

**THE PRACTICES OF SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT IN SECONDARY
SCHOOLS OF KEFA SOUTHERN NATION NATIONALITIES AND
PEOPLES OF ETHIOPIA.**



**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

BY: ABERA AERO

**A RESEARCH SUBMITTED TO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT JIMMA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP**

October , 2022

JIMMA, ETHIOPIA

**THE PRACTICES OF SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT IN SECONDARY
SCHOOLS OF KEFA SOUTHERN NATION NATIONALITIES AND
PEOPLES OF ETHIOPIA.**



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

BY: ABERA AERO

ADVISOR: Dr. MEBRATU TAFESSE

CO –ADVISOR: FEDLU ABBA GUMBUL (MA)

**A RESEARCH SUBMITTED TO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT JIMMA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP**

October , 2022

JIMMA, ETHIOPIA

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis entitled “**The Practices Of School Based Management In Kefa Zone Secondary Schools, Southern Nation Nationalities And Peoples Of Ethiopia.**” is my original work and has not been presented by other individual; and that all the source materials used for this thesis have been dully acknowledged.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

This thesis has been submitted for examination by my approval as the college advisor.

Confirmed by: Name: _____ (Thesis Advisor)

Signature: _____

Date: _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and for most, I would like to express my unshared thanks to the Almighty God for allowing me to get this success and for his mercy. Then I would extend the deep and heartfelt thanks to my advisors, Mebratu Tafesse (PhD) and my co –advisor Fedlu Abba Gumbul (MA), whom I frequently consulted in matters of my study, without their great deal of contribution from the very beginning up to the end of this investigation it would be very difficult and even impossible for me to complete the study. Finally, I would like to thanks my respondents from education office heads and experts, principals, supervisors, teachers, and PTA committee member

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	i
Table of Contents	ii
ABREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	v
ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER ONE	1
Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	4
1.3 Basic Research Questions	5
1.4. Objectives of the Study	6
1. 4.1 General Objective	6
1.4.2 Specific Objectives	6
1.5 Significance of the Study	6
1.6 Delimitation of the Study	7
1.7 Limitation of the study	7
1.8 Operational Definition of key Terms	8
1.9 Organization of the Study	8
CHAPTER TWO REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
2.1 Concept of School Based Management	9
2.2 The Objectives of School Based Management	10
2.3 The Rational for School Based Management.....	10
2.4 The Principles of School Based Management.....	11
2.5 The Components of School Based Management	12
2.5.1 Developing school policies.....	12
2.5.2 Personnel Management.....	12
2.5.3 Financial and Material Resource Management	12
2.5.4 Instructional Leadership or School based Curriculum.	13
2.6 The Practice of School Based Management around the World	13
2.7 The School Based Management Practices in Ethiopia.....	14

2.8.The Effect of practices of SBM on Schools goal achievement.....	16
2.8.1 Ignite High Expectations from School	17
2.8.2 Emphasis on Educational leadership	17
2.8.3 Create Consensus and Cohesion among School Community.....	17
2.8.4 Promote Parental Involvement	18
2.8.5 Secure Effective learning time.....	18
2.9 Challenges of the SBM Practices	18
CHAPTER THREE	21
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	21
3.1 Design of the Study	21
3.2 Research Method.....	21
3.3 Sources of Data	22
3.4 The Population of the Study.....	22
3.5 Sample and Sampling Techniques of the Study.....	22
3.6 Data Collecting Instruments.....	23
3.6.1 Questionnaires	23
3.6.2 Interview	24
3.6.3 Focus Group Discussion.....	24
3.7 Reliability and Validity of Instruments.....	24
3.8 Methods of Data Analysis	26
3.9 Ethical Consideration	26
CHAPTER FOUR.....	27
4.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents.....	27
CHAPTER FIVE.....	38
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	38
5.1 Conclusions	41
5.2 Recommendations	43
References	45
Questionnaire	56
Interview	62

List of table

Table 3.1: Sample size determination	23
Table 4. 1. Background of Respondents	27
Table 4. 2: Academic Staff Development	28
Table 4. 3 : Decision-Making process.....	30
Table 4. 4: The School Resources Management	33
Table 4. 5 : Monitoring and Evaluation Process	36

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CPD	Continuous Professional Development
DfID	Department for International Development
EEGRA	Ethiopian
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
ETP	Education Training Policy
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GTP1	Growth and Transformation Plan
HRM	Human Relation model
IPM	Internal Process model
KETB	Kebele Education Training Board
MOE	Ministry Of Education
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PTA	Parent Teachers Association
SBM	School Based Management
SNNP	Southern nation nationalities and peoples
SER	School Effectiveness Research
SIR	School Improvement Research
SPSS	Statistical Package of Social Sciences
WEO	Woreda Education Office

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the practices of school based management in secondary schools of Kefa Zone. Descriptive research design with concurrent collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data was employed. Both primary and secondary sources of data were used. The data was collected through questionnaires, interviews, and FGD and document analysis. The quantitative data were analyzed through frequency, percentages, mean and SD whereas the qualitative data were narrated and explored in words. The study was conducted on 132 sample size as respondents, and the collected data was analyzed through frequency, percentages, Mean and SD and the qualitative data was analyzed through thematic analysis. The finding of this study shows that the staff development and instructional leadership process were perceived at adequate level of practice. Besides the students' gross and net enrollment rate as well as fair or equal enrollment rate of female to male students. This study also found that the SBM practices in the schools were constrained with problems such as: Inconsistency of mentoring newly employed teachers, lack of providing school based on job training and evaluating its effect on staff development, Inadequate practice of participatory decision making, lack of effective monitoring and evaluation procedures and inconsistency of providing effective supervisory function, inadequate survival rate of students at these secondary schools, low participation of pupils in class room instruction, inability of students in cooperative learning skills, low achievement of students in reading, writing and arithmetic skills, lack of parental support and inability of making conducive school environment which attract students for learning. Therefore, based on the finding of the study, the researcher concluded that as one of the SBM the staff development and instructional leadership process were perceived at adequate level of practices in contrast the practices of participatory decision making, monitor and evaluation, resources management as well as function of supervision were at inadequate level of practices, and the participation of community in setting the school priorities, the involvement of school –community in allocation of resources to exercise the school and engagement of external audit resources utilization are at in adequate level of implementation. Finally, based on the finding and conclusion, the researcher recommended that the school principals, KETB, PTA committee members and the whole school community should actively participate in SBM practices in regard of setting the school developmental plan, allocation of necessary resources in school improvement.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This section of this study includes about back ground of the study, statement of the problem, basic research questions, objectives of the study, significance of the study, limitation delimitation, operational of key words and organization of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

School based management is decentralization of authority to the school level (World Bank, 2014). It is transfer of responsibilities and decision-making over school operations and school management to principals, teachers, parents, sometimes students and other school community members (Caldwell, 2005).The decentralized educational management is an ideology of ensuring the improvement of all teachers and local community at site level (Hogue, 2007). The school level actors, however, have to, or operate, with in a set of centrally determined policies (Caldwell, 1998). School based management (SBM) framework pays attention on school effectiveness to enhance students' outcome through devolution of responsibilities to the site stakeholders' (Lauglo, 1993). It provided the schools with enhanced flexibility and autonomy in managing their own operation and resources to create an environment that facilitate continuous school effectiveness (Botha, 2011).

Thus the ultimate aim of SBM is to improve teaching standard and learning outcomes through increased accountability of school management by involving key stack holders such as teachers, students, principals, parents and other community member in decision-making of school affairs under the SBM governance framework to address school effectiveness (Leithwood and Earl, 2000). Because, SBM practice enhance the accountability of principals and teachers to their students, parents and teachers themselves (World Bank, 2004).

Scholars such as Botha (2011) stated the school based management practice involves the schools to adapt external and internal environment and it should enhance environmental analysis, systematic planning, appropriate staffing and directing, constructive evaluation, leadership and participatory decision-making. He also suggested SBM empowers the school leaders to develop vision, mission, value, strategies and operational directions as well as sourcing, mobilizing, allocating and utilizing material and human resources effectively and efficiently in a sense of

transparency and accountability to ensure schools' effectiveness (Botha, 2011). Another scholar Hogue confirmed SBM enhance the local decision-makers to adapt the appropriate mix of inputs and education policies to meet local realities and needs so as to facilitate school effectiveness (Hogue, 2007).

The popularity of SBM is evidenced by the large number of development agencies promoting it as a key component of the decentralization reforms and the growing number of countries that have adopted aspects of this approach (Gertler, Patrinos and Codina, 2007). The reason why the School based management reform was recently accelerated in education system through the world is due to demand of increasing education quality standard without necessarily investing more resources (World Bank, 2004). According Verger and Antilyelken (2011) the increasing international pressure stemming from international standardized test, loan conditionality, the EFA (education for all) action frame work and so, more and more governments are open to experimenting with innovative ways of education delivery and in adapting new managerial approaches and the same is true for expansion of the practice of a SBM over the world.

Now a days many governments and international agencies are increasingly interested in finding ways to boost learning outcomes and get maximum benefit from their education investment especially in developing countries (Gertler, patrinos and Condina, 2007). Their education systems are usually highly centralized and have very strong teachers, teachers often lack strong incentives and accountability mechanisms, which result in high teachers absenteeism rates (Banerjee and Duflo, 2006; Chaudhury and others, 2006). This enforced the policy- makers and researchers in developing countries to concentrate their focus on introducing SBM or decentralization of school management to place education resources, decision-making and responsibilities closer to the beneficiary at school level (World Bank, 2003).

The practices of SBM in Ethiopian schools was introduced and widely used following the introduction of decentralized educational management system since the implementation of education and training policy of the country (MOE, 2005). The major objectives of the education policy were enhancing the relevance, quality, equity, access and efficiency of education system (MOE, 1994). This is because previously the education sector of our country was faced with very high problems on these issues (MOE, 2000). For example in 1994 the gross enrollment rate was 30% at elementary, 13% in secondary and less than 1% at tertiary levels. The

gross enrolment rate 30% at primary was one of the lowest in the world and even less than half of average for sub-Saharan African countries (MOE, 1994). These limitations enforced the government of Ethiopia in developing education training policy and giving high concern on decentralized education management that later focus more on the SBM practices by devolving duties, responsibilities and authorities to local schools which systematically and gradually intend to alleviate above mentioned educational problems(MOE, 2002; Worknesh, 2012).

The government also designed the education sector development program (ESDP), which is a long range-rolling plan with a focus on the comprehensive development of education over twenty- year period. The main thrust of ESDP is to improve education quality and expand access to education with especial emphasis on primary education in rural and underserved areas as well as the promotion of girls' education (MOE, 1997/98). The final goal of the ESDP for the primary education in a universal primary enrolment by the year 2015 and at the same time improving quality, equity and efficiency of the system at all levels which calls for strong SBM practice in all regions of the country.

Generally, implementation of SBM over the world as well as in our country concentrates attention on enhancing the autonomous and responsibility of site mangers, empowering the local community in decision-making of school affairs, encouraging the involvement of school community in school improvement programs developing the transparency and accountability of both top and site leaders, making cooperation among members of school to ensure the effectiveness of school through achieving enhanced students learning outcomes(MOE 2008; 2010).

Therefore, this survey study was intended to assess the overall practices of the school based management in secondary schools of Kefa zone. Beside this it indicated some of the mechanisms to be employed to enhance the SBM practices in the secondary schools of Kefa zone, SNNP regional government.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

School based management is key element of educational decentralization that allows the schools to exercise their autonomy in sense of accountability and responsibilities through devolution of decision-making authority to principals, teachers, parents and other community members at the school site (Hague , 2007). Global trends show that SBM is one of the widely used educational managerial reforms which are being practiced in various countries (Gertter, Patrinos and Codina, 2007). The SBM practices empower the commitment and autonomy of local school leaders in changing the progress of their schools (Bandur, 2012).

The practices of SBM in Ethiopian educational and management system has officially been introduced and adopted to Education and Training Policy of the country to create the necessary condition in expanding, enriching and improving the relevance, quality, access, enrolment and equity of education and training policy (MOE, 2002). The practice of this issue has providing rapid success in access, enrollment and equity goal attainments but faced with the problem of quality in education system (MOE, 2015).

For instance Abenet (2016) stated the practice of decentralized education management at the schools resulted achievement in students enrolment, accesses, equity and leadership process but lacks uniformity from region to region specially in decision-making process, communication in school planning, school based capacity building, instructional leader ship, monitoring and coaching functions, resources allocation, community mobilization and parental involvement in students' academic success. Another researcher Wubet (2015)suggested lack of sufficient instructional and professional material to build teachers' professional capacity, inability of organizing short term trainings and experience sharing programs are challenges affecting primary school administration. Moreover Obasaa (2010) forwarded the lack of the necessary resource and trained manpower at the local level is challenges of SBM to improve school effectiveness.

Finally Mekonnen(2015)recommended coordination of educational personnel, assigning the right person in the right place, provision of adequate resources, the provision of training, adequate participation of stake holders, addressing clear roles and responsibilities, and creating conducive environment are mechanisms to enhance SBM.

Therefore, this study is different by that , it specifically focus on the practices of school based management and certain constraints that affecting the implementation of school based management in secondary schools of Kefa zone.

The report showed none of the secondary schools of Kefa zone have arrived at quality standard level 3 or 4 which is the maximum expected quality assurance level Kefa zone education office, 2011). As the data taken from Kefa Zone education bureau (2022) asserted that from 52 secondary schools currently find in Kefa Zone, 68% of them are under standard, which are not qualified with set principles of MoE, and the rest 32% of them are meet the set standards. This result of the report initiated the researcher to conducted study on the practices of school based management in Kefa Zone secondary schools, with the respect to staff development, decision making process, and financial and material resources management and monitoring. Therefore, this report indicated there is great gap on enhancing the quality level of schools' toward standards which demands for committed and competent SBM practices.

So the education system in Kefa zone has facing with a great problem in promoting the schools toward standards and goal achievement which needs a strong SBM practices. Because effective SBM inspires the responsibility and accountability of school stake holders through creating healthier teaching-learning environments, enhancing participatory decision making, involving stronger school community relationship, developing good leadership, providing participatory instructional process and improving student academic out comes to attain the desired school goals(Khattri, Ling and Jha, 2012).

Therefore, the purpose of this research was to assess the practices of school based management. It provided the most constraining challenges which are affecting the SBM practices. Indeed, this study was aimed to justify mechanisms undertaken to improve SBM process to attain the desired school goals in Kefa zone, SNNP regional government.

1.3 Basic Research Questions

1. How school is based management effectively practiced in secondary schools of Kefa zone?
2. Do stake holders effectively participating in implementing the school based management practices in the study area?

3. What mechanisms are employed to enhance the function of SBM practices in secondary schools of kefa zone?

4. What are the major challenges which are affecting the implementation of SBM in secondary schools of kefa zone?

1.4. Objectives of the Study

1.4.1 General Objective

The main objective of this study was to assess the practices of school based management in Kefa zone secondary schools.

1.4.2 Specific Objectives

The following specific objectives were addressed by this research:

- To evaluate how school based management is effectively practiced in secondary schools of Kefa zone
- To assess whether or not stake holders effectively participating in implementing the school based management practices in the study area
- To identify the mechanisms are employed to enhance the function of SBM practices in secondary schools of kefa zone
- To identify the major challenges which are affecting the implementation of SBM in secondary schools of kefa zone

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study is crucial for key stockholders such as teachers, principals, parents, students and other community members who are responsible and participating in SBM governance frame work in Kefa zone, secondary schools. It may expands their insight about what challenges are affecting the practices of SBM and provide feedback how to solve these constraints so as to develop effective SBM practices at the locality.

Generally, the results of the study may have the following significant contributions. Hence, it informs the Woreda education office leaders' and experts' how to monitor the school site leaders' commitment in SBM practices. This study may give clues on how the school community is involved to mobilize, allocate and utilize financial and material resource at the schools.

The result of this study may also help teachers' involvement in SBM practices for effective instructional leadership and curriculum management processes.

1.6 Delimitation of the Study

School based management is one of the recently used education managerial reforms which are being practiced in various developed and developing countries around the globe (World Bank, 2004). The issue of SBM practice in educational management in our country has got focus since the adoption and implementation of educational decentralization in education and training policy of Ethiopia (MOE, 2002). Even though, the practice of SBM accounted more than 10 years in the country the level of implementation from Woreda to Woreda (school to school) still varies.

So, this research was delimited to assess the practices of school based management in Kefa zone secondary schools that particularly focused on components of school based management such as personal management, financial and material resources management, and instructional leadership managements .Finally, the constructs of SBM practices assessed under this inquiry were (staff development, decision-making process, instructional leadership, financial and material resources management, monitoring)

1.7 Limitation of the study

Even though, the researcher overcame the existed limitation, and accomplished this thesis, there were limitations; the first limitation was an unavailability of secondary data that can be easily accessed for the purpose. The other significant challenge was the willingness of the respondent to fill the questioner due fear of threating of the result of the study. In this regard, some of the respondents also seemed sensitive about revealing confidential cooperative information, which increased the difficulty of doing this research. However, the researcher managed these limitations by persuaded the respondents about the purposes of this study and created awareness about the aim of the study and peacefully convinced them to filled the questionnaires voluntarily.

1.8 Operational Definition of key Terms

School based management (SBM): It is transfer of responsibilities and decision-making authority over school operations and school management to principals, teacher , parents, students and other school community members or else it is decentralization of authority to school site , which refers to in the contest of this study

Instructional leadership process: refers to leading teaching learning process and managing the curriculum through observation of classroom teaching learning process and providing professional support to enhance students' academic and behavioral out comes.

Conducive or safe school environment: Is the school environment that initiates and attracts learners' attention and secular for all those who are involved in teaching learning process.

School resource mobilization and management: refers to the process of collecting available financial and material resources as well as utilizing it efficiently on SBM practice.

1.9 Organization of the Study

This research has organized to five chapters. Chapter one deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, the objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, definition of key terns and organization of the study. Chapter two focuses on the review of related literatures. The third chapter deals with the research design and methodology. The fourth chapter is about presentation , analysis and interpretations , and the last chapter is discuss major finding, conclusion and recommendation.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of literature on practices and challenges of school based management focusing on the conceptual and practical aspects of the issue both in global as well as national practices . The first section reviews Concept of School Based Management. The second section deals with The Objectives of School Based Management. The third section shows the Rational for School Based Management. The fourth section is about the Principles of School Based Management. The fifth section concerns on Components of School Based Management. The sixth section regards the Practices of School Based Management around the World. The seventh section is about the Introduction of SBM practice in Ethiopia. The eighth section deals on the Effect of practices of SBM over Schools goal achievement. The last section concerns Challenges of SBM Practices.

2.1 Concept of School Based Management

School based management is a reform movement which consists allowing schools more autonomy in decisions about their management: that is, in use of their human, material and financial resources to impact school effectiveness' (Ayeni1 and Ibukun 2013; Oswald 2014). It is also referred as school based governance: school self-management, decentralized educational management or school site management (Leithwood and Earl 2000).

World Bank (2014) stated that SBM is the decentralization of authority to school level. It involves transfer of responsibility and decision making over school operations and school management to principals, parents, sometimes students and other community members. The school level actors however, have to conform to, or operate, with in a set of centrally determined policies (Caldwell 1998). The basic principles around SBM is that giving school–level actors more autonomy over school affairs will result in school improvement as they are in better position to make decision to meet the school needs in a more efficient manner (Malen, Ogawa and Kranz 1990).

Generally SBM is a management frame work which is school based student centered and quality focused through devolution of responsibilities. Schools are provided with enhanced flexibility and autonomy in managing their own operations and resources so as to provide an environment that may facilitates continuous improvement. At the same time schools are also required to

increase accountability in school management through the participation of key stakeholders in decision-making under the school based management governance frame work Hong Kong city education and manpower Bureau report (2006).

2.2 The Objectives of School Based Management

The ultimate objective of school based management is to improve teaching standard and learning outcomes as suggested by Hong Kong city education and manpower Bureau report (2006). The objective of school based management is to empower and given full autonomy and freedom for school site leaders, enhance service deliver and quality of output will improve and implementation efficiency increases drastically (Donald and Boon-Ling, 2007). The SBM is a means to an end, which is providing good quality education to students and improving school management, transparency and accountability (Gertler, Patrinos and Codina 2007). Beside the objective of SBM is to enhance organizational productivity and quality service deliver through increased accountability felling and management ownership (Donald and Boon-Ling, 2007).

2.3 The Rational for School Based Management

There are number of arguments put forth in favor of the introduction to SBM. The first one is allowing school agents (principals, teachers and parents) to make decision about relevant educational issues is believed to be more democratic process than keeping their decisions in the hand of selected group of central level officials (Malen Ogawa and Kranz, 1990). The second is locating the decision making power closer to the final users will arguably lead to more relevant policies. Third is an additional gain in efficiency could come from decision-making process less bureaucratic. Fourth one is empowering the school personnel and the community might lead to higher commitment, involvement and effort which result in a great resource mobilization and possibly a more enjoyable school climate if all different agents involved in the decision making process cooperate and coordinate efforts. The closer parent school partnership might also improve the home environment with respect to learning. Fifth one is involving parents in school management or in monitoring and evaluation activities is likely to increase the levels of transparency and accountability with the school. This might in turn improve school effectiveness and school quality (Gertler, partners and Rubio-Cardina 2007).

Indeed, it has been demonstrated that the quality of education depends primarily on the way schools are managed more than on the availability of resources as Hanushek (2003) cited in

Gertler P. (2007). It has also been show that the capacity of schools to improve teaching and learning is strongly mediated by the quality of the leadership (CaldWell, 2005). Therefore, it is crucial to focus on SBM to empower the involvement of key stakeholders specially teachers and principals in school management to improve instructional process in a sense of transparency and accountability.

The proper implementation of school based management helps the schools to adapt and analyze internal and external environment so as to generate systematic planning appropriate staffing and directing, constructive evaluation leadership and participatory decision-making (Botha 2011). It fosters the opportunity of community participation in decision-making process (Hogue 2007, Bouer and Bogtch 2006). It improves the accountability of principals and teachers to parents, students and teachers themselves (World Bank, 2004).

2.4 The Principles of School Based Management

School based management has been carried forward following the ideology of ensuring the involvement of all teachers and local community at site level. The established school based management is mostly known as site based management with the headmasters' managerial task more evenly distributed and oriented on teachers, stakeholders and students.

The leaders (head masters) roles are more of supportive, comprehensive and facilitative that provides the necessary environment for teachers' collaboration and integration, teachers' empowerment and their participation in decision making and teachers- professionalism. So, decentralized decision-making and facilitating empowerment of parents and professionalism of teachers are the critical issues of school based management (Murph's 1997). Thus, the practice of school based management in general has two most important principles. These are:

Principle of participatory (democratic) decision-making at the school level. The school site leaders who are engaged in schools' management have autonomy and authority to make decision and approve every school operational or developmental projects as well as effective and efficient use of human, financial and material resources at a school level. Furthermore, it also monitors the worth of instructional leadership or curriculum management to attaining the predetermined educational goals to address school effectiveness (Brandao 1995).

Empowering the involvement of school stakeholders in school management to ensure and increase responsibility, transparency and accountability of schools to a society. As expectation of World Bank strengthening accountability relationship among school stakeholders will strengthen the education system as whole so that it will efficiently deliver better learning outcomes (World Bank 2011). Therefore, the accountability relationships between teachers and state as well as teachers with citizens in many countries are introducing the following components of accountability in their education system. These are: the collection and publication of education information's, such as test results, enrolment numbers and class attendance figures, establishment of standards for assessing performance, the formulation of consequences of success or failure to teachers, the establishment of an authority that collects information, decide whether or not standards have been met, distribute rewards and sanctions (Newman et al 1997).

2.5 The Components of School Based Management

According to Hong Kong city education and manpower report (2006). The functions or components of school based management includes development or making school policies , dealing on personnel management, conducting issues of financial and material resource management and carrying out instructional leadership or school based curriculum.

2.5.1 Developing school policies

Developing school policies stands formulating school development strategies with aim to attain the school vision and educational goals to enhance learning effectiveness. Drawing up policies and priorities for development projects plan and manage school resources so as to ensure the missions of the school are carried out in a way to attain the school values (Workneh, 2012).

2.5.2 Personnel Management

A personnel management issue goes with a process of staff appointment, promotion, maintenance and dismissal (Gray 2005). It deals with performance appraisal and professional development (Castetter, 1992). Finally, it is also concerned with establishing effective communication channel and handling grievances and complaints.

2.5.3 Financial and Material Resource Management

Financial and material resource management in line of SBM starts with approving school development plan, annuals school plan and school budget, managing government and non-government funds to ensure the wise utilization of resources(Oumer, 2009). Reviewing school

plans and budgets to see if they are in line with over all education goals and school policies then making appropriate adjustment when necessary (Cheng Cheong, 1996). Building relevant networking's with site stakeholders to secure community resource in order to enhance teaching learning effectiveness.

2.5.4 Instructional Leadership or School based Curriculum.

The function of school based management in a regard of instructional leadership or school based curriculum focuses ensuring curriculum design in line with government education policies. Provide a coherent flexible, broad and balanced curriculum that is in line with the aim of education Gamage (1998). Promoting education for students at the school and leading the schools to strive for excellent and continuous improvement. Therefore, the school based managers responsibly should deal with important tasks of monitoring, developing and implementing school based curriculum.

2.6 The Practice of School Based Management around the World

School based management is one of the recent global educational managerial reform practices which are aimed at increasing education quality standard without necessary investing more resources in education system. The fact that the managerial approach to education reform has been worldwide is to great extent, related to material and ideational power of organizations backing them. These reforms count on persistent performers strategically located in very influential and well-connected international organizations, the World Bank, being the most outstanding of them (Verger and Antilyeken 2011)

These types of organizations counts on necessary skills to frame managerial education reforms in appealing ways as well as on the resources promote them effectively via international seminars, well distributed publications, highly ranked web-pages and so on. However projects funded by the world bank but also the regional development banks in the last decants show how components such as school competitions, school based management, decentralization, private sector participation and more recently accountability have been disseminated to all world regions (Gertter, Patrinos and Codina, 2007).

In general due to international pressure stemming from international standardized test, loan conditionality's, the EFA (Education for all), Action framework and so on, more and more

governments are open to experimenting with innovative ways of education delivery and to adapt new managerial approaches and the same is true for expansion of the practice of SBM over the world (Verger and Antilyeken 2011).

Beside this today many governments and international agencies are increasingly interested in finding ways to boost learning outcomes and get maximum benefit from their education investment especially in developing countries (Gertler, Patrinos and Codina, 2007). Bonerjee and Duflo (2006) stated the education system of most developing countries are usually highly centralized and have very strong teachers, that often lack strong incentives and accountability mechanisms, which result in high teachers absenteeism rate or turnover. Finally this leads to low students' academic achievement (Chaudhurty and others 2006).

In other side as world development report presented at 2004, placing education resources, decision-making authority responsibility and accountability closer to the beneficiary is one of the approaches for school improvement to ensure enhanced students learning outcomes (World Bank, 2003). These are the major arguments that enforced the policy makers and researchers in developing countries to concentrate their focus on introduction and dissemination of school based management reform or decentralized school management.

2.7 The School Based Management Practices in Ethiopia

Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia issued two policy documents entitled “Education and Training Policy and Education Sector Strategy” in 1994. Initially, policy focused on improving education access and equity. The Government then started to emphasize the importance of school governance. For example, the Education Sector Development Program ESDP I (MOE, 1998) defined the roles and responsibilities of school governance at the federal, regional and woreda level.

Next ESDP II was designed in 2002; the Government realized the significance of management and decision-making at the woreda and school levels. This was further strengthened with ESDP III (2005) when the Government decided to decentralize critical decision-making from regions and zones to the woredas and municipalities, and further to the school level, with the objective of having education become more responsive to school situations (MOE, 2005).

The devolution of decision-making authority to the woreda level was expected to strengthen woreda-level educational institutions, to offer better local governance, to promote accountability and to improve community participation (MOE, 2005). The focus of the decentralization program at this time was to strengthen the capacity of Woreda Education Offices WEOs through training in educational and financial management (MOE, 2005).

ESDP III also outlines the importance of community participation in school decision-making and financing. Communities were expected to raise funds for purchasing basic school equipment, hiring contract teachers, constructing schools and classrooms, building teachers' houses, and encouraging girls to enroll in schools. Community members and parents are members of the Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs), which were expected to participate in preparing annual action plans (MOE, 2005).

The Government has recognized that weak management and implementation capacity at school level was one of the main barriers to achieving access, equity and quality in primary education (MOE, 2005). After 2005, therefore, the Government acknowledged the importance of school management for improving school-based decision-making. It designed policies and programs that strengthened the role of communities and parents in school management and financial administration, with the primary objective of improving the quality of education.

However, the woreda administration still had more powers of critical decision making and improving governance in schools. For instance, the WEO was responsible for recruiting teachers and managing the financial and material resources of the schools (MOE, 2005). At the end of ESDP III, it was recognized that despite the increased attention given to devolving decision-making to the local level, in practice, school based management and administration remained inefficient and ineffective. In addition, the system suffered from a weak relationship between regions and woredas (MOE, 2010).

ESDP IV therefore emphasized the further devolution of key decision-making to the local level, including improving the functioning of offices at all levels, promoting cluster resource centers, and improving school-level management through capacity-building programs (MOE, 2010). The General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP) aims to improve quality intervention in key areas, including school based management (Ayalew Sh., 2009). Priority areas identified

included increasing effectiveness and efficiency through decentralized educational planning and management; establishing open, transparent and productive management systems; and promoting effective horizontal and vertical communications across the education system (MOE, 2008).

Generally, the practice of school based management in our country is concentrated its attention on empowering autonomy of school site managers to participate and make decision over school operations in a sense of transparency and accountability to ensure school improvement program through attaining enhanced students learning outcome (Tassew et al. 2005; Dom 2009; MOE 2008; MOE 2005 and Jeilu 2009).

2.8.The Effect of practices of SBM on Schools goal achievement

SBM is one of component of educational decentralized administration involve an autonomy to local level actors and it empowers the internal decision making capability of principals, teachers, parents, students and other community members belonging to particular school (World Bank 2004).

The school based management involves the schools to adapt external and internal environment and should enhance environmental analysis, systematic planning, appropriate staffing and directing, constructive evaluation, leadership and participatory decision-making (Botha, 2011). As Botha SBM empowers the school leaders to develop vision, mission, value, strategies and operational directions as well as sourcing mobilizing allocating and utilizing material and human resources effectively and efficiently in a sense of transparency and accountability (Botha, 2011). SBM also enhance the local decision-makers to adapt the appropriate mix of inputs and education policies to meet local realities and needs so as to facilitate schools goal achievement (Hogue, 2007).

The schools goal achievement concerned on enhancing issues which are related with a teaching-learning, school administration, students' motivation, learning outcomes, safe and orderly school environment, learning community and parental involvement both at school and in classroom level so as to attain enhanced students result (Scheerens, 2004).Therefore SBM as crucial element of educational decentralization process which has compulsory effect over schools achievement (DeGrauwe 2004).

Finally the focus on school based management is to foster effective instructional process through efficient marshaling of both human and material resources at the school and in the class room to attainment enhanced students learning out comes (Raczynski and Munoz. 2005). So some major effects of SBM were ignite high expectations from the schools, emphasis on Educational leadership, Create Consensus and cohesion among school community, Promote Parental involvement and Secure Effective learning time.

2.8.1 Ignite High Expectations from School

By empowering parents and giving them information about the school's performance relative to national standards or benchmarks, SBM may increase parents' participation in school governance, raise their expectations of school performance, and lead to increased pressure on teachers and schools to perform (OECD 2000).

2.8.2 Emphasis on Educational leadership

School autonomy gives headmasters and school administrators the tools and the responsibility to effectively lead the school. Headmasters can encourage school-based reform when they display good leadership and receive sufficient training to lead and manage the school community and, especially, the teacher corps (Hanushek, 2002).

2.8.3 Create Consensus and Cohesion among School Community

School level decentralization is often accompanied by policies requiring teachers, parents, and administrators to jointly prepare school improvement plans, with grant funding provided on a competitive basis by the education ministry. The joint preparation of school improvement plans can create a shared commitment to raise quality as well as incentives to work together to implement it. Teachers who shirk this duty may face disapproval from their colleagues. In addition, the increased power given to headmasters under SBM gives them the opportunity, if not the obligation, to develop a vision and mission for the school that is shared by both the faculty and the community. Under school autonomy, headmasters often acquire increased management powers to recruit, select, monitor, evaluate, and train teachers and to use the school's discretionary monies to fund that training. This combination of new powers allows headmasters to select teachers who share values and a common vision for the school's development (Elmore, 1995; DeStefano, 2004).

2.8.4 Promote Parental Involvement

SBM often promotes both the formal and informal participation of parents in the school. Formally, parents participate in meetings to select their representatives on the school management committee. Informally, parents are encouraged to donate money to the school, gaining a stronger interest in monitoring its finances and becoming more involved in their children's education. Involving parents more directly in the education of their children may also lead to changed behavior in the home, resulting in parents more closely monitoring their children's study habits (Eskeland and Filmer, 2000).

2.8.5 Secure Effective learning time

SBM is unlikely to have a large impact on how teachers use classroom time, but it can have an important effect on teacher attendance. Teachers may be pressured by parents to reduce their absenteeism from the classroom and parents may play a role in monitoring teacher attendance (Parker and Leithwood, 2000).

2.9 Challenges of the SBM Practices

According to Garia and Rajhumar (2008) there are critical challenges that affect the implementation of educational decentralization in a sense of promoting the full autonomy of school site stakeholders through school based management process. These constraints are inadequate resources at school level, inadequate information, unclear expenditure assignment and responsibility declining share of spending on capital expenditure by sub-nation government, need to boost administrative capability at local level, vested interest on some of government bureaucrats at the top managerial level, overlapping or burdening of responsibility to a single leader, absence of clear guidelines to carry out SBM as well as practice of incomplete decentralize are some of major obstacles for proper practice of SBM to ensure school effectiveness (McGinn and Welsh, 1999; MOE, 2002).

It is widely argued that efficiency and effectiveness are more likely to be achieved when decision-making is placed at the local level. But localization of decision alone should not be considered as an end rather as a means to the ends provided that fundamental requirements that enhance the implementation process are fulfilled at the local level. Otherwise devolving decisions and function to the local will not have advantage (Welsh & McGinn, 1999). The requisites to be available at the local level include effective local authority and autonomy,

sufficient resource for localities, effective institutions of collective actions, accountability and transparency in operations (Olowu&Wunsch, 2004; Welsh &McGinn, 1999).

But quality of local decisions depends on the ability of local units to process and use information and representing the interests of individuals and groups affected by the decisions (Hurst, 1985; Welsh &McGinn, 1999). Sometimes this is not available at the local. In Ethiopia during the regional devolution, educational decentralization had not achieved the intended objectives because the local governments lacked the basic knowledge and experience to perform effectively (Garcia &Rajkumar, 2008; Tadesse, 2007). Recent studies also note acute shortage of skilled manpower as a critical challenge of the implementation of Ethiopian local governance policy (Ayele, 2009). The same is true for practice of SBM at Ethiopian schools. Tikson (2008), Galshberg and Winkler (2003) stated the success of educational decentralization in certain African countries including Ethiopia was affected by local features like parents' illiteracy, fragile democracy, and less well developed banking system.

There are other criticisms forwarded toward educational decentralization at local level. Decentralization is considered as a means through which governments transfer the burden of educational finance and provision to parents and other local community (Bray, 2001; Welsh&McGinn, 1999). Nonetheless, low political bargaining power and economic capacity will affect the active participation of the poor and minority groups in local matters (Chapman et al., 2002).Hence it is imperative for decentralization reform not only to transfer the resources burdens to the local level, but also the strengthening of community, the school management technical capacity and collaboration with community organization (Shaffer, 1994).

Another controversy involves the rationale of equity, choice and competition. In the rhetoric educational decentralization in a sense of SBM is advocated for maintaining equity but this is not always true. Many scholars assert that decentralization is widening the inequality gap between rich and poor localities (Dunne et al., 2007; UNESCO, 2008; Winkler, 2005). As the literature shows this challenge is associated with variation in local resource endowment, commitment of local government and community for educational development. On the other hand, the imperatives of choice and competition tend to jeopardizes equity as richer localities devote more resource on education and get better education but this has high frustration in poor localities.

Consequently, some urge centralized decision-making and control of education within a decentralized system for considerations of not only maintaining equity but also for national unity and efficiency in management (Lyons, 1985).

Indeed, government intervention could serve for maintaining equity. It could be employed in the form of “deliberate action to counteract the natural dynamics of the expansion of education system and reallocation of educational resources among the different regions and call for special effect in favor of deprived ones” (Chau, 1985). The shared responsibility (partnership) between community and the government for local initiatives increase educational access, quality and equity (Bray, 2001). So the SBM practice to be functional in a way to attain school effectiveness, it is imperative to have consistent bi-directional communication between local school management and top government leadership.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Design and Methodology

3.1 Design of the Study

According to Schumacher, (2001) a research design describes the procedure for conducting the study including when, how, for whom and in what conditions the data are obtained organized analyzed and interpreted. Furthermore, it is the plan or blue print to which data are collected to investigate the research questions in more economic manner (Huyscomen, 1995). Descriptive research is basically used to ascertain and describe the characteristics of variables of interest in some situation and subject of study. This research design enables the researcher to describe the phenomenon of interest from individual or organizational perspectives. Therefore, the design of this study was descriptive research design so as to find out the existed problems solution and answer the how , when , what and other related question on the practices of school based management in Kefa zone secondary schools.

3.2 Research Method

Based on the nature of the problem as well as interest of the researcher there are quantitative, qualitative and mixed research methods of studies (Creswell, 2003). In quantitative research methods a research problems are investigated or manipulated through descriptive forms that help the researcher to describe the trends, explain the relationship among variables and compare the groups or else to test the effect of existing theories (Creswell, 2012). In qualitative research methods a research problems are explored through gathering and analyzing the views or perspectives of individuals to develop detailed understanding of a central phenomenon so as to introduce theory (Creswell, 2012). A mixed methods research design is a procedure of collecting, analyzing, and “mixing” both quantitative and qualitative methods in a single study or a series of studies to understand a research problem (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).Therefore, from the mixed approach of the study, the researcher applied concurrent types of mixed research design in which both quantitative and qualitative data are triangulated and analyzed by cross checking the outcomes of both data.

Thus, this study was conducted through qualitative and quantitative method because such method ignores the weakness of studying the problem through either quantitative or qualitative

method alone, and provides more comprehensive and convenient evidence for the study (Creswell, 2012).

The procedure of this study was carried out through concurrent triangulation mixed method. Therefore, in this study the researcher was collected and analyzed both quantitative and qualitative data simultaneously then used the qualitative data to enrich and triangulate the result of quantitative observation (Miller and McKenna, 1998).

3.3 Sources of Data

The data used in this study were both primary sources and secondary sources of data. The primary sources of data were collected from key stockholders such as principals, supervisors, teachers, PTA and KETB committee members who are playing their role in SBM practices to address school effectiveness in secondary schools of Kefa zone. The data was collected from principals by that they are the agents who are expected to exercise the school based management and the supervisors also intervene and take part on the decision making of the school and have to supervise all situation of the schools. The teachers has observing whether principals decentralized the decision making process or not. The secondary sources of data were collected from articles, journals, thesis and magazines that related with the practices of school based management.

3.4 The Population of the Study

The population of this study were secondary school teachers, supervisors, directors, PTA, woreda education experts KTEB of the Kefa zone selected woredas .

3.5 Sample and Sampling Techniques of the Study

Kefa Zone has 13 woredas .There are 52 secondary schools at zonal level. From the 13 woredas of Kefa zone, 6 woredas were selected on the bases of those secondary schools, which have more experienced and senior secondary school that expected to practices the school based management. So that that from each identified woredas 6 secondary schools were included in the study in which they were selected on the bases of severity of the problem of practices of school based management.

Therefore, in order to select the sample size for this study, the researcher was use simple random sampling techniques for teachers, and purposive methods for directors, supervisors, PTA, KTEB

and woreda education experts. Therefore, from the total 265 (N) teachers of these 6 secondary school, the sample size 132 (n) were taken using sample size determination formula of Yamane, (1967). The study was also include 6 directors, 6 supervisors, 12 PTA, 12 KTEB from each selected woredas.

Table 1: Sample size determination

NO	NAME OF WOREDA	NAME OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS	TOTAL POPULATION	SAMPLE TAKEN	METHOD USED
1	Adio	Boka secondary school	22	11	Simple random
2	Gimbo	Gimbo secondary school	72	36	Simple random
3	Chena	Chena secondary school	48	24	Simple random
4	Gawata	Gawata secondary school	45	22	Simple random
5	Gesha	Amero secondary school	26	13	Simple random
6	Shisho ende	Shishinda secondary school	52	26	Simple random
Total	6	6	265	132	

Sources : Kefa Zone , woreda education bureau, 2022

3.6 Data Collecting Instruments

Since this survey study was carried out through mixed methods. The instruments that were used to gather the data included both quantitative and qualitative tools of measurements concurrently. Structured questionnaires answered with Likert scale, open ended questions, focus group discussion and document analysis was employed to conduct this study.

3.6.1 Questionnaires

The structured questionnaires was developed and distributed to the teachers. The questionnaires were designed in the form of 5 Likert scale rates (i.e, strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, Agree, strongly agree) was provided for teachers, who are selected to be the participant of the study in secondary schools. The items of the were 40 questions, which is 10 questions that

need to answer each 4 basic research questions .All these respondents were involved with the same type of well-developed valid and reliable questionnaires. The questionnaire was adopted from standardized questionnaire, that was taken from Al Kaabi (2015).According to authors questionnaires are important and widely used tools to obtain and analyze quantitative data and they are more appropriate instruments to access much more data from many respondents at a time and allow the respondent to express their idea freely and confidentially (Ravi parkash, 2005). That is why this study was used these tools as major instruments for the data investigation.

3.6.2 Interview

Interview was prepared for the directors, supervisors and woreda education experts. Therefore, five semi- structure questions was designed for each of which concerning the practices of school based management in the selected secondary schools of the zone.

3.6.3 Focus Group Discussion

Another qualitative procedure which, the researcher was employed that was focus group discussion with PTA. The open ended questions which were constructed in English and it involved to these participants. The discussions with these groups of respondent were mainly held with local language for further clarification.

3.7 Reliability and Validity of Instruments

Validity refers to the extent to which an instrument of data collection measures what it was designed to measure (Amin: 2005). Content validity refers to how well an instrument includes a representative sample of questions that relate to the domain being measured (Pattern, 2004). To ensure content validity of the survey instruments, the researcher make extensive literature review of independent and dependent variables and other literature to develop appropriate instrument content. To develop additional instrument content, two informed, competent and expert persons in research methods including Jimma University, department of Educational Planning and Management, critiqued the content of the developed questionnaire.

The professionals were determine whether the instruments contained clear and appropriate content as deemed necessary to measure the study objective. The professionals were asked to identify any area of study that was not well represented in the research instrument and propose possible questions. Further, the professionals checked for the clarity of questions and

instructions. Once the professionals accomplished all the above tasks, revision and modification of the instruments were performed. The revised instrument was then re-submitted to the professionals for re-evaluation after which corrections were made and the final instrument was developed.

Reliability is the extent to which an instrument of data collection yields similar results under constant conditions on all occasions. It is the consistency, accuracy or precision of a measuring instrument in measuring what it is constructed to measure (Litwin, 1995). A split-half reliability test was therefore conducted to determine the consistency and stability of the survey instrument. Litwin (1995) recommended the split half reliability test as good as administering the different forms to the same sample at different points in time.

To carry out the split half reliability test, the instrument was administered to 60 teachers from 6 secondary schools, who were randomly selected to test the reliability of the instrument. Samples of 30 questionnaires were deemed adequate for the reliability test according to recommendations of Alreck and Settle (1995).

The authors recommend the use of a sample approximately 10% of parent population as large enough to compute statistical analyses. Spearman Brown coefficients of 0.73 were obtained which showed that the measuring instrument was reliable. A post hoc analysis using the study sample generated a Spearman Brown coefficient of 0.75 which confirmed the reliability of the survey instruments. Reliability of the instrument was also established by the researcher through the use of Cronbach's Alpha co-efficient method of internal consistency which was computed through the use of statistical package for social scientists.

For the purpose of this study to ensure the reliability of instruments, the researchers carried out the pilot study in other non-selected woredas that was used Cronbach's alpha coefficient method to evaluate the reliability of the questionnaires. Thus the coefficient alpha value of variables from pilot test was examined in the study. Therefore, pilot tests were conducted on Seyilem Secondary school in which 60 respondents were participated on the study to test the reliability and validity of the study.

Reliability of the instrument was also established by the researcher through the use of Cronbach's Alpha co-efficient method of internal consistency which was computed

through the use of statistical package for social scientists. Therefore, the reliability result of this study was 0.796

3.8 Methods of Data Analysis

Quantitative data which are obtained from structured questionnaire was coded and processed using statistical package of social sciences SPSS, version 23. The data which was collected from different respondents could be categorized and grouped with frequency and then statistical tools were employed to analyze and interpret the finding of the study. Therefore, the quantitative data was analyzed using percentage, frequencies, Mean and Standard Deviation whereas the qualitative data was analyzed through thematic analysis, in which the researcher was analyzed the data non-numerical to triangulate with the quantitative data

Generally percentages and frequency counts were used to analyze various characteristics of the respondents such as sex, age, qualification and service year. Whereas mean and standard deviation were applied to summarize set of numerical data collected by rating Likert scales on school based management. Because this measurements provided good description of how members of a sample scored on particular measurements (Best and James, 2004).

In other side qualitative data analysis from open ended questions were mixed in concurrent with discussion of quantitative inquiry examined from questionnaires. These qualitative observations were organized and interpreted in words to triangulate the quantitative findings simultaneously..

3.9 Ethical Consideration

To access either quantitative or qualitative data in secondary schools of Kefa zone, the researcher was hold permission from institution review board of Jimma University EdPM department and some selected woredas education office. The researcher kept the participants' right and volunteerism to be the part of the study at the schools' site. The respondents who participated in the study was highly encouraged and respected for their voluntary contribution to this study as well. Finally it was researchers great responsibility in keeping the confidentiality of data obtained from respondents and that was used it for only academic purpose.

CHAPTER FOUR

Presentation, Analysis and Interpretations of Data

4.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 4. 1. Background of Respondents

		Count	Column N %
Teacher and their current position	unit leader	18	13.6%
	department head	24	18.2%
	coordinator of curricular activities	25	18.9%
	No position	65	49.2%
	Total	132	1000%
Sex	Male	106	80.3%
	Female	26	19.7%
	Total	132	100%
Age	Less than 20 years	23	17.4%
	21- 30 years	20	15.2%
	31- 40 years	55	41.7%
	More than 40 years	34	25.8%
	Total	132	100%
Education level	Diploma	29	22.0%
	Degree	76	57.6%
	Masters and above	27	20.5%
	Total	132	100%
The experience in leader ship or teaching	less than 5	18	13.6%
	5 – 10 years	50	37.9%
	11 – 15 years	25	18.9%
	more than 15	39	29.5%
	Total	132	100%

Sources : Own Field survey, 2022

Regarding the socio demographic features of the respondents, 106(80.3%) of the respondents were male, and the rest 26(19.7%) of them were female .Next , majority 55(41.7%) of the participants were found between 31-40 age level, 34(25.8%) of them were found more than 40

years old, 23(17.4%) of them were found less than 20 years old, minority 20(15.2%) of them were between 21-30 years old. Regarding, the educational back ground of the respondents, majority 76(57.6%) of them were degree holders, 29(22.0%) of them were diploma holders, 27(20.5%) of them were Masters and above. Concerning, teacher and their current position, majority 65(49.2%) of the participants were No position, 25(18.9%), 24(18.2%) and 18(13.6%) of the participants were coordinator of curricular activities, department head and unit leader resp. regarding the experience in leader ship or teaching majority 50(37.9%) of the respondents were between 5 to 10 years and minority were less than 5 years of experience.

The demographic features of the respondents implies that most teachers of these selected secondly schools are qualified with practicing the school based management in which they carried out the instructional management , financial and personal managements are effectively implemented in these secondary schools

Table 4. 2: Academic Staff Development

	strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree	Mean	SD
Teachers at the school are categorized in to academic department	29 22.00%	41 31.10%	38 28.80%	14 10.60%	10 7.60%	2.51	1.17
Delegation of responsibility to teachers is based on their experience	56 42.40%	4 3.00%	24 18.20%	42 31.80%	6 4.50%	2.92	1.02
The new staff members actively engage induction program at the school	26 19.70%	43 32.60%	41 31.10%	17 12.90%	5 3.80%	2.48	1.07
Experienced teachers are Coiled-up with Newly employed one as mentor	7 5.30%	33 25.00%	48 36.40%	26 19.70%	18 13.60%	3.11	1.10
All teachers at the school participate in CPD program	12 9.10%	56 42.40%	26 19.70%	27 20.50%	11 8.30%	2.77	1.13
The school involve different short term on job training and reflection programs for teachers	15 11.40%	48 36.40%	32 24.20%	29 22.00%	8 6.10%	2.75	1.31
The school evaluate and monitor the effect of different updating strategies on academic staff development	28 21.20%	40 30.30%	40 30.30%	18 13.60%	6 4.50%	2.50	1.11

Sources : Own Field survey, 2022

As it can be seen from the table 2 below, majority 41(31.1%) of the respondents were said disagree, whereas 38(28.8%) of the respondents were said undecided, 29(22.0%) of the respondents said that strongly disagree while 14(10.6%) ad 10(7.6%) were responded as agree

and strongly agree resp. regarding Teachers at the school are categorized in to academic department.

In addition, respondents asked about Delegation of responsibility to teachers is based on their experience, and majority 42.4% of the asked participants replied that strongly disagree, 31.8% of them were said agree, and still about 18.2% of the respondents were said undecided. While only 4.5% and 3.0% of the respondents reply strongly agree ad disagree resp. Regarding the new staff members actively engage induction program at the school most 32.6% replied Disagree and 31.10% reply undecided while 19.7% and 12.9% said strongly disagree and agree only 3.8% strongly agree.

Further, the respondents were also asked about the Experienced teachers are Coiled-up with Newly employed one as mentor, majority 36.4% of the respondents were said that there was undecided, 25% of the asked participants replied that as disagree, 19.7% among the asked respondents replied that as agree while 13.6% said strongly agree and 5.3% strongly disagree.

The respondents were also asked about all teachers at the school participate in CPD program most 42.4% of them were replied that disagree, 20.5% of the respondents replied that agree, and about 19.7% replayed undecided while the rest 9.10% and 8.30% of the participants replied strongly disagree and strongly agree resp.

Regarding the school involve different short term on job training and reflection programs for teachers, majority 36.4% of the respondents replied that as disagree 24.20% of them were replied undecided, 22.0% said agree while 11.4% said strongly disagree a few 6.10% of the respondents replied that strongly agree.

Finally, under Academic Staff Development factors, respondents were also asked about The school evaluate and monitor the effect of different updating strategies on academic staff development, majority 30.30% of the respondents replied disagree & undecided, whereas the 21.20% of the respondents were replied that strongly disagree, the rest 13.6% and 4.5% of them were replied that agree ad strongly agree.

In addition , the data obtained from FGD and interviewee added that, categorizing teachers into academic departments, delegating responsibility to staff members based on experience and participation of all teachers in CPD program were conceived as adequate practice in schools .Whereas mentoring the new teachers, the engagement of newly employed teachers in induction program, providing different short term on job training as well as evaluating and monitoring the effect of this training programs in the schools had at weak level of practice. Bahaskara R. and Ediger (2003) stated moral and motivation of school personal must be appraised continuously to develop and maintain teacher enthusiasm and purpose for teaching-learning be effective element in SBM.

Table 4. 3: Decision-Making process

	strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree	Mean	SD
Stake holders are involved in school self-evaluation	6	17	41	32	36	3.57	1.15
	4.50%	12.90%	31.10%	24.20%	27.30%		
Stake holders participated in developing common vision, mission, goals and values of the school	10	34	21	46	21	3.26	1.22
	7.60%	25.80%	15.90%	34.80%	15.90%		
Stake holders are engaged in identifying school priorities	14	37	26	49	6	2.97	1.13
	10.60%	28.00%	19.70%	37.10%	4.50%		
Stake holders communicate and create consensus on school development plan	8	39	22	30	33	3.31	1.30
	6.10%	29.50%	16.70%	22.70%	25.00%		
The school development plan is based on a sense of enhancing instructional process	19	20	25	61	7	3.13	1.18
	14.40%	15.20%	18.90%	46.20%	5.30%		
The school board has played leadership role on practice of school plan and make over all decision	16	35	19	52	10	3.04	1.21
	12.10%	26.50%	14.40%	39.40%	7.60%		
The school PTA committee periodically visit the school and provide advisory function for school board on performance of school operations	8	40	26	54	4	3.05	1.04
	6.10%	30.30%	19.70%	40.90%	3.00%		

Sources : Own Field survey, 2022

As can be seen from table 3, Stakeholders are involved in school self-evaluation the result of the table indicate that, 27.30%; 24.20%"strongly agree" and "agree" respectively, Others 12.90%;4.50% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively. The rest 31.10% rated "undecided".

The mean value 3.57 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. The analysis of results from the response of teachers, one can conclude that the many teachers cannot decide, as stakeholders are involved in school self-evaluation.

When the teachers asked as stake holders participated in developing common vision, mission, goals and values of the school the result of the same table indicate that, 15.90%; 34.80%;"strongly agree" and "agree" responsively.

Nearly 25.80%; 7.60%; of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively. The rest 15.90% rated "uncertain". The mean value 3.26 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. Based on the above response of teachers we can conclude that stakeholders participated in developing common vision, mission, goals and values of the school not highly at the study area. Similarly item 3, indicate that "stake holders are engaged in identifying school priorities" the result of the same table indicate that, 4.50%; 37.10%; "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively. Nearly 28.00%; 10.60%; of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively. The remaining 19.70% rated "uncertain". The mean value 2.97 indicates that the respondents agree to the stake holders are engaged in identifying school priorities.

When the teachers asked as "Stake holders communicate and create consensus on school development plan" the result indicate that 25.00%; 22.70%; "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively. Others 29.50%; 6.10%; of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively and the remaining 16.70% rated "undecided". The mean value 3.31 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. Based on the above response of teachers we can conclude that the sum of agree and disagree 47.70%. This shows that blow half of the respondents agree on the issue. Again, by this side the work done at the study area is weak.

Form the 'above table item 5, the teachers response 5.30%; 46.20%; "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively. Others 15.20%; 14.40%; of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively and the remaining 18.90% rated "undecided". The mean value 3.13 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. In the same table item 6, when the teachers asked as "the school board has played leadership role on practice of school plan and make over all decision", the result of the table indicate that, 7.60%; 39.40% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively,

Others 26.50% 12.90% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively. The rest 14.40% rated "undecided" and the mean value 3.04 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. The analysis of results from the response of teachers, one can conclude that many teachers not agree on the issue, as the school board has played leadership role on practice of school plan and make over all decision.

In the same table regarding to "the school PTA committee periodically visit the school and provide advisory function for school board on performance of school operations" the teacher's response, 3.0%; 40.90% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively. Others 30.30%; 6.10% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively and the remaining 19.70% rated "undecided". The mean value 3.05 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. The results show at the study area the school PTA committee periodically visit the school and provide advisory function for school board on performance of school operations weak.

In addition to quantitative data, the data obtained from interviewee and FGD explored also pointed that the school board has leadership role in school practices and make over all decisions in schools in line with education policy suggested by ministry of education MOE (1994). However, most of the time the school board members can be over burdened with different meetings and public issues which enforces the school management not to make urgent decisions while waiting for the board members.

Table 4. 4: The School Resources Management

	strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree	Mean	SD
The list of urgent physical and material resource problems are identified and prioritized at the school	6	36	30	29	31	2.80	1.23
	4.50%	27.30%	22.70%	22.0%	23.50%		
The school has developed the necessary physical and material resource plan and its corresponding financial estimation	8	27	31	51	15	3.29	1.10
	6.10%	20.50%	23.50%	38.60%	11.40%		
The school communicate with the whole school-community and make consensus to allocate financial or material inputs	5	26	33	47	21	2.65	1.09
	3.80%	19.70%	25.00%	35.60%	15.90%		
The school community actively participate in setting priorities and development plan	13	22	41	41	15	3.17	1.14
	9.80%	16.70%	31.10%	31.10%	11.40%		
The school-community involve financial or material resource to exercise the school plan	15	24	35	43	15	3.14	1.19
	11.40%	18.20%	26.50%	32.60%	11.40%		
The school has efficiently utilized financial or material resource allocated to its priorities	10	27	30	48	17	2.98	1.15
	7.60%	20.50%	22.70%	36.40%	12.90%		
The school has internal transparency and accountability systems in utilization of school resource	8	21	40	43	20	3.35	1.11
	6.10%	15.90%	30.30%	32.60%	15.20%		
The school has involved external audit regarding material and financial resource utilization	7	19	40	34	32	4.20	1.16
	5.30%	14.40%	30.30%	25.80%	24.20%		

Sources: Own Field survey, 2022

The above table reveals the extent to the school resources management. As can be seen from table 4, the list of urgent physical and material resource problems are identified and prioritized at the school. The result of the table indicates that, 23.50%; 22.0% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively and others 27.30%; 4.50% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively.

The rest 22.70% rated “undecided ”. The mean value 2.80 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. The analysis of results from the response of teachers, one can conclude that few teachers agree on the issue while many teachers cannot agree.

When the teachers asked as the school has developed, the necessary physical and material resource plan and its corresponding financial estimation the result of the same table indicate that, 11.40%; 38.60% "strongly agree" and "agree" responsively. Nearly 20.50%; 6.10% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively and the rest 23.50% rated "uncertain". The mean value 3.29 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. Similarly item 3, indicate that “The school communicate with the whole school-community and make consensus to allocate financial or material inputs” the result of the same table indicate that, 15.90%; 35.60% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively. Nearly 19.70%; 3.80% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively and the remaining 25.0% rated "uncertain" and the mean value 2.65 indicates that the respondents agree to the school communicate with the whole school-community and make consensus to allocate financial or material inputs.

When the teachers asked as “The school community actively participate in setting priorities and development plan” the result indicate that 11.40%; 31.10% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively. Others 16.70%; 9.80%of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively and the remaining 31.10% rated “undecided”. The mean value 3.17 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. Based on the above response of teachers we can conclude that the sum of agree and disagree 42.50% and this show that blow half of the respondents agree on the issue and the work done at the study area by this side also weak.

Form the 'above table item 5, the teacher’s response 11.40%; 32.60% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively and others 18.20%; 11.40%of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively. The remaining 26.50% rated “undecided”. The mean value 3.14 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. In the same table item 6, when the teachers asked as “the school has efficiently utilized financial or material resource allocated to its priorities”, the result of the table indicate that, 12.90%; 36.40% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively, Others 20.50%; 7.60% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively and the rest 22.70% rated “undecided ”.

The mean value 2.98 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. The analysis of results from the response of teachers, one can conclude that many teachers not agree on the issue, as the school has efficiently utilized financial or material resource allocated to its priorities.

In the same table regarding to “The school has internal transparency and accountability systems in utilization of school resource”, the teacher’s response, 15.20%; 32.60% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively and others 15.90%; 6.10% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively. The remaining 30.30% rated “undecided” and the mean value 3.35 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. Similarly, in the same table when the teachers asked, “the school has involved external audit regarding material and financial resource utilization”, the teacher’s response, 24.20%; 25.80% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively and others 14.40%; 5.30% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively. The remaining 30.30% rated “undecided” and the mean value 4.20 indicate that the respondents agree to the issue. The analysis of results from the response of teachers, one can conclude that the many teachers cannot decide, as the school has involved external audit regarding material and financial resource utilization.

Additionally, the qualitative data explored from FG discussion pointed the school principals develop action plans to use budgets to most urgent priorities. The school board dived and approve on allocation of budget in line with a mandate involved for them as stated in education policy document by ministry of education MOE (1994). The school informs the allocated budgets to school community through public meetings and putting it on announcement boards.

Table 4. 5: Monitoring and Evaluation Process

	strongly disagree	disagree	undecided	agree	strongly agree	Mean	SD
The appropriate tools (check-lists) are used to monitor the school operations.	14	24	28	37	29	3.33	1.29
	10.60%	18.20%	21.20%	28.00%	22.00%		
The frequent monitoring has conducted over the school operations based on schedule	12	23	21	64	12	3.31	1.14
	9.10%	17.40%	15.90%	48.50%	9.10%		
The constructive feedback has periodically given for all those who are working in the school	25	37	22	39	9	2.77	1.25
	18.90%	28.00%	16.70%	29.50%	6.80%		
The school formatively take corrective measures on poor performance	33	25	24	43	7	2.74	1.29
	25.00%	18.90%	18.20%	32.60%	5.30%		
The school conduct quarter, mid or annual school performance evaluation and revise its course of action	13	30	19	56	14	3.21	1.20
	9.80%	22.70%	14.40%	42.40%	10.60%		
the school stake holders actively participate in school’s performance evaluation process and enhance their commitment to take measures on poor performance	12	37	20	52	11	3.10	1.17
	9.10%	28.00%	15.20%	39.40%	8.30%		

Sources : Own Field survey, 2022

The above table reveals the extent to the monitoring and evaluation process. As we observed from table 5, the responses obtained from teachers regarding” The appropriate tools (check-lists) are used to monitor the school operations” the result indicate, 22.00%; 28.00% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively. Others 18.20%; 10.60% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively and the remaining 21.20% rated “undecided”. The mean value 3.33 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue.

When the teachers asked as “the frequent monitoring has conducted over the school operations based on schedule” the result of the same table indicate that, 9.10%; 48.50% "strongly agree" and "agree" responsively. Nearly 17.40%; 9.10% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively, the rest 15.90% rated "uncertain’. The mean value 3.31 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. Similarly item 3, indicate that “The constructive feedback has periodically given for all those who are working in the school” the result of the same table indicate that, 6.80%; 29.50% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively. Nearly 28.00%; 18.90% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively and the remaining 16.70% rated "uncertain".

The mean value 2.77 indicates that the respondents agree to the constructive feedback has periodically given for all those who are working in the school. The analysis of results from the response of teachers, one can conclude that many teachers not agree on the issue, as the constructive feedback has periodically given for all those who are working in the school and the work done at the study area by this side also weak.

In the same table when the teachers asked, the school formatively takes corrective measures on poor performance, the result indicates that 5.30%; 32.60% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively and others, 18.90%; 25.0% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively, and the remaining 18.20% rated "undecided". The mean value 2.74 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. Based on the above response of teachers we can conclude that the sum of agree and disagree 37.90%. This shows that blow half of the respondents agree on the issue.

Form the 'above table item 5, the teacher's response 10.60%; 42.40% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively. Others 22.70%; 9.80% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively and the remaining 14.40% rated "undecided". The mean value 3.21 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. In the same table the final item, when the teachers asked as "the school stake holders actively participate in school's performance evaluation process and enhance their commitment to take measures on poor performance", the result of the table indicate that, 8.30%; 39.40% "strongly agree" and "agree" respectively, Others 28.00%; 9.10% of the respondents "disagree" and "strongly disagree" respectively. The rest 15.20% rated "undecided ". The mean value 3.10 indicates that the respondents agree to the issue. The analysis of results from the response of teachers, one can conclude that many teachers not agree on the issue, as the school stake holders actively participate in school's performance evaluation process and enhance their commitment to take measures on poor performance.

Beside this data explored from interview and FGD discussion suggested: in most schools there are schedules and strategies to conduct monitoring of school activities, the evaluations of the schools' performance at the end of semesters are very common but monitory activities on time and taking immediate measures are very low.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Summary

The main objective of this study was to assess the practices of school based management in secondary schools of kefa zone .To meet the objectives of this study, descriptive research design was applied , and the study also carried out by using the mixed approach in which both quantitative and qualitative data were triangulated . Therefore, this study aimed to address the following basic research questions.

1. How school is based management effectively practiced in secondary schools of Kefa zone?
2. Do stake holders effectively participating in implementing the school based management practices in the study area?
3. What mechanisms are employed to enhance the function of SBM practices in secondary schools of kefa zone?
4. What are the major challenges which are affecting the implementation of SBM in secondary schools of kefa zone?

Based on the data that obtained from both quantitative and qualitative data, the following major finding was drawn:

As the analysis and discussion regarding the staff development practice in these secondary schools, the respondents agreed that staff are somehow developed practices its major elements In other side, analysis explored from qualitative investigation and the schools documents such as: Staff and departments agendas revealed there were frequent and functional meeting and discussion to carry out operational and annual plans in most secondary schools.

The results of discussion on issue of decisions making the practices of all items under participatory decision-making process were almost at poor level of practice. Moreover, the result of the study indicated that agreed decision making process is participatory and adequately practical in the Secondary Schools.

The result of responded the decision making process was not participatory and not adequately practical in the schools. Additionally, analysis explored from FGD discussion with KETB and PTA committee revealed discussions and decision making process of school board member in most primary school is not consistent.

Even in some schools both school board and PTA members discussion is compiled together which lead to problem in duties delegation. Relatively in most schools the meeting and functionality of PTA committees is better than the school boards. The result regarding instructional leadership process, respondents agreed about instructional leadership

The analysis Regarding the Monitoring and Evaluation indicated the school leaders revealed the practice of this variable in the school was ineffectively practiced. Whereas the teachers responded the practice of this issue was not effectively implemented. Beside this data observed from schools document such as: the schools advisory note books, external supervisors' suggestion note books, the school committees' follow up diaries and minutes indicated the practice of this issue in majority of the schools was poor.

The qualitative finding showed various uncertainties such as inconsistent provision of frequent monitoring over the school plans, the lack of supplying periodic feedback for stakeholders who are working in the school, inability of taking corrective measures on poor performance and the lack of participation of stakeholders in school's performance evaluation and enhancing their commitment to take measures on poor performance. With the support of this , a study by Garia and Rajhumar (2008) stated there are critical challenges that affect the implementation of educational decentralization in a sense of promoting the full autonomy of school site stakeholders through school based management process. Further, a study conducted by McGinn and Welsh (1999) listed these constraints as inadequate resources at school level, inadequate information, unclear expenditure assignment and responsibility declining share of spending on capital expenditure by sub-nation government, need to boost administrative capability at local level, vested interest on some of government bureaucrats at the top managerial level, overlapping or burdening of responsibility to a single leader, absence of clear guidelines as well as practice of incomplete decentralization for proper practice of SBM to ensure school effectiveness.

Hence some of the basic findings conceived from them under this inquiry are: parental involvement in the schools should be enhanced, the resource allocation from government must be exceed, concerned bodies (such as education office heads, experts, KETB and etc) should focus on urgent decision making, stakeholders in the schools should make coordination to enhance school progress, the access of necessary teaching materials and infrastructures should be adequately supplied, teachers assignment in schools must be inconsideration with their subject matter, teachers and principals should give more attention in class room teaching learning, continuous guidance and counseling to students should be provide by school leaders even monitoring and evaluation on school performance must be employed to have effective and functional SBM practice in attaining school effectiveness in Secondary Schools . Literatures demonstrated the quality of education depends primarily on the way schools are managed, more than on the availability of resources as Hanushek (2003) cited in Gertler P. (2007). It has also been shown that the capacity of schools to improve teaching and learning is strongly mediated by the quality of the leadership Caldwell (2005).

Beside Mekonen A. (2015) in his MA thesis study at East Hararghe zone secondary schools reported that challenges of educational decentralization are: lack of coordination among educational leaders, absence of clear guidelines, lack of skilled man power, inadequacy of material resources such as computers, paper, etc.), lack of clear accountability relationship, absence of clearly defined decision making process, lack of training for the stake holders, Shortage of budget for educational activities and inadequate participation of stake holders.

Obviously, SBM is the smaller scope of educational decentralization which is very crucial school leadership activity in enhancing schools effectiveness (MOE, 2002).Hence some of the major challenges of this issue in these secondary schools are explored from qualitative investigation through FGD discussion with KETB and PTA as well as from open ended questions involved for school leaders. As a result these respondents narrated some of the most constraining factors which are hindering the practices of SBM in the primary schools as: in adequate human, material and financial resource allocation from government, delay of urgent decision making, insufficient school infrastructures, facilities and furniture, lack of coordination among school stakeholders, over burdening of responsibilities Specially KETB, principals' function overload (he act as leader, secretary, record officer, Kebele education cabinet, resource manager and etc.)

inconsistent parental and community involvement as well as inadequate monitoring and evaluation from education office and concerned bodies.

In other side challenges regarding students' academic progress were also discussed from the respondents. Scholars confirm that schools' effectiveness is rooted from effective teaching and learning processes (Nazrol, 2000; Bergeson, 2002). However, the students' academic progress in secondary schools had facing with various challenges which are more originated from teaching-learning in consistences. These problems are: lack of students' interest, commitment and participation in classroom teaching-learning process, lack of process of consistent classroom supervision by principals, lack of assigning teachers based on subject matter, insufficiency of teaching aids, laboratory materials and science kits, low parental involvement in students learning, absence of teachers commitment in evaluation of curriculum materials (such as text books and teachers guides), inadequate students' academic achievement and students absenteeism.

5.1. Conclusions

Based on the major findings examined from this study the following conclusions were drawn.

SBM is one of educational decentralized administration techniques involving autonomy to local level actors and it empowers the internal decision making capability of principals, teachers, parents, students and other community members belonging to particular school. Therefore, SBM is crucial element of educational decentralization process which has compulsory effect on school goal achievement. The effective SBM practice inspire the moral and motivation of school personal it continuously appraise, develop and maintain teacher enthusiasm toward good teaching-learning to attain enhanced students' academic achievement.

As a result of the investigation the staff development and instructional leadership process were perceived at adequate level of practice. Besides the students' gross and net enrollment rate as well as fair or equal enrollment rate of female to male students', the students' dropout and repetition rate at every grade and at national exam was also improving from year to year.

In contrast the study showed the practice of participatory decision making, monitoring and evaluation, resource management as well as function of cluster supervision were examined at inadequate level of practice.

The discussion from mean rating of school leaders and total response indicated resource management and utilization in schools were adequately practiced. Whereas analysis from teachers' response examined the practice of the issue in the secondary school was at weak level of practice. In addition the data explored from financial resource management in schools indicated the schools have full autonomy in using their internal resource and budgets allocated from government concerning on the school's particular needs. Majority of secondary schools use different techniques of announcing the school communities regarding utilization and management of allocated resource. However the participation of school community in setting the school priorities, the involvement of school-community in allocation of resources to exercise the school plans and engagement of external audit to examine resources utilization were at inadequate level of implementation.

Additionally, analysis explored from FG discussion with KETB and PTA committee revealed discussions and decision making process of school board member in most secondary school is not consistent. Even in some schools both school board and PTA members discussion is compiled together which lead to problem in duties delegation. Relatively in most schools the meeting and functionality of PTA committees is better than the school boards. In more than average in secondary schools the participation of school community discussion are not adequate. Hence the decision making process in Kefa zone, selected secondary schools are inadequate.

5.2. Recommendations

At the end of this investigation depending on the findings and conclusions acquired from the study the following useful recommendations are made. These are:

- The result of this study on staff development pin out inconsistency of mentoring activities, inadequate engagement of new teachers in induction program, low focus on providing short term school based on job trainings as well as evaluating and monitoring the effect of these training programs in secondary schools.
- The participatory decision-making process in these selected secondary schools was at poor level of practice. So the school principals, KETB, PTA committee members and the whole school community should actively participate in SBM practices in regard of setting the school developmental plan, allocation of necessary resources in school improvement program and decision making process in line with their duties and responsibilities clearly delineated in education training document of Ethiopia(MOE, 1994; 2002)
- The education office experts' and heads, principals, department heads, KETB and PTA members in the schools must provide frequent monitoring and evaluation on the school activities, supply periodic feedback for stakeholders who are working in the schools, take corrective measures on poor performance and they should involve and empower stakeholders in school's performance evaluation and enhancing their commitment in school progress.
- The function of supervisor should focus on improving the practice of the school, developing teachers' instructional skill, enhancing professional development of teachers and school leaders as well as providing training programs for stake holders.
- Teachers in schools should conduct active teaching–learning approaches, empower cooperative learning abilities of pupils' and they must focus on improving the reading, writing and arithmetic skill of students in every class room.
- Some aspects of the problem that needs to get attention are the management of facilities and infrastructure, financing and cooperation partnerships. These aspects of the problem are related to the availability and fulfillment of minimal service management standards.
- Some determinant factors on the effectiveness of SBM implementation in the implementation of the program in schools mainly related to contributory factors such as

the availability of facilities and infrastructure, financial factors, and human resources available in this case the professional teachers

References

- Abenet (2016). Linking school-based management and school effectiveness: The influence of self-based management, motivation and effectiveness
- Agesa RU 2000. Ethnicity, nepotism and employment in public enterprises in Sub-Saharan Africa: a theoretical note. *African Finance Journal*, 2(1):39-43.
- Al Kaabi (2015). An Evaluation of the School Based Management Practice in the New School and Achievement: Implications for Ethiopia's Second Poverty Reduction Strategy (2006-10). London, Young Lives/Save the Children UK.
- Ayalew Shibeshi. (2009). Overview of Education Research in Ethiopia Studies, *Journal of*
- Ayeni, A.J. & Ibukun W.O. (2013) A Conceptual Model for School-Based Management Operation and Quality Assurance in Nigerian Secondary Schools. *Journal of Education and Learning*, vol 2(2) 36 – 43.
- Ayeni, J. and Ibukun, O. (2013). A Conceptual Model for School Based Management and
- Banerjee, A. and Duflo, E. (2006). Addressing Absence, *Journal of Economics perspectives*,
- Bauer, H. (2007). *High Poverty, High Performing: High hope!* IDRA Newsletter, 24(6).
- Berkman, S. (2013). Bricks to books: education sector procurement past and present, in Transparency International Global Corruption Report: Education. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Blasé, J. R. (1998). *Hand Book of Instructional Leadership: How really good principals promote teaching learning?* London: sage
- Bonilla Bogaert, S.E., Saraf, P., White, J. & Goutali, M. (2013). Enhancing school based management in decentralized education systems: the case of Ghana, in Transparency International Global Corruption Report: Education. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bosker, R.J. & Scheerens, J. (1994). Alternative Models of School Effectiveness put to the test.

- Botha, R.J. & Triegaardt, P.K. (2017). The principal as a distributed leader: supporting change and improving South African schools. *International Journal of Educational Science* vol 10(3) 419 – 427.
- Brandao (1995). *The Effects of School Based Management on Work Life of Elementary Teachers*.
- Brookover et al. (1979). *School Systems and Student Achievement: Schools Make a Difference*.
- Bush, T. and Glover, D. (2003). *School Leadership Concept and Evidence*. Nottingham: National
- Bush, T., Glover, D., Bisshoff, T., Moloi, K., Heystek, J. & Joubert, R. (2006). School leadership, management and governance in South Africa: A systematic literature review. Research series no 2. Johannesburg: Matthew Goniwe School of Leadership and Governance.
- Cand Well, B. (1998). Strategic Leadership, Resource Management and Effective Schools Reforms, *Journal of Education Administration*, 36(5), 445 – 461.
- Candwell, B. (2005). *School Based Management*. Paris IIEP – UNESCO.
- CandWell, B. and Spinks, J. (1992). *Leading the Self-Managing Schools*. London: Flamer Press.
- CDE (2011). Schooling reform is possible: Lesson for South Africa from international experience. CDE Round Table no 18. Johannesburg: CDE.
- Chapman, D., Barcikowski, E., Sowah, M., Gyamera E., & Woode, G. (2002). Do communities
- Chau, T. N. (1985). Equity and the decentralization question. In J. Lauglo and M. McLean
- Chaudhury, N., Hannmer, J. kremer, M., Muralidharan , k. and Rogers, F.H. (2006). Missing in
- Cheng YC 1996. A School-Based Management Mechanism for School Effectiveness and Development. *Journal of School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 7,35-61.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education (5th ed.)*. London: Routledge/Falmer.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education (5th ed.)*. London: Routledge/Falmer.

Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., MacPartland, J., et al. (1966). *Equality of Educational*
College for School Leadership.

Corruption Watch (2018). Corruption Watch (Analysis of Corruption Trends) Report. August
2018 vol 2 issue 2.

Cotton, K. (1995). *Effective Schooling Practices: A Research Synthesis. 1995 Update. School
Improvement Research Series*. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Planning Conducting and Evaluation Quantitative and Qualitative*
Critical Directions: *International Journal of Education Development*.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Quality Teaching: The Critical Key to Learning*. Principal 77(1),
5-11.

De Grauwe (2013). The decentralization of education and corruption, in Transparency
International Global Corruption Report: Education. Abingdon: Routledge.

Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Ministry of Education. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Department of Mathematical and Statistical Science. University of Hawassa, Ethiopia

DeStefano, J. & Elaheebocus, N. (2010). *School quality in Woliso, Ethiopia: Using opportunity*

Dunne, M., Akyeampong, K. and Humphreys, S. 2007. School Processes, Local Governance,
and Community Participation: Understanding Access, CREATE Pathways to Access:

Edmonds, R.R. (1979). Effective Schools for the Urban Poor. *Journal of Educational Leadership*,
37(1), 15-27.

Education, University of Addis Ababa 2009, <http://unesdoc.unesco.org>

ESDPIII (2004/05). *Education Sector Development Program*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ESPPIV (2011).*Education Sector Development Program*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Ethiopian Studies XLII.1–2 141–74

Fiske, E. B. 1996. Decentralization of education: Policies and consensus. Washington, DC: The

Fiske, E.B. & Ladd, H.F. (2004). Elusive equity: education reform in post-apartheid South Africa. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.

Florida University.

Fullan, M. & Watson, N. (1999). School-based Management: Reconceptualizing to Improve Learning Outcomes. Paper prepared for the World Bank. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Fullan, M. (2013) *Stratosphere: Integrating Technology, Pedagogy and Change Knowledge*.

Gamage, D.T. (1998b). How Did School and Community Partnership Result in More Effective Schools in Australia. *Perspective in Education*, 14 (1), 47-58

Garcia, Marito, Rajkumar and Sunil, A. (2008).*Achieving Better Service Delivery through Decentralization in Ethiopia*. Washington D.C, The World Bank.

Gay, L. R. (1996). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Beverly

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (9th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Merrill Publishing Co.

Gertrel, P. Patrinos, H.A. and Rubio-codina, M. (2007). *Methodological Issues in the Evaluation*

Goodman, C. L. (1997). *Principal of National Blue Ribbon Schools Says High Poverty Schools can excel*. IDRA Newsletter, 24(6). Retrieved from October 30,1997, <http://www.idra.org/Newsltr/1997/Jun/Zarate.htm>.

Gray J 2004. School Effectiveness and the ‘Other Outcomes’ of Secondary Schooling: A re assessment.*Journal of Improving Schools* 7, 185-198.

Hague (2007). Stakeholders' Responses To School-based Management in Indonesia. *International Journal of Education Management*, Vol.08(0191).

Hill, CA: Sage Publications.

Jansen, J. & Middlewood, D. (2003). From policy to action: Curriculum management at school level. In Coleman, M., Graham-Jolly, M. & Middlewood, D. (eds) *Managing the curriculum in South African schools*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Jirru and BerehAleltuWeredas in North Shoa. In T. Assefa& T. Gebre-Egziabher (Eds.), *Decentralization in Ethiopia* (pp. 131 - 144). Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Journal of Educational Research, 21(2) 159-180.

Journal of School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 3, 247-257.

Kayabwe, S. & Nabacwa, R. (2014). The use and usefulness of school grants: Lessons from Uganda. Paris: IIEP.

Kiragu, J.W., King'oina, J.O. & Migosi, J.A. (2013). School-based management prospect and challenges: a case of public secondary schools in Murang'a South District, Kenya. *International Journal of Asian Social Science* vol 3(5) 1166 – 1179.

know best? Testing a premise of educational decentralization: Community members' perceptions of their local schools in Ghana. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 22(2), 181-189.

Levacic, R. & Downes, P. (2004). Formula funding of schools, decentralization and corruption. Paris: IIEP.

Lugaz, C. & De Grauwe, A. (2010). Schooling and Decentralization: Patterns and policy implications in Francophone West Africa. Paris: IIEP.

Majgaard, K. & Mingat, A. (2012) *Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: A comparative analysis*. World Bank: Washington DC.

marginalized.Oxford; oxford University press.

McMeekin, A. (2013). Increasing transparency through education management information systems, in Transparency International Global Corruption Report: Education. Abingdon: Routledge.

Mekonnen (2015) : The roles of principals in practices of school based management in the secondary schools.

*Model.*United Arab Emirates University.

MOE (1994).*The Education and Training Policy.*Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

MOE (1998).*Education Sector Development Program I (ESDP-I): Action Plan.*Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

MOE (2002a).*Directive for Educational Management, Organization, Public Participation, and Finance.* Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

MOE (2005).*Education Sector Development program III (ESDP-III) program Action plan (PAP),*Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

MOE (2006a).*Decentralized Management of Education in Ethiopia.* Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

MOE (2006b).*Education Sector Development Program Action Plan III (ESDP-III),*Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

MOE (2008).*Ministry of Education, General Education Quality Improvement Package (GEQIP),inEthiopia.* Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

MOE (2009).*Ministry of Education, Continuous Professional Development for Primary and Secondary School Teachers, Leaders and Supervisors in Ethiopia, the Framework.* Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

MOE (2010).*Education Sector Development Program IV (ESDP IV),*Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

MOE 2002b.*Education sector Development program II (ESDP-II).*Addis Ababa, Ethiopia..

MOE and USAID (2008).*Review of the Ethiopian Education and Training Policy and its Implementation,* Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

- Motala, E. & Pampallis, J. (2001). *Education and equity: the impact of state policies on South African education*. Cape Town: Heinemann.
- Murphy, J. and Beck, I. (1995). *School Based Management as A School Reform: Taking Stock*. Thousand Oaks. CA: Crown.
- Mzabalazo Advisory Services (2016), ‘We are the architects of our own destiny’: Study of Positive Deviant Schools in Namibia. Windhoek: UNICEF Namibia.
- Nampota, D. & Chiwaula, L. (2014). *The use and usefulness of school grants: Lessons from Malawi*. Paris: IIEP.
- Nekhwevha, F. (2002). The influence of Freire’s “Pedagogy of Knowing”, in Kallaway, P. (ed) *The history of education under apartheid 1948 – 1994*. Cape Town: Pearson Education. New York: Praeger.
- Newman, F.M. king, M.B. and Rigdon, M. (1997). *Accountability and School Performance: Implications from Restructuring School*. *Hardvald Educational Review*, 67, 41 – 74.
- Nico (Bath), R.J. (2011). *Contextual factor in the Assessment of the Effect of School Based Management*. *Department of Teachers Education School of Education, college of Human sciences*. University of South Africa.
- Novelli, M. and Lopes Cardozo, M.T.A (2008). *Conflict Education and the Global South*: New
- Nyanda, G. (2014). *Resourcing public ordinary schools*, in Maringe, F. & Prew, M. (eds) *Twenty years of education transformation in Gauteng 1994 to 2014*. Somerset West: African Minds and GDE.
- Obasa (2010). *School-Based Management Developments And Partnership with school community*. *of School Based Management*. Washington D.C: The World Bank.
- Opportunity*. Washington, D.C: US Government Printing Office.
- Oumer, Jeilu (2009). *“The Challenges of Free Primary Education in Ethiopia”*, College of

Padayachee, A.D., Naidu, A. & Waspe, T. (2014). Structure and governance of systems, stakeholder engagement, roles and powers, in Maringe, F. & Prew, M. (eds) Twenty years of education transformation in Gauteng 1994 to 2014. Somerset West: African Minds and GDE.

Pearson Canada Inc., Toronto.

Pergamon Press.

Pillay, P. (1995). Fiscal decentralisation and rural development: the case of education. Policy paper 13. Johannesburg: Land and Agriculture Policy Centre.

Pillay, S. (2004). Corruption - the challenge to good governance: a South African perspective. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 17(7):586-605.

Piper, B. (2010). *Ethiopia Early Grade Reading Assessment: Data Analysis Report*. UNESCO.

Prew, M. (2013a). 'People's education for people's power': the rise and fall of an idea in Southern Africa, in Griffiths, T.G. & Millei, Z. (eds) *Logics of socialist education*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Prew, M. (2013b). South Africa: the education struggle continues, in Yan Wang (ed) *Education policy reform trends in G20 members*. Heidelberg: Springer.

Quality Assurance in Nigeria Secondary Schools, *Journal of education*, 2(2)pp?

Rachel M. et al (2010). *Mathematics text for grade 12 students: Further on Statics*. Federal Research (4th – edition). University of Nebraska – Lincoln.

Research Monograph No. 6, Brighton: Consortium for Educational Access, Transitions and Equity, University of Sussex.

Retrieved June 30, 1997, from <http://www.idra.org/Newsltr/1997/Jun/Hilaria.htm>

Review to the Literature. Oxford University.

- Saleem, F. et al (2012). Determinants of School Effectiveness: A study at Punjab Level. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(14).
- Sammons P. et al (1995). *Key Characteristics of Effective Schools: Review of School Effectiveness Research*. London University.
- Sammons, P. and Bakkum, L. (2011). *Effective Schools Equity and Teachers Effectiveness: A*
- Scheerens, J. (1992). *Effective Schooling, Research, Theory and Practice*. London: Cassel.
- Scheerens, J. (2004). *Review of School Instructional Effectiveness Research*. UNESCO.
- Scheerens, J. (2013). *What is Effective Schooling? A Review of Current Thought and Practice*.
- Serfontein, E., and de Waal, E. (2015) The corruption bogey in South Africa: Is public education safe? *South African Journal of Education*, 35(1): 1-12.
- Sileshi G.(2016). *Determinants of Students Academic Achievement towards to Mathematics Subject: A Case Study in Yem Special Woreda Preparatory School*, Unpublished Msc.
- Slater RO & Teddlie C (1992). *Toward a Theory of School Effectiveness and Leadership*.
- SMS.(2014) cited in Sileshi G. (2016). *Statically Package for Social Science Manual:*
- South African Department of Basic Education (2016a). *Policy on the South African Standard for Principalship*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- South African Department of Basic Education (2016b). *Report of the Ministerial Task Team appointed by Minister Angie Motsheka to investigate allegations into the selling of posts of educators by members of teachers unions and departmental officials in provincial education departments*. Released 18 May 2016.
- South African Department of Basic Education (2018). *Proposed draft Basic Education Laws Amendment Bill*.
- South African Department of Education (1996a) *South African Schools Act*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

- South African Department of Education (1996b). *Changing Management to Manage Change in Education: Report of the Task Team on Education Management Development*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Stringfield S (1994). *Advances in School Effectiveness Research and Practice*. Oxford:
- Tadesse, T. (2007). *Decentralization and education service delivery: The case of Moretenna*
- Tassew Woldehanna, Jones, N., & Bekele T. (2005). *Children's Educational Completion Rates*
- Teddlie C & Reynolds D. (2000). *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research* London: Falmer Press.
- The South African (2018). 'Education Sector reports highest number of corruption complaints' report from 7th August 2018 in <https://www.thesouthafrican.com/most-corrupt-government-sectors-in-sa/> (accessed 30th October 2018)
- Thesis Submitted to Hawassa University School of Mathematical and Statistical Science Hawassa, Ethiopia.
- Thurlow, M. (2003). The changing context of education management in South Africa. In Lumby, J., Middlewood, D. and Kaabwe, E. (Eds) *Managing human resources in South African schools*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Tikly, L. & Mabogoane, T. (1997). Marketisation as a strategy for desegregation and redress: the case of historically white schools in South Africa. *International Review of Education*, 43(2/3) 159 – 178.
- Tikson, D.T. (2008). Indonesia towards decentralization and democracy. In F. Saito (Ed.), *Foundations for Local Governance: Decentralization in comparative perspectives* (pp. 25- 46). Heidelberg, Germany: Physica-Verlag HD. U
- to Learn and Early Grade Reading Fluency to Measure School effectiveness. EQUIP2*. Retrieved January 30, 2010, from <http://www.equip123.net/docs/e2-SchoolEffectivenessInEthiopiaCS.pdf>.
- Transparency International (2013). *Global Corruption Report: Education*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Tsotetsi, S., van Wyk, N. & Lemmer, E. (2008) The experience of and need for training of school governors in rural schools in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education* vol 28 385 – 400.

Twenteuniversity.Netherland.

UNESCO (2010).*Education for all Global Monitoring report (2010): Reaching the*

World bank (2003). *Successful Decentralization : The Roles and Challenges of DEOs in Kenya.* France: The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP).

World bank (2004). *School-Based Management Developments And Partnership : Evidence from Indonesia.* *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32(2), 316–328.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2011.05.007>

World bank, (2014). *Linking school-based management and school effectiveness : The influence of self-based management, motivation and effectiveness in the Arab education system in Israel.* *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 1–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218775428>

Wubet (2015). *the practices of school based management , comparative studies*

APPENDIX A
JIMMA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND
MANAGEMENT

The research Questionnaires to be filled by school leaders and teachers

Dear Sir/Madam:

This survey study will be undertaken by graduates of Jimma University department of Educational Planning and Management College of Education and Behavioral Science in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in School Leadership. This study will be conducted entitled on “ *The Practices Of School Based Management In Kefa Zone Secondary Schools , Southern Nation Nationalities And Peoples Of Ethiopia* ” .The purpose of these questionnaires is to collect to investigate the school based management practices in Kefa zone secondary schools , some selected secondary schools

The success of this study entirely depends up on your genuine response, so I would like to express my felt thanks and respect for your frank, sincere and voluntary contribution to this study. It will be my great responsibility to keep the confidentiality of your response and the information obtained from you will be undoubtedly used only for academic purposes. Please read the instruction of each item carefully to provide your response correctly but No need to write your name.

Thank you in advance for your time and concern!

Sincerely yours.

Section I. Background of Respondents

Please answer the following questions by putting a (X) mark in the provided brackets.

Respondent: principal (): vice principal () Supervisor () & teacher and their current position unit leader (), department head (), coordinator of curricular activities () No position () etc.

Sex: Male () Female ()

Age: Less than 20 years (): 21-30 years (): 31-40 years () & More than 40 years ()

Education level: certificates (): diploma (): first degree (): second Degree: (): other ()

The experience in leader ship or teaching: less than 5 years (): 5- 10 Years (): 11-15 years (): & more than 15 years ()

Section II. The extent of school based management practices in Kefa Zone secondary schools

The constructs of school based management and their corresponding questioners which can be answered through a Likert scale of strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, Agree and strongly agree are listed in the following tables. Each scale is represented by Roman numbers 1 to 5 respectively. (NB: (1) represent strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) undecided, (4) represent agree & (5) stands strongly agree.)

A. Academic Staff Development

Questionnaires for school leaders and teachers

No	STATEMENTS	1	2	3	4	5
1	Teachers at the school are categorized in to academic department					
2	Delegation of responsibility to teachers is based on their experience					
3	The new staff members actively engage induction program at the school					
4	Experienced teachers are Coiled-up with Newly employed one as mentor					
5	All teachers at the school participate in CPD program					
6	The school involve different short term on job training and reflection programs for teachers					
7	The school evaluate and monitor the effect of different updating strategies on academic staff development					

Based on your perception write at list three to five strength and weakness of staff development in your school

B. Decision-Making process

Questionnaires for school leaders and teachers

No	STATEMENTS	1	2	3	4	5
1	Stake holders are involved in school self-evaluation					
2	Stake holders participated in developing common vision, mission, goals and values of the school					
3	Stake holders are engaged in identifying school priorities					
4	Stake holders communicate and create consensus on school development plan					
5	The school development plan is based on a sense of enhancing instructional process					
6	The school board has played leadership role on practice of school plan and make over all decision					
7	The school PTA committee periodically visit the school and provide advisory function for school board on performance of school operations					

Based on your perception write at list three to five strength and weakness of decision making process in your school

C. The School Resources Management

NO	STATEMENTS	1	2	3	4	5
1	The list of urgent physical and material resource problems are identified and prioritized at the school					
2	The school has developed the necessary physical and material resource plan and its corresponding financial estimation					
3	The school communicate with the whole school-community and make consensus to allocate financial or material inputs					
4	The school community actively participate in setting priorities and development plan					
5	The school-community involve financial or material resource to exercise the school plan					
6	The school has efficiently utilized financial or material resource allocated to its priorities					
7	The school has internal transparency and accountability systems in utilization of school resource					
8	The school has involved external audit regarding material and financial resource utilization					

Based on your perception write at list three to five strength and weakness of resources management process in your school

D. Monitoring and Evaluation process

No	STATEMENTS	1	2	3	4	5
1	The appropriate tools (check-lists) are used to monitor the school operations.					
2	The frequent monitoring has conducted over the school operations based on schedule					
3	The constructive feedback has periodically given for all those who are working in the school					
4	The school formatively take corrective measures on poor performance					
5	The school conduct quarter, mid or annual school performance evaluation and revise its course of action					
6	the school stake holders actively participate in school's performance evaluation process and enhance their commitment to take measures on poor performance					

Based on your perception write at list three to five strength and weakness of resources management process in your school

Appendix B

Section IV. FGD questions for school board and PTA committee in Kefa zone secondary schools

Dear Sir/Madam:

This survey study will be undertaken by graduates of Jimma University department of Educational Planning and Management College of Education and Behavioral Science in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in School Leadership. The purpose of the discussion is to collect convenient data collect to investigate the practices of school based management in Kefa zone, selected woreda secondary schools. The success of this study entirely depends up on your genuine response, so I would like to express my felt thanks and respect for your frank, sincere and voluntary contribution to this study. It will be my great responsibility to keep the confidentiality of your response and the information obtained from you will be undoubtedly used only for academic purposes.

Thank you in advance for your time and concern!

Sincerely yours.

Discuss on the following questions

1. How do you understand school based management?-----

2. How do you evaluate the practice of SBM process in your school? -----

3. Do you have any role in school decisions making? (Yes) or (no) if you say yes in what issues?-----

4. According to your perception what is school's goal achievement? -----

5. Do you think the SBM practices contribute school's goal achievement? please discuss your idea -----

6. Write down challenges which are affecting the SBM practices in your school?-----

7. What do you suggest to improve the practices of SBM in your school?-----

