIP implementation. To alleviate the challenges and to improve the implementation of SIP it was suggested that, the schools should have properly prepared planning, preparing adequate awareness creation program to ensure practical involvement of active participation of all stakeholders on SIP implementation, making school committee functional and strengthening monitoring and evaluation on school improvement program implementation.

Keywords: SIP

Introduction

1.1. Background of the Study

Education is the base for reasoning. Regarding this, Vidyarth (2015) described that unlike literacy which means knows how to read and write, education is to be able to reason, to use our ability to read and write to our benefit and to be able to gain our spectrum of knowledge by trying to surge deeper into the literate knowledge imparted to us.

In the same way as summarized from Gravity (2011), education plays a very important role in people's life; for living a luxurious life or for living a better life, people should be educated. Education helps people to show their best by their mind and spirit. It gives people a lot of knowledge in whatever aspects. Education plays a vital role in people's success in the personal growth. For determining what is good or what is bad for people, education will help them. Without education a person is incomplete, so education makes man a right thinker and a correct decision-maker. Education is the solution of any problem; it is the only education which promotes good habits, values and awareness towards anything like terrorism, corruption and much more.

Education is used to accelerate the reduction of poverty in a sustained manner. As inferred on MoE (2010) that launched the fourth Education Sector Development Program (ESDP IV) by Government of Ethiopia and spanned from 2010/11-2014/15, Ethiopia's development strategy is summarized as the Agricultural-Development-Led Industrialization (ADLI) to transform Ethiopia into a middle-income country. Its broad objectives are to modernize agriculture and improve its efficiency and productivity, ensure food security, create employment opportunities and enhance the country's foreign exchange earnings with the aim to promote the development of a vibrant industrial sector and accelerate overall economic growth if supplemented by education. It demands on the other hand that human resources development be strengthened by training competent and innovative people with special attention to engineering, technology and natural sciences, through introducing high quality science and mathematics curricula at primary and secondary schools and the recently adopted policy of the university intake ratios in favor of science & technology. But, if students do not acquire significant knowledge and skills, Ethiopia will not be able to compete within a global economy. It is necessary therefore to shift attention to quality concerns in general and to those inputs and processes which translate more directly into improved student learning and which help change the school into a genuine learning environment (such as: quality-focused school supervision, internal school leadership, increased student participation, school-community partnerships).

In order to improve such situation variety of school improvement program have been taken place since 1978 as described on Edmonds (1982) that was carried out in five cities of USA starting from 1978-1981 on four models of school improvement program including: The grassroots site-based reform model; Locally mandated reconstitution; A nationally recognized whole school reform and partnership with a local external partner (Borman et al., 2000). By taking in to consideration the lessons learned from supporting basic education programs in different regions of the world, in 2001 a plan began drafting basic guidelines for the school improvement program. These were then adapted and developed and each interested country where Plan has a presence selected 10 primary schools to pilot the program. Until 2004 as described on (Sathyabalan et al., 2004), 20 countries were implementing the school improvement program in hundreds of primary schools across Africa, Asia and America.

Based on this, the government of Ethiopia launched a major nationwide reform program, GEQIP (General Education Quality Improvement Program), in primary and secondary schools, aimed

to improve the quality of general education throughout the country (MoE, 2008). The package was composed of a number of components and sub-components which are complementary to each other and form part of an integrated school effectiveness model. Among the components of the package one is planning of school improvement and of resource use by schools (MoE, 2008; 2010). But, as identified by MoE (2010), the capacity to implement SIP at school and Woreda level is still limited. The SIP monitoring and evaluation system is not yet well established. In the same way as 2014/15 annual report of Somali Regional Education Bureau and Kebridahar City administration education office (SEB, 2015) indicated the implementation (practice) of SIP in secondary school (9-10) did not achieve the target of ESDP IV.

The importance of implementing SIP as indicated in school improvement guideline are: first it enables the school to improve the teaching-learning process by systematically increasing the competency, efficiency and motivation of teachers and the management through various techniques (mutual teaching by correcting weakness by self-evaluation and developing strong unity by exchanges the experiences and the realistic practical training). Second, it increases students' achievement or education and improving the necessary resources for education and to create suitable condition for learning. Third, it increases the participation of parents and the community and their feeling of responsibility by increasing their awareness regarding education and lastly it provides quality of education by providing the necessary resources through the coordination of the community, nongovernmental organizations, in addition to assistance provided by the government (MoE, 2012).

Thus, in the implementation of SIP, leadership takes a lion share (Dea & Basha, 2014). Hence, this study will assess the Perception, Practices and challenges of School Improvement of Program in Kabridahar Government Secondary Schools.

1.2. Statements of the Problem

According to Chapman and Adams (2002), education quality is examined within context, education quality apparently may refer to inputs (numbers of teachers, amount of teacher training, number of textbooks), processes (amount of direct instructional time, extent of active learning), outputs (test scores, graduation rates), and outcomes (performance in subsequent employment). As described by UNICEF (2000), quality education includes learners who are healthy, well-nourished and ready to participate and learn, and supported in learning by their families and communities; environments that are healthy, safe, protective and gendersensitive, and provide adequate resources and facilities; content that is reflected in relevant curricula and materials for the acquisition of basic skills, especially in the areas of literacy, numeracy and skills for life, and knowledge in such areas as gender, health, nutrition, HIV/AIDS prevention and peace; Processes through which trained teachers use child-centered teaching approaches in well-managed classrooms and schools and skillful assessment to facilitate learning and reduce disparities; Outcomes that encompass knowledge, skills and attitudes, and are linked to national goals for education and positive participation in society. Therefore, quality education is the base for all rounded development of any nation that enables individuals and society to make all rounded participation in the development process by acquiring knowledge, ability, skills and attitudes (MoE, 1994).

Based on the importance of quality education, Ethiopia has initiated to reform change to improve teaching-learning and school conditions of the country by developing a General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP) which includes six program components: (i) Teacher Development; (ii) Curriculum improvement; (iii) Leadership and Management improvement, (iv) School Improvement Program (SIP); (v) Civic and Ethical Education; and (vi) Information Communication Technology expansions (MoE, 2008). The school as a social institution needs to adjust itself in order to be in a steady state. One of the mechanisms for this adjustment is improving their overall activities in relation with the needs of the student, parent and community at large that accomplished by SIP. The SIP focuses on four major domains (MoE, 2008): Teaching and learning process, school leadership and management, parents-community school relationship, and safe and healthy school environment. As Mekango (2013), each of these domains is equally important, if anyone is weak, the strength and the success of the whole will be affected. Thus the schools should give due emphasis for each domain.

By putting the domains in considerations, MoE (2010) listed key outcome targets of SIP for primary and secondary education expected at the end of 2015/2016 at national level. Among these one is student teacher ratio is 33.3:1 and the others are student section ratio is 40:1 and 70% students were scoring at least 50% in NLA. In line with these key outcome targets according to the 2014/15 annual report of Somali Regional Education Bureau (SEB, 2015) indicated, student teacher ratio is 27:1; student section ratio is 59:1 and students scored 50% and above in grade 10 NLA are only 56%.

In the same way, the 2015/16 annual report of Kebridahar City administration education office listed, as the student teacher ratio is 43:1; the student section ratio is 62:1 and students scored 50% and above in grade 10 NLA were only 40.71%. Based on these indicators of quality education, implementation of SIP in Kebridahar City administration secondary schools (9-10) is much below than the national standard and even less than average implementation of SIP at regional level. Thus why, this study is very important in Kebridahar City administration secondary schools (9-10) to identify challenges observed in implementation of SIP. For the failures of SIP, Mekango (2013) concluded that difficulty of understanding of school improvement program, shortage of educational finance, lack of school facilities, and limited support from Woreda education office, cluster supervisors; PTA members and lack of practical training on implementing SIP are the major challenges that hinder the implementation of SIP. This proves the challenges identified by MoE (2010) in implementation of SIP. These includes: low capacity to implement SIP at school and Woreda level and low SIP monitoring and evaluation system. In support of this, lack of support, lack of commitment, lack of incentives, lack of understanding and weak collaboration of stakeholders are the main challenges schools' leadership experience in the implementation process of SIP (Dea and Basha, 2014). Furthermore, there are other studies carried out in other parts of the country; including the study conducted by Makango (2013) on secondary school of Metekel zone and the study conducted by Dea and Basha (2014) on primary schools in Wolaita Zone Administration.

However, as far as the knowledge of the researcher is concerned, there is no study conducted on Government Secondary Schools of Kebridahar City Administration regarding perceptions, practices and challenges of School Improvement Program.

So, the study area makes it different from other, since every school's problems are slightly different, this study will be designed, to assess the Perception, Practices and Challenges of School Improvement of Program in Kebridahar Government Secondary Schools.

1.3. Objective of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective of the Study

The general objective of this study is to assess the perceptions, practices and challenges of school improvement program in Kabridahar government secondary schools

1.3.2. Specific Objectives of the Study

1. To investigate teachers and school leaders perception about SIP in government secondary schools of Kabridahar town.
2. To assess the practice of SIP with respect to four domains of the program in the schools under study (Learning and Teaching; Safe School Environment; Leadership and Management; and Community Participation).
3. To explore major challenges that affect school principals in practicing SIP in government secondary schools of the town.

1.4. Basic Research Questions

The following basic research questions will be addressed in the study:

1. How do teachers and school leaders perceive SIP in government secondary schools of Kabridahar town?
2. To what extent is SIP practicing in the schools under study with respect to four domains of the program (Learning and Teaching; Safe School Environment; Leadership and Management; and Community Participation)?
3. What major challenge affects school principals in practicing SIP in government secondary schools of the Kabridahar town?

1.5. Significance of the Study

Assessing the practices of SIP in secondary schools of the town is believed to generate reliable information that help all concerned bodies to facilitate effective implementation of SIP in the study area. Thus, the researcher believed that the findings of this study have the following significances. It may help school managements to acquaint with the existing practices and factors affecting the effectiveness of SIP leadership; and may gain important ideas on how to become successful in their future endeavor in their respective schools. The findings of this study may also provide pertinent information for Educational Managers, decision makers, and all other stakeholders to take actions on major challenges faced the principals while implementing SIP in government secondary schools of the town. Moreover, it may also help supervisors, teachers, parents, students, and other stakeholders to take part in the efforts made to improve the practices of SIP in secondary schools of the town. Besides, the findings of this study may add bits of information to the existing literature in the areas

of SIP implementation; and may serve as additional source of information for those scholars interested to conduct further research on the issue.

1.6. Delimitation of the Study

The challenges facing school principals in practicing SIP may be seen in various schools in the town, Somali and the country at large. Accordingly, it may require carrying out an investigation at all school levels as it provided a comprehensive picture about its implementation and the challenges than what this study would contribute. However, this will be beyond the capacity of the researcher due to various resource related constraints and the purpose of conducting this study. Therefore, to make the study specific and manageable; geographically, the scope of this study was delimited to government secondary schools of Kabridahar town. Kabridahar is preferred as study area, because of the proximity of the study site to the researcher and properly complete the study within the scheduled timeframe. In addition, government secondary schools were selected as a subject of the study because of the researcher's affiliation to observe and get awareness about challenges related to the issue in those schools while work in secondary school of the town in the past recent five years. Moreover, conceptually, this study was delimited to assess issues related to the perceptions, practices and challenges of School Improvement of Program with particular emphasis in the schools under study. In this regard, more emphasis would be made on investigating the perception of teachers and school leaders about SIP; extent of its practices with respect to four domains (Learning and Teaching; Safe School Environment; Leadership and Management; and Community Participation); and major challenges facing school principals in leading SIP practicing in their respective government secondary schools of Kebridahar own.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

By considering the nature and objective of the study, descriptive research design involving both quantitative and qualitative approach will be employed. Since the purpose of this study was gain a detail insight into school principals', directors' and students' perceptions, practices and challenges conducted in naturally occurring inside and outside contexts. To support this, [Cohen, Minion, & Morrison, \(2007:205\)](#) stated that, many educational research methods are descriptive; that is, to describe and interpret the state of affairs of the issues under the study as it exists. Similarly, [Kothari \(2004\)](#) describing the state of affairs as it exists at present is the central aim of descriptive research design.

3.2. Research Setting

The research was conducted at Qorahey zone Secondary School, which is found in Somali Region, Qorahey Zone Ethiopia. The school was purposely chosen for this study for some reason. One, as to the researchers' knowledge, no related study is conducted in this school. Second, the researcher is the desire to work for the benefit of the school since the outcome of this research may indicate some solutions. Finally; the geographical proximity of the research place is another factor that contributes to the selection of the target setting. So, the administrators of the schools, teachers, and students (participants of the study) were facilitated the situations to gather the data.

3.3. Participants of the study

Participants of the study were: School Principals and V/Principals, Members of School improvement committee, PTA Members, Inbuilt supervisors from the schools, and Experts from Education Office & CRC Supervisors at Kabridahar town.

3.4. Sample Size

To determine the number of sample respondents for this study, a formula developed by [Kothari, \(2004:179\)](#) and recommended by [Cohen et al., \(2007:104\)](#) in educational research will be employed. To support this, [Watson \(2001\)](#) selecting the error from the desired level of precision 5%-10% and selecting the sample using scientific evidence making the data empirical. Since this formula has been practically tested and used by scholars for more than four a decade, the researchers were considered the formula to determine correctly the appropriate sample size for this study.

$$n = \frac{Z^2 * p * q * N}{(e^2(N - 1)) + (Z^2 * p * q)}$$

Where:

n= the required sample size

Z² = is the abscissa of the normal curve that cuts off an area α at the tails (1- α equals the desired confidence level. The value for Z is found in statistical tables which contain the area under the normal curve. e.g., Z=1.96 at 95% confidence level; and Z²=3.841).

N= the population size (386)

P= the population proportion (assumed to be 0.5 since this would provide the maximum sample size)

q= 1-p

e = is the desired level of precision or margin of error (9% error or 0.09)

3.5. Sampling Techniques

Among the total number of teachers of the schools, the number of sample size determine for this study was selected using simple random sampling technique from each government secondary schools included in this study. Simple random sampling technique was preferred and used to select sample teacher respondents, because this sampling technique gives equal chance for each members of the population the likelihood of probability of being chosen for the study as a sample. Thus, using name list of teachers from work attendance sheet, the sample respondents will be selected randomly until the required number of sample is obtained from each secondary school included in this study. On the other hand, experts from Kabridahar Education Office & CRC Supervisors, Principals and V/Principals and inbuilt supervisors from the schools were selected using purposive sampling technique.

3.6. Data Gathering Instruments

To achieve the study's objectives, questionnaire, interview, and focus group discussion were employed.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

The questionnaire was the major data collection instrument to collect primary data from sample respondents. It was found to be appropriate and effective tool to collect data for this study from the respondents, because the sample respondents found in the study areas have sufficient level of education to understand and respond the questionnaire. The questionnaire was prepared separately for different group of respondents. In the questionnaire a set of close-ended and open-ended questions for each specific objective of the study was derived from extensive literature. The close-ended

question was developed, with the belief that, it helps the respondents to choose an option from the given alternatives that best fit their responses. In addition, the open-ended question was included in the questionnaire in order to give an opportunity for respondents to express their view, feelings, perceptions, and intensions related to implementation and challenges of SIP in government secondary schools of the town.

3.5. 2. Interview

The purpose of using interview in this study is to collect more supplementary opinion so as to stabilize the data collect through the questionnaire. In this regard, Jacobson (2005) stated that, an interview is used to gather data about the thoughts, outlook and beliefs that the interviewees had about a particular topic. The interview permits greater depth of response which is not possible through any other means. Besides, considering the advantages of its flexibility in which additional questions can be forwarded during the interview session, semi-structure questions will be prepared and administered with Officials from Kabridahar town Education Office that has the responsibility of facilitating and supervising SIP activities in secondary schools of the town.

3.5.3. Focus Group Discussion (FGD)

Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was held with members of student council to collect data regarding their understanding about SIP, their contribution in the implementation of the program, current practices of the program, and about challenges encountered the schools while implementing the program. Furthermore, various data from official documents were collected and analyzed for this study.

3.4.5. Procedures of Data Collection

Primarily, the questionnaire was prepared in English language. Then pilot test was made on randomly selected respondents from kabridahar District (neighboring district) secondary schools. Based on the comments will be given by those respondents, necessary correction will be made and duplicate the questionnaire will be done considering the sample sizes of each group of the respondents. In order to get permission and collect data requires for the study, the researchers primarily established official relationship with concerned bodies of the schools understudy. Then, selection of the sample respondents and conducting orientation programs for respondents on the purpose of the study and how to fill the questionnaires will be carried-out at respective sample schools. Following the orientations, the set of questionnaire will be distributed to the respondents and their response was collected from them. The distribution of the questionnaire for all sample respondents and the collection of the questionnaire from them was carried-out by the researcher himself with the assistance of two train data collectors. Moreover, in the process of data collection assistance was made for those respondents who did not clearly understood the contents of the questionnaire by the two trained data collectors particularly for respondents which was selected from members school improvement committee and PTA members. Moreover, the interview session was administered with the sample

interviewees by the researcher on face-to-face bases and one-to-one bases. This enables the researcher to focus on some specific issues to be raised for different interviewee's separately during the interview session. The question was raised for the interviewees in af-Somali language during the interview session to reduce communication barriers and to obtain more clarified information regarding the subjects of the study. In addition, the collection of data from secondary sources was made by the researcher with the assistance of one responsible person from the schools understudy.

3.5. Validity and Reliability of the Data

In order to assure data quality, the questionnaire prepare for this study was validated and tested at pilot level for its reliability before used as data collection instrument. Primarily, the validity of the instruments was tested by experts to judge the items on their appropriateness and clarity of its contents. Then, the reliability of the questionnaire was tested through pilot study using Cronbach's alpha coefficient used for all parts and items of the questionnaire.

3.6. Methods of Data Analysis

To analyze the data obtained from different sources, various methods of data analysis was employed based on specific nature of the data. Therefore, the collected data was checked, classified, arranged and organized according to their characteristics and specific objectives of the study and was prepared for analysis. In order to analyze and interpret the raw data, the quantitative data was tabulated and processed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS V-20). The analyses of quantitative data were made using descriptive statistics, like frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviations and ranges. Besides, t-test results will be used to analysis the presences of significant differences between two groups of respondents' responses regarding each items of the questionnaire. The results of quantitative data was organized and presented in tables and figures for analysis. Furthermore, analysis and description of them will be made following the data illustrated in each tables and graph. Besides, the qualitative data that was obtain through interview, open-ended questions of the questionnaire, FGD, and from secondary sources (official documents) was discussed in conjunction to the analysis of the quantitative data. This helps the researchers as a supplementary data for triangulation and validation purposes.

3.7. Ethical Consideration

According to Singh (2006.p.221), any researcher who involves human subjects or samples in their research has certain responsibilities towards them. to keep the respondents' confidentiality and privacy their names was not written on the questionnaire or revealed to anyone.

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

4.1. INTRODUCTION

Table 4 .1: 4.2.1. Analysis of the first research objective on the respondents' perceptions towards SIP

Table 4.2: respondents' response on SIP

No	Items	Teacher		Leader		Total		t-	p-
		mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD		

1	SI is about putting in place a set of well-tested processes for identifying the developmental needs of each school	3.95	0.95	4.11	0.96	4.00	0.96		
2	SI programs focus on how schools improve student achievements	4.23	0.89	4.29	0.98	4.25	0.92		
3	Creating an appropriate structure, developing a sound plan and designing a well-established system of communication are the major areas of preparation and readiness to implement a SIP successfully	3.83	0.95	3.86	0.95	3.84	0.95		
4	For success of SIP, understandings of the features of each phases of the program by all stakeholders are always indispensable	3.65	1.06	3.58	1.20	3.63	1.11		
5	In school improvement doing the involvement of parents/community in school governance and decisionmaking should be considered as success factor.	4.17	1.01	4.20	0.96	4.18	0.99		
6	Well trained and committed teachers are always required for successful implementation of SIP at any school levels								
7	The core intention of school improvement program is student achievements in terms of learning outcomes								
8	Successful implementation of SIP constantly needs competent, committed and informed school leaders at the frontline								

NB: Rating scales 1=Very Low, 2=Low, 3=Moderate, 4=High, and 5=Very High.

Concerning perception about school improvement programs both teachers and leaders were asked the questionnaire to indicate their level of agreement using eight items listed in Table 4.2. Accordingly the data illustrated in the table show that, both teachers and leaders level of agreement was found at higher level ($M=4.04$, $SD=1.03$). Besides, the mean score calculated for both teachers and leaders responses illustrated in the table shows better understanding of them about the concepts of school improvement program for all eight items. When respondents' perception was compared between the two groups of respondents, significant variation was not observed between teachers and Leaders in indicating their perception of SIP for the eight items listed in the Table. Furthermore, the results of t-test calculated for each items listed in Table 4.2 and overall perception of the respondents ($t(155,83)=-0.22$; $P=0.98>0.05$) confirmed that, statistically there is no significant differences between teachers and Leaders level of understanding about school improvement programs. That is, teachers and leaders have responded the items synonymously. However, among the eight items of perception, both groups of respondents were rated item number two, that stated about „School improvement programs should focuses on how schools improve student achievements” ($M=4.25$, $SD=0.92$); item number seven, „the core intention of school improvement program is student achievements in terms of learning outcomes” ($M=4.24$, $SD=0.87$); item number five, „in school improvement doing the involvement of parents/community in school governance and decision-making should be considered as success factor” ($M=4.18$, $SD=0.99$); and

item number eight, „successful implementation of SIP constantly needs competent, committed and informed school leaders at the frontline” ($M=4.15$, $SD=1.01$) from first to fourth level in ranking orders. Next to the above four items, both teachers and leaders perceived that, „well trained and committed teachers are always required for successful implementation of SIP at any school levels” ($M=4.01$, $SD=1.21$); and „school improvement is about putting in place a set of welltested processes for identifying the developmental needs of each school” ($M=4.00$, $SD=1.23$) as 5th and 6th levels respectively. Moreover, item number three and item number four were rated 7th and 8th. Accordingly, teachers and leaders perceived that; „creating an appropriate structure, developing a sound plan and designing a well-established system of communication are the major areas of preparation and readiness to implement a SIP successfully” ($M=3.84$, $SD=0.95$); and „for success of SIP, understandings of the features of each phases of the program by all stakeholders are always indispensable” ($M=3.63$, $SD=1.11$). In general, the overall results of the table clearly indicated that secondary schools teachers and leaders in the study area have better theoretical knowledge and understanding about school improvement program. Moreover, there is no significant difference between teachers and leaders in perceiving about SIP.

Preparation and Implementation of SIP

This part comprises the practices of SIP with regards to preparation and readiness of schools; and the actual implementation of the program in the schools under study.

4.3.1. Preparation and Readiness of Schools

Table 4.3: Extent of Preparation and Readiness of the Schools for SIP Implementation

No	Items	Teacher		Leader		Total		t-	p-
		mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD		
1	Preparation of the plan is participatory: involving PTAs, SIC, teachers, students, parents, and other stakeholders	2.21	1.07	2.27	1.15	2.23	1.09		
2	Plan is prepared on the basis of school's self-evaluation.								
3	Plan is clear, simple & understandable								
4	Plan is in alignment with the vision of the school								
5	Plan addresses high priority needs								
6	Plan represents an attempt to improve the performance of all students								
7	Objectives of the plan reflect progress towards improvement								
8	Actions steps for implementation are based on proven strategies								
9	Strategies are designed to achieve objectives of the plan within the established timeline								
10	Evaluation mechanisms are well established								
11	Continuous monitoring mechanisms are clearly defined								
12	Evaluation reports are always used as an input for subsequent years planning.								
13	Plan addresses all the domains of SIP.								
14	Structures required at school level are in place for SIP implementation								
15	The program is well communicated among school society								
16	All organs of the school knows their role on SIP implementation								
17	Resources required for the program are readily available								

NB: Rating scales 1=Very Low, 2=Low, 3=Moderate, 4=High, and 5=Very High.

Creating an appropriate structure, developing a sound plan and designing well-established systems of communication are the major of areas of preparation and readiness to implement a SIP successfully. Considering these facts, seventeen items associated with preparation and readiness of schools for SIP implement were administered to the respondents for rating on a five point scales (5 for Very high, and 1 for Very Low). Most of the items were focused on strategies, goals and objectives structure and communication mechanism for the implementation of SIP. As shown in table 4.3, teachers and leaders working at secondary school level were not satisfactorily agreed with all items. Overall results of respondents responses indicated 2.59 mean score ($SD=1.02$). Moreover, the maximum mean score 3.32 ($SD=0.83$) regarding item number four and the minimum mean score 2.23 ($SD=1.09$) for item number one showed insufficiency of preparation among secondary schools of the City for SIP implementation. Besides, the data of the Table

indicated that, among seventeen items listed in the table, only five of them were rated above overall mean score ($M=2.59$). However, the remaining twelve items were rated below the calculated overall mean illustrated in the table. Among these the following items were rated the least mean score: item number one (The extent of preparation of the plan is participatory; $M=2.23$, $SD=1.09$); item number seventeen (The extent of resources required for the program are readily available; $M=2.28$, $SD=0.87$); item number eleven (The extent of continuous monitoring mechanisms are clearly defined; $M=2.39$, $SD=0.84$); item number thirteen (The extent of the plan addresses all the domains of SIP; $M=2.41$, $SD=0.98$); item number ten (The extent of evaluation mechanisms are well established; $M=2.42$, $SD=1.01$); and item number twelve (The extent of all organs of the school knows their role on SIP implementation; $M=2.44$, $SD=0.98$). The above statements indicated that, the preparation of the plan was not participatory;

resources required for the program are not readily available; continuous monitoring mechanisms are not clearly defined; the contents of the plan did not address all the domains of SIP; evaluation mechanisms for the plan are not well established; and all organs of the school did not properly know their role on SIP implementation. In relation to this, the results of an interview administered with two officials from kabridahar town Education Office also showed insufficiency of preparation and lack of readiness among government secondary schools for SIP Implementation in the City. They said that, the plan was not prepared with the participation of all concerned bodies. Schools did not carry out self-evaluation to prepare the plan. Only school directors prepare and present for School Board's approval at the beginning of every academic years. They further said that, the participation level of students and parents were not to the required level. Planning activities of SIP was a big burden left for the school principals. In the same way, response obtained from FGD indicates similar responses stated by the interviewees. These showed preparation and readiness of SIP implementation needs the effort and commitment of school teachers and leaders to conduct self-evaluation, and to identify the focus areas that the school should give emphasis. Similarly the schools have to prioritize the problem and allocate adequate budget for implementation. In general, seen from the opinion of teachers and leaders at educational office and secondary school level, who involved at school level; the preparation made by the schools for SIP Implementation seems not adequate. Particularly inadequacy of preparation was identified in areas like involvement of stakeholders on the preparation of the plan, developing

appropriate monitoring and evaluation systems, allocating resources required for the plan, addressing all the domains of SIP in the plan, and having proper understanding on their roles in SIP implementation among all organs of the schools under study. From all the above discussions it is possible to infer that involvement of stakeholders in formulating school strategic plan was very low. Thus, it is possible to say that the practices of planning SIP by participating key stakeholders were low in secondary schools that affect SIP implementation. So, without conducting self-evaluation and identifying specific problems areas of SIP and issues related to major domains of SIP, it is difficult to properly implement the plan and obtain efficient results expected from the program.

Implementation of SIP

In this sub-section, respondents' responses related to the implementation of SIP were presented in tables analyzed. The tables were organized for analysis into four categories according to the domains of SIP: Learning and Teaching; Creating Favorable Learning Environment; School Leadership; and Community Participation. Finally, summary of SIP Implementation in Government Secondary Schools of the City was illustrated in table and graph. Learning and teaching domain is the major determinant of students' achievement that indicates what is going in classroom. Not much powerful and sustainable change happened in learning teaching process unless it happens in classrooms (Earl, 2003). This domain focuses on the actual interaction between teachers and students. The implementation of learning and teaching process were rated by the respondents as can be vivid from table 4.4.

Major Challenges of SIP Implementation

No	Items	Teacher		Leader		Total		t-	p-
		mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD		
1	Lack having properly prepared plan for SIP implementations	3.70	1.1	3.93	1.18	3.78	1.11	1.4	0.14
2	Lack of proper understanding of SIP at school level	3.57	1.3	3.72	1.36	3.63	1.30	0.8	0.40
3	Weak monitoring and evaluation system of SIP	3.59	1.3	3.67	1.53	3.62	1.38	0.4	0.65
4	Lack of leadership capacity	3.63	1.3	3.57	1.32	3.61	1.34	-	0.71
		4						0.3	7
								64	
5	Different organs of the school; not properly understanding their role in SIP	3.50	1.4	3.80	1.39	3.61	1.42	1.5	0.13
6	Lack of sufficient stakeholders involvement in SIP	3.47	1.3	3.78	1.33	3.58	1.35	1.7	0.08
7	Giving less attention for SIP	3.43	1.2	3.71	0.82	3.53	1.21	1.8	0.06
		1						83	1
8	Lack of supplies and resources required for SIP implementation	3.38	1.3	3.63	1.09	3.47	1.31	1.4	0.14
		1						60	6
9	Shortage of budget and low financial support	3.43	1.3	3.51	1.37	3.45	1.34	0.4	0.66
		4						36	4
10	Resistance to change among some teachers and others	3.35	1.4	3.60	1.25	3.44	1.40	1.3	0.16
		0						82	8
11	Lack of professional development opportunities linked to the needs of the	3.46	1.5	3.39	1.59	3.43	1.50	-	0.72
		0						0.3	8

	teachers to improve student performance						48
12	Insufficiency of support from the local education authorities	3.43	1.3 6	3.37	1.36	3.41	1.36 83 8
13	Frequent change made in assigning school leaderships	3.31	1.2 8	3.40	1.22	3.34	1.28 14 8
14	Unfavorable nature and context of school neighboring	3.26	1.4 6	3.25	1.70	3.26	1.46 - 0.0 6 55
15	Inappropriate interference of external bodies that create tensions and turbulences	3.26	1.4 6	3.24	1.53	3.26	1.46 - 0.1 7 17
16	Absence of induction programs for newly employed teachers	3.19	1.4 6	3.33	1.64	3.24	1.46 0.6 34 7
17	Shortage of qualified teachers	3.15	1.3 9	3.12	1.49	3.14	1.39 - 0.1 0 77

NB: Rating scales 1=Very Low, 2=Low, 3=Moderate, 4=High, and 5=Very High.

According to the data of this table the most dominant challenges that has been influencing proper implementation of SIP in the study schools includes the following seven items: Lack of having properly prepared plan for SIP implementations ($M=3.78, SD=1.11$); Lack of proper understanding of SIP at school level ($M=3.63, SD=1.30$); Weak monitoring and evaluation system of SIP ($M=3.62, SD=1.38$); Lack of leadership capacity ($M=3.61, SD=1.34$); Different organs of the school; not properly understanding their role in SIP ($M=3.61, SD=1.42$); Lack of 47 sufficient stakeholders involvement in SIP ($M=3.58, SD=1.35$); and Giving less attention for SIP ($M=3.53, SD=1.21$). Moreover, the data of the table further indicated that, Lack of supplies and resources required for SIP implementation ($M=3.47, SD=1.31$); Shortage of budget and low financial support ($M=3.45, SD=1.34$); Resistance to change among some teachers and others ($M=3.44, SD=1.40$); Lack of professional development opportunities linked to the needs of the teachers to improve student performance ($M=3.43, SD=1.50$); and Insufficiency of support from the local education authorities ($M=3.41, SD=1.36$) were also identified as challenges of SIP implementation in the study schools next to the above stated seven factors. However, issues related to Shortage of qualified teachers ($M=3.14, SD=1.39$); Absence of induction programs for newly employed teachers ($M=3.24, SD=1.46$); and Inappropriate interference of external bodies that create tensions and turbulences ($M=3.26, SD=1.46$) were identified as the least factors that influence the success of SIP implementation in Government Secondary Schools of kabridahar town. In general, the data in Table 4.9 illustrated clearly indicated that, Leaders competence, commitment and the effort they made in the implementation of SIP can greatly facilitate or hinder the effectiveness of SIP in their respective school. On the other hands, the interferences of local offices and shortage of qualified teachers in the study area does not greatly affect the success of SIP in the study schools. Moreover, interview responses obtained from official of kabridahar town Education Office also identified similar factors as challenges of SIP implementation in Government secondary schools of the city. They stated that, lack of leadership competence, inappropriate programming, not properly scheduling for SIP implementation, and lack of giving sufficient attention among school

management and teachers as challenges of SIP in the study schools.

4.5. Analysis of Data Collected through Interview

An interview was administered with two officials from **kabridahar town**. Education Office. Concerning preparation and readiness of schools for SIP Implementation, the result of the 48 interview showed that insufficiency of preparation and lack of readiness among government secondary schools for SIP implementation in the city. This was reflected as follow: The plan was not prepared with the participation of all concerned bodies. The respective schools did not carry out self-evaluation to prepare the plan. From the stake holders, only school directors prepare and present for school board's approval at the beginning of every academic year. On the contrary, the participation level of students and parents were not to the required level. At the end, planning activities of SIP was a big burden left for the school principals. In the same way, regarding the implementation of SIP with respect to the four domains, the officials had mentioned that: keeping safety of the schools and the activity of creating favorable learning environment had performed by school management on regular bases with the support of different sector offices of the town. However, they argued that, the effort made in this regard so far was not satisfactory. Moreover, they described insufficiencies of the existing practices related to strategic visions and the degree to which these plans were communicated in government secondary schools of the town. Furthermore, regarding major challenges of SIP implementation seen in the schools understudy, the officials listed the following major challenges that hinder SIP implementation. Those are: Lack of leadership competence, inappropriate programming, not properly scheduling for SIP implementation, and lack of giving sufficient attention among school management and teachers.

4.5.2. Analysis of Data Collected through FGD

The FGD was held with 28 member of student council. The discussion was made on different points related to SIP. Regarding preparation and readiness of schools for SIP implementation, the students gave the following responses briefly. The plan was not prepared with the participation of all concerned bodies. Schools did not carry out self-evaluation to prepare the plan. Out of the

stakeholders, only school directors prepare and present the plan for school board's approval at the beginning of every academic year. Moreover, the participation level of students and parents were not to the required level and planning activities of SIP was a big burden left for the school principals. In the same way, on the discussion point about the implementation of SIP with respect to the four domains, the students forwarded their opinions as follows. Regarding the first domain they said that, school environment was somewhat safe and health concerning the second domain they argued that, the school, was relatively free from harassment and suited to teaching and learning activities. With regard to the third domain, the result of FGD showed that, school leadership, do not know the concept of the strategic vision and not oriented in this regards. Finally concerning the fourth domain students who participate on FGD were argued that, parents have not played the responsibility of their children's education to school teachers though PTA. Because they are expected to have frequent interaction and contact and to follow up and support their children's learning.

4.5.3. Analysis of Data Collected from official Documents

The document analysis was used to see to what extent the SIP was implemented in kabridahar town secondary schools (9-10) included in this study. For this purpose, the 2014/15 annual educational implementation report of kabridahar town administration educational office was used to compare the implementation of SIP with targets listed at national level (Table 4.10).

Table 4.10: Data from Official Documents

in the academic year of 2014/15 annual report of kabridahar town Educational Office showed that the student teacher ratio was 43; the student section ratio was 62 and students scored 50% and above in grade 10 NLA were only 40.71%. Based on these indicators of quality education, the implementation of SIP in kabridahar town secondary schools (9-10) was much below than national target and even less than average implementation of SIP at Regional level. From this one inferred that, SIP was not implemented as expected in the study schools.

5.1. Summary

The purpose of this study was assessing the perceptions, practices and challenges of school improvement program in government secondary schools in kabridahar town. More specifically the study objective gave emphasis to explore teachers' and school leaders perception about SIP; to examine the practices of SIP with respect to four domains of the program in the schools understudy (Learning and Teaching; Safe School Environment; Leadership and Management; and Community Participation); and to identify major challenges that affects the implementation of SIP in government secondary schools of the kabridahar town. In order to attain these objectives the following basic research questions were addressed in the study: How do teachers' and school leaders perceive SIP in government secondary schools of kabridahar town; To what extent is SIP practiced in the schools understudy with respect to four domains of the program; and What major challenge affect school principals in practicing or implementing SIP in government secondary schools of the kabridahar town. The data were collected through questioners, interview, and focus group discussions. The questioners were initially distributed to a total of 262 respondents selected as a sample from four government secondary schools.

Among the distributed questionnaires 238 (90.84%) were appropriately filled and returned. Thus, the analysis and interpretation of the data was made on those questionnaires. Furthermore, the results of interview and Focus group discussions made with students' council were also used in the analysis and interpretation of the data. In addition data obtained regarding SIP from official documents also used for analysis and interpretation of the data made in previous chapter. So, in this part major findings of the study were presented in four parts. The first part presents about background information of the respondents. In the second part issues related to perception of SIP were summarized. The third part summarizes results related to the practicing of SIP. In the fourth part, the results obtained regarding major challenges that affect SIP implementation were presented briefly.

Perceptions of Respondents about SIP

The overall results in this study indicated that secondary schools teachers and Leaders had better theoretical knowledge and understanding about school improvement program ($M=4.04$). Moreover, there is no significant difference between teachers and Leaders in perceiving SIP. However, among eight items of perception included in this study, highest rating results was identified by both groups of respondents for items that stated about „School improvement programs should focuses on how schools improve student achievements“ ($M=4.25$); „the core intention of school improvement program is student achievements in terms of learning outcomes“ ($M=4.24$); „in school improvement doing the involvement of parents/community in school governance and decision-making should be considered as success factor“ ($M=4.18$); 52 and „successful implementation of SIP constantly needs competent, committed and informed school leaders at the frontline“ ($M=4.15$) from first to fourth level in ranking orders.

The Practices of SIP Implementation

Preparation and Readiness of Schools for SIP Implementation
 Considering this, items that focused on strategies, goals, objectives, structure and communication mechanism for the implementation of SIP were administered for respondents ratings. However, teachers and leaders were not satisfactorily agreed with all items. Overall results of respondents responses indicated 2.59 mean score; with the maximum of 3.32 mean score; showing insufficiency of preparation among secondary schools of the town for SIP implementation. The least mean scores were identified regarding items that focuses on the extent of preparation of the plan on participatory bases ($M=2.23$); resources required for the program are readily available ($M=2.28$); continuous monitoring mechanisms are clearly defined ($M=2.39$); the plan addresses all the domains of SIP ($M=2.41$); and all organs of the school knows their role on SIP implementation ($M=2.44$). These indicates, the preparation of the plan was not participatory; resources required for the program are not readily available; continuous monitoring mechanisms are not clearly defined; the contents of the plan did not addresses all the domains of SIP; evaluation mechanisms for the plan are not well established; and all organs of the school did not properly know their role on SIP implementation. Moreover, the results of an interview also showed insufficiency of preparation and lack of readiness among government secondary schools for SIP Implementation in the town.

Implementation of SIP

This focuses on four domains of SIP: Learning and Teaching;

Creating Favorable Learning Environment; School Leadership; and Community Participation. The implementation of learning and teaching process were rated by the respondents of the study above moderate level with aggregated mean value of 2.95. Therefore, it is likely to say that the learning and teaching domain had been implemented moderately in all sample schools. However, the lowest rating result was observed regarding Curriculum ($M=2.55$); indicating; the extent to which curriculum materials have been revised and validated by teachers in terms of appropriateness of its contents, free from gender biases, and relevancy to the context of the school and maturity level of the students had not practiced in secondary schools of the city sufficiently. Moreover, among the four domain of SIP, Creating Favorable Learning Environment is the second one. The result showed that, among all items listed under this domain the mean responses of respondents for items of school facilities was 2.91 mean score, for items focused on student empowerment was 2.89 mean score and regarding items related to student support was 2.93 mean score. This indicates that respondents rated the practices of creating favorable learning environment below moderate level. Besides, an interview results obtained from interview administered with kabridahar town Education Office officials regarding creating favorable learning environment among government secondary schools found in the City also confirmed what was responded by teachers and leaders of the schools understudy. The third domain of SIP was about School leadership and management; which has a vital role for the effectiveness of the implementation school improvement programs. In this regards, the results showed that, teachers and leaders rated strategic vision the lowest mean scores ($M=2.48$) without significant differences between two groups of the respondents. While teachers and leaders rated the leadership behavior and items related to school management almost with similar mean score (2.67 and 2.69) better than items related to rated strategic vision. The overall results of teachers" and leaders" ratings ($M=2.63$) indicated, almost lower level efforts made by School Leadership to succeed the implementation of SIP in their respective secondary schools. In addition to teachers and leaders, officials from kabridahar town Education Offices during interview session also described insufficiencies of the excising practices related to strategic visions and the degree to which these plans were communicated in government secondary schools of the town. The fourth domain of SIP School community relations is refers to a process of communication between the school and the community for the purpose of increasing citizen understanding educational needs, practices, interest and cooperation showed that participation of community was determining factor for success of SIP. With regards to this the results of respondents rating indicated that, both groups of respondents rated all the items as medium. This was also supported by the aggregate mean score 3.11 which is in the medium range. As a result, it appears that parents have not sufficiently played the responsibility of their children's education to school teachers though they are expected to have frequent interaction and contact and to follow up and support their children for better performance moderately. Overall, summary results of SIP implementation in the study schools with regards to the four domains indicated that, the implementation of SIP in secondary schools of kabridahar town administration was not efficient. It was found below moderate level ($M=2.87$). However, when the status

of SIP implementation was compared among the four domains, significant variation was observed; in that, issues related to community participation ($M=3.11$) were relatively implemented better than the remaining three domains. Moreover, the implementation status related to learning teaching and Creating Favorable learning Environment issues were also rated 2.95 and 2.92 mean score respectively. On the other hand, issues emphasized on school leadership were not implemented as other domains (2.63 mean score). This implies that, the practices of SIP was better regarding school relationship with community; but weak with regards to managing and leading the program to be successfully implemented in the schools under study.

Major Challenges of SIP Implementation

As identified by both group of respondents, the most dominant factors that has been influencing proper implementation of SIP in the study schools includes the following seven items: (i) Lack of having properly prepared plan for SIP implementations ($M=3.78$); (ii) Lack of proper understanding of SIP at school level ($M=3.63$); (iii) Weak monitoring and evaluation system of SIP ($M=3.62$); (iv) Lack of leadership capacity ($M=3.61$); (v) Different organs of the school; not properly understanding their role in SIP ($M=3.61$); (vi) Lack of sufficient stakeholders involvement in SIP ($M=3.58$); and (vii) Giving less attention for SIP ($M=3.53$). Moreover, Lack of supplies and resources required for SIP implementation ($M=3.47$); Shortage of budget and low financial support ($M=3.45$); Resistance to change among some teachers and others ($M=3.44$); Lack of professional development opportunities linked to the needs of the teachers to improve student performance ($M=3.43$); and Insufficiency of support from the local education authorities ($M=3.41$) were also identified as challenges of SIP implementation in the study schools next to the above stated seven factors. However, issues related to Shortage of qualified teachers ($M=3.14$); Absence of induction programs for newly employed teachers ($M=3.24$); and Inappropriate interference of external bodies that create tensions and turbulences ($M=3.26$) were identified as the least factors that influence the success of SIP implementation in Government Secondary Schools of the City. In general, the results indicated that, leaders" competence, commitment and the effort they made in the implementation of SIP can greatly facilitate or hinder the effectiveness of SIP in their respective school. On the other hands, the interferences of local offices and shortage of qualified teachers in the study area does not greatly affect the success of SIP.

Conclusions

It was implied that successful school improvement is related to systematically planning, monitoring and evaluation process which could be achieved through collective efforts of all stakeholders. They should encouraged to have active participation in SIP planning and implementation by continuously creating awareness among them. The extent of providing monitoring and evaluation by concerned bodies and school leadership capacity determine the extent of stakeholders" participation in planning and implementing SIP. Therefore, based on the findings of the study the following conclusions were drawn. In this study, it is found that overall process of SIP practices lacks having properly prepared plan for SIP implementations; understanding of SIP at school level, weak monitoring and evaluation system; lack of leadership capacity; different organs of the school not had proper understanding of their

role in SIP; lack of sufficient stakeholders involvement in SIP and giving less attention for SIP implementation. This implies that low involvement of key stakeholders in planning and implementing SIP was the most challenge affecting its success in secondary schools found of the city. Majority of schools implement SIP at moderate level of performance with respect to four domains of SIP. However, the practice of SIP with regards to community participation was relatively better. Whereas, the practices of SIP activities concerning leadership and management domain showed unsatisfactory level of performance at the schools under study. This indicated that, the practices of SIP was better regarding school relationship with community; but weak with regards to managing and leading the program to be successfully implemented in the study schools. According to the findings of this study, majority of school organs had not properly familiar with their roles on SIP implementation. That is, they could not be able to contribute to SIP implementation starting from planning to monitoring and evaluation of the program. Thus, without conducting self-evaluation and identifying specific problem areas of SIP and issues related to major domains of SIP, it is difficult to properly implement the plan and obtain efficient results expected from the program. On the other hand, lower level of involvement among stakeholders in SIP implementation, inadequate planning of SIP process, lack of training on SIP implementation, lack of leadership commitment to implement SIP, lack of understanding of stakeholders at school level on SIP implementation were reported to be the challenges of SIP implementation at present. This disappointing results confirmed inadequate consideration given to the importance of school improvement program among school leaders and other stakeholders.

Recommendations

- The finding of the study indicates that conducting self-evaluation and prioritizing problems to develop strategic plan of SIP was weak. Therefore, the school leadership have to give attention to participatory planning in developing strategic plan that entirely involves conducting self-evaluation by participating key stakeholders (like teachers, students and parents) and deploy by building consensus among them for effective program implementation.
- The central focus of SIP was improving students' achievements. In order to improve academic achievements of students, therefore, the schools should implement school improvement program properly by making awareness among stakeholders which would improve the practices of collaborative planning; to develop accountability and responsibility in all stakeholders; to improve the implementation of the four domains of SIP; to perform continuous monitoring and evaluation on the implementation of SIP.
- The study indicates that SIP plan was developed by individual school leaders or a few individuals were involved in the planning process. The involvement of stakeholders in the planning of SIP was very low. To improve the challenges related to planning even implementation, all stakeholders should be involved in planning process. To do so, school leaders are expected to organize stakeholders to actively participate in planning SIP in their respective schools.
- In order to improve students' achievement in teaching learning process, Practicing and developing the extent of SIP implementation was crucial. As the study make known, the community involvement in improving teaching learning was the most critical issue which was not achieved yet. So Education Officers and school leaders should make great effort to strengthen their relationship with local authorities and communities by creating educational forum so that they could get necessary support from them. In addition, creating mechanisms that enable school principals, teachers, parents, students and educational officials at every level of education sectors to work all together, trust each other on SIP implementation is vital.
- The findings of this study showed that the allocation of budget for implementation of SIP seems insufficient. Therefore, the government should allocate additional budget to the school grant for successful implementation of SIP. Moreover, in order to solve challenges of finance and material resource, the schools should design income-generating mechanisms by taking in to account the available school facilities and technical experts to make involvement of all stakeholders of the school.
- Monitoring and evaluation on the SIP were not under taken properly. Therefore, Educational Officers and schools should give attention for monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for the success of SIP.
- Finally, though the findings of this study identify major challenges that affect the practices of SIP implementation in secondary schools of the city, there may be other specific factors not assessed through this study. So, to identify such factors and to take proper actions on time; it is advisable if further research is conducted on issues related to SIP in all schools of the town.

References

1. Arcaro, Jerome J.(1997). Quality in Education an Implication of Handbooks. New Delhi
2. Barnes, F. (2004). Inquiry and action: Making School Improvement Part of Daily Practice. Retrieved from <http://annenberginstitute.org/publication/inquiry-and-action-making-school-improvement-part-daily-practice> on September/2015
3. Borman, G., Rachuba, L., Datnow, A., Alberg, M., MacIver,

M., String field, S., and Ross, S. (2000). Four Models of School Improvement Successes and Challenges In Reforming Low-Performing, High-Poverty Title I Schools, Report № 48. Retrieved from <http://www.jhucos.com/wpcontent/uploads/2016/04/report48.pdf> on 30/09/2015.

4. Chapman, D., and Adams, D. (2002). Education in developing Asia (Volume 5): The quality of education: dimensions and strategies. Asian Development Bank, Hong Kong
5. Cohen, L.; Manion, L.; and Morrison, K. (2007). Research Methods in Education (6th Edition). London: Routledge - The Taylor & Francis Group
6. Dea,L.M. & Basha, T.T. (2014). Leadership challenges facing school principals in implementation of general quality education improvement program: the case of Wolaita Zone Town Administration. Wudpecker Journal of Educational Research, 3(4), 059 – 069.
7. Duignan, P.A., & Macpherson, R.J.S. (Ed). (2004). *Educative leadership: A practical theory for new administrators and managers*. The Falmer Press, London.
8. Edmonds (1982). Program of school improvement. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/> on 30/09/2015.
9. EIC (2000). School improvement planning: A hand book for principals, teachers, and school councils. Retrieved from <https://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/> on September/2015
10. Fullan, M.(2001). The New Meaning of Educational change: London Cassell.
11. Gravity (2011). Education Services – Education Solution, Education Needs: Importance of Education – Why It Is Important In life. Retrieved from <https://myeducationservices.wordpress.com> on October 2014.
12. Grover, S & Singh, N. (2002). The quality of primary education: A Case study of Madurai & Villupuram Districts in Tamilnadu. Retrieved from www.earthinstitute.columbia.edu
13. Johnson, B., and Christensen, L. (2012). Educational Research Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches. UCOM: University of South Alabama
14. Harris, A. (2002). School improvement: What's in it for schools? London: Routledge Falmer. Harris, A. and Linda Lambert (2003).Building Leader ship Capacity for Improvement. Philadelphia, Open University Press.
15. Hopkins,D. (2001) School Improvement for Real. London, Rutledge.
16. Incoing, T. (1999). Managing Effective Schools:SBM experience. Retrieved on October.26,2015 from www.linkpdf.com.
17. Khosa G. (2009). Sustainable School Improvement: A partnership between the State, the private Sector and Civil Society. Retrieved on Nov.16,2015 from www.jet.otga.za.
18. Kothari, C. (2004). Research Methodology (2nd Ed.). New Delhi: New Age International Limited Publishers.
19. Kruger.A.G. (1996). School Management: International and External environment. Pretoria. University of South Africa.
20. Langridge, D. (2004). Introduction to Research Methods and Data Analysis in Psychology. New York: David Fulton publisher
21. Leedy,P.D and Ormrod,,J.E.(2005).Practical research planning and design(8thEd).New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall
22. Lockheed and Verspoor (1991). Improving primary education in developing countries. London:Casell
23. Marsha, C (1988). Spotlight on School Improvement. Singapore: Kim Hup Lee Printing Plc. Ltd.
24. Mekango , A. (2013). Practices and Challenges of Implementation of School Improvement Program in Secondary Schools of Metekel Zone (MA Thesis).
25. MoE (1994).Education and Training Policy: Federal Democratic Republic Government of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa. St. George Printing Press
26. MoE (2004). ESDP Program Implementation manual (revised Version). Ministry of Education, Addis Ababa
27. MoE (2008).General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP). Addis Ababa
28. MoE (2010). Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP IV): Program Action Plan. Addis Ababa MoE (2010). School Improvement Program Guidelines. Addis Ababa: MOE-General Education
29. MoE (2012). School Improvement Program (SIP): Implementation, Challenges and Policy Implications: Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Analysis Report. Addis Ababa: USAID/IQPEP in Ethiopia
30. OEB (2015). Oromia Regional Governmental Administration: GTP-II: General education sector. OEB, Addis Ababa
31. Robtalsall (1998). Teachers' Research and School Improvement: Opening Door from the Inside. England Bristol and USA: Open University Press
32. Sathyabalan, V., Tran,H., Ngwata, W., Cardenas, M., Alainchar, F. (2004). School improvement program retrieved from <http://www.eird.org/herramientas/eng/documents> on 30/09/2015
33. South Worth, G. (2004). Primary School Leader ship Context: leading small, medium and Large Sized Schools. London, Rutledge Farmer.
34. UNICEF (2000).Defining Quality in Education. Retrieved from <http://www.unicef.org/educaon> September/2015
35. Vidyarth, K. (2015). Top 15 Reasons Why Education is extremely important. Retrieved from <http://listsurge.com/top-15-reasons-education-important> on October 2014
36. World Bank (2004). Improving Primary Education in Ghana: An Impact Evaluation. Washington: The World Bank.