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OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation of Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td>Assignment of duties to individuals basing on their skills, expertise, capabilities and availabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board of Management (BOM)</strong></td>
<td>School governing body involved in the provision of strategic guidance. It is composed the principal of the schools as the secretary of the board, two teachers as members of the board, parents, school sponsor and members of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision</strong></td>
<td>Choice reached by BOM after thinking and deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory Management</strong></td>
<td>is the practice of empowering members of a group, such as employees of a company or citizens of a community, to participate in organizational decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance of public schools</strong></td>
<td>Meeting of the set expectations in the course of students schooling. In this context, performance is looked at through student’s behavior, enrolment and mean scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource management</strong></td>
<td>Efficient and effective utilization of finances, time and human personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Management</strong></td>
<td>Focusing and Evaluation of unexpected eventualities that are inform of financial, strategic, operational and reputational risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Engagement</strong></td>
<td>is the process by which an organization involves people who may be affected by the decisions it makes or can influence the implementation of its decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

Performance has remained poor in most of the public secondary schools in Kenya. This is despite the government’s commitment to improve standards of education through the constitution of school board of management (BOM). The strategic approaches by the BOMs can be attributed to the performance of public secondary schools. This study therefore purposed to examine strategic actions of boards of management and the performance of public secondary schools in Nakuru County Kenya. The study was guided by four objectives: To establish the effects of BOM decisions, resource management, allocation of responsibilities and risk management on the performance of public Secondary schools in Nakuru County. The study would be significant to scholarly disciplines where knowledge would be added to the body of strategic management, the study would be beneficial to BOM in public schools as they can link strategy and performance of public secondary schools. Lastly the study would be significant to policy makers as it would provide important information on education policy formulation and how education can be improved using participatory methods. Two theories were used for the study; stakeholder’s engagement theory and agency theories. The target population included 350 board of management from 25 public secondary schools in Nakuru County. The sample size for the study was 75 board members who were purposely selected. Descriptive research design was used where questionnaires were the main data collection tool. Data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics with the aid of computer software; Statistical Programme for Social Scientist (SPSS). Descriptive statistics entailed counts, percentages and cross tabulations. Inferential statistic on the other hand entailed performing a multiple regression analysis. The study established that most schools involve their BOM in decision making and these decisions have an influence in the performance of public secondary schools. On resource management, BOM were not involved in budget preparations however they undertook monitoring, supervision and budget approvals. On allocation of responsibilities, most tasks were given basing on individual expertise knowledge and the involvement is geared towards a better management of the schools. It was further established that most BOM were not aware of the operational steps involved in risk management. All the four variables had significant effect on performance of public schools. However, decision making followed by allocation of responsibilities, resource management and risk management subsequently. The study recommends that decisions made during board meetings should be shared to help avoid any unseen conflict. The BOM needs to involve all its members and assign them responsibilities that they can handle effectively. Lastly, the BOM needs to encourage all its members to be part of the risk management proces
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

School performance can be measured through regular monitoring of its progress. This further helps in ensuring that the schools are able to reach their potential. One of the ways to measure performance is through use of school performance framework that is able to rate how the school supports student’s growth and achievement and further how it serves students and communities. Suryadarm, Suryahadi, Sumarto and Rogers (2006) are of the opinion that vast resources is invested in education hence there is a need to understand the factors that are crucial in improving students learning.

Good Performance in most schools is measured at using student’s tests. This approach is debated to be useful at providing objective measure of quality. This conclusion however can only hold water if the test used are well designed, standardized and allows comparison among schools from different regions (Suryadarma, et. al, 2006). According to World Bank (2003) using tests to measure performance is disadvantageous as teachers might be tempted to teach on the tested areas hence comprehensive learning is neglected. Additionally there might be an attempt to manipulate results by teachers and administrators. Student specific factors such as their family background, social economic conditions and different access to facilities at times explain student’s school performance hence creating a challenge on the attribution of school contribution on the overall performance. Stevens and Graddy(2003) further opine that strong performance may simply reflect the student’s innate ability or prior preparation, rather than the school’s contribution.

There is a rising trend of comparing school performance between developed and developing nations. Aspects of performance under study have included school quality, teaching quality, teacher remuneration, class size and gender. Kingdon and Teal (2007) further explain that while looking at students’ performance, it is important to consider both measurable and unmeasurable inputs while looking at school performance.
According to Armentano (2003) teachers are the most important influence on students’ progress. He looks at teachers influence to be important than both social economic status and school location. Banerjee, Cole, Duflo and Linden (2005) further asserts that students learning is significantly increased when teachers conduct after school tutoring. Teacher’s absence in class has a correlation with student’s performance in schools (Chaudhury et al. 2006).

There are different parameters that can be used to measure performance as indicated by earlier empirical reviews. This study used three parameters to measure performance. These were mean score, student’s discipline and enrolment.

1.1.1 Strategic Actions

For school performance to be enhanced there is need for strategic actions in public schools in Nakuru County. One of the strategies that has been introduced is use of school boards as a management tool. It is believed that this boards are made up of various stakeholders from the education sector. These might include: Administrators, teachers, staff, students, parents, community members, school board members and state representative. Involvement of stakeholders in education set ups imply the devolution of decision making powers from central government to school level (Botha, 2007). This is one of the current international trends in educational reforms which aims to move towards institutional autonomy.

In Europe, Participation of school boards, and consultation of citizens, is considered a key element in policy decision making. According to the European Network of Education of 2011 Council, good governance is indicated by stakeholder’s participation in education policy making. Education councils have been set in Europe as national or regional bodies that provide policy advice on innovation in education policies (Agostini & Natali, 2015). Governments and different stakeholder groups come together to examine the benefits of the council by forming an advisory body which enhances transparent consultation and efficiency in the education system. EUNEC supports cooperation between several European education councils to strengthen participative processes at both national and European level.

In South Africa, school based management is compulsory and has been made into a policy framework embedded in South African Schools Act 84 of 1996. This enables each school in South Africa to renew its management in a responsible and effective way (Botha, 2007). It’s
important noting that there is widespread implementation of school-based management in South Africa yet moderate attention has been received when it comes to stakeholders’ participation and their impact on the values on school based management process (Mchunu, 2010).

In Ghana, the ministry of education is solely concerned with provision of quality education by providing physical facilities, equipment, teaching and learning materials (TLMs), adequate number of trained teachers, and promotion of gender equity in enrolment and retention among others (Harriet, Anin, &Asuo, 2013). Basic schools in Ghana are initiated by communities teacher recruitment are responsible in teacher recruitment and provision of learning places for children. This schools are usually absorbed into the public system and the management and control of these schools shift to central government authorities with minimum community participation. It has been noted that the shift in management tend to adversely affect local community commitment and involvement in quality basic education (Addae-Boahene, 2007). The government came up with various community structures to strengthen community participation.

Kenya as a country still experiences challenges in provision of access to quality education on an equitable basis (GoK, 2001). To mitigate this, efforts have been made such as phasing out untrained teachers and providing teacher training, providing funds for instructional materials, paying teachers’ salaries and employing quality assurance staff (Kimu, 2012). There is a recognition that there is need to involve different stakeholders to enable synergy and to meet the desired objectives. The Education Act, Cap. 211 part III, 9(2), Legal Notice 190/1978 provides for formation School Management Committee (SMC).

School management involves the planning, organization and coordination of resources so as to deliver on educational goals. Education institutions face challenges in regard to management, the public schools in Kenya have not been spared of this. Many public schools are characterized by under performance in examinations, governance issues, financial management concerns, low staff turn-over and infrastructural deficits. Jeynes, (2007) indicate that there is a strong relationship between quality of school management and the degree of attainment of educational and school goals. It is expected that the BOMs would have more influence and power to make decisions in regard to quality of education in secondary schools.
The strategies that have been used to enhance performance include management of resources, allocation of responsibilities, risk management and decision making ability by the school boards. Nakuru is one the areas that has already put in place BOMs whose work include: Developing of all institutional policies and ensuring accountability and prudent use of institutional resources. Mobilizing resources for the institution development, promoting networking and partnership for the school, discussing and approving comprehensive termly and annual reports and forwarding them to the County Education Board (CEB).

1.1.2 Board of Management

Kenyan schools have had board of management since after its independence (Nyaga, 2009). The names of the boards have changed from time to time yet their sole responsibility has remained as the management of schools. The roles have been made statutory responsibilities as stipulated in different Acts over time. The Ominde commission in its report made recommendations for board of governors to be in charge of management of school (GoK, 1964). This move was meant to decentralize the authority of schools and make it effective and additionally give the schools individualized personalities.

The Year 1988, saw the amendment of the school boards following recommendations made by the Kamunge report. The minister was made in charge of appointing members of the board of governors through a selected committee comprising of provincial administration, local leaders, members of parliament and local councilor, sponsors, local education officer and the head teacher. The committee selected 3 persons who represented local community, 4 individuals who represented bodies and organizations like sponsor and 3 representing special interest groups. Once the members were appointed by the minister the chair person was selected among members and three individuals were coopted from the parent’s teachers association making the board to have a composition of ten members (Opot, 2006)

In service management was provided by the ministry of education from 1980 where school principals were trained on management of schools. The Kenya education Staff Institute (KESI) was established in 1988 to offer in-service training for heads of educational institutions. It is however noted that the institution has failed to provide training on other school leaders such as deputy principles, heads of department, school committees and board of governors for the two
decades of its existence (Otunga, Serem, Kindiki, 2008). Inadequate funding has been used to explain why KESI has not been able to train more individuals in educational leadership. According to the Koech report, management of educational institution has been weak due to lack of management capabilities by the board of governors (RoK, 1999). This has made the government of Kenya to come up with policies that aim to improve the school management boards in Kenya with an aim of offering quality education. According to MOEST (2005) the sessional paper no 1 of 2005 highlighted the functions of the board of governors to include: management of both human and other resources in order for facilitation of smooth operations.

The recently formed board of management as provided for in the Basic education Act of 2013 indicate that the County Education Board is in charge of appointing the school board of management which comprises of 14 members who include: six persons representing parents or local community, a nominee of the county Education Board, one representative of teaching staff, three representatives of sponsors, one representative of special interest group and a representative of a person with special needs (ROK, 2013). Schools interest should come first hence the BOMs are supposed to adhere to this ethic in their course of work.

Board of management in schools now perform strategic roles that can be measured against performance of schools. The study had its major focus on the strategic roles of school boards that include BOM decisions, allocation of responsibilities, risk management and resource management.

School boards of management have been present since Kenya attained its independence, it is expected that management of schools would not be facing the modern day challenges due to their evolvement over time. Different task forces and commissions have come up with reports on how education stakeholders can be involved towards increased performance in schools. However different challenges have also been faced over time despite the efforts put in place.

For any school programme to be effective, there is need for stakeholders in education to be committed. According to MOEST (2005) the BOMs are charged with managing resources which leads to effective operations. The management roles bestowed to BOMs require that its members should have practical hands on experience on management practices like planning, organizing, staffing, budgeting, coordination, monitoring and evaluation. Performance of public secondary schools in Nakuru Sub-County is still wanting despite the presence of the BOMs. It is upon this
context that the study sought to establish Board composition and the performance of public secondary schools in Nakuru County.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Performance has remained poor in most of the public secondary schools in Kenya despite the government’s commitment to offer quality education (MoEST, 2005). Limited involvement and participation by some BOM members in its strategic decisions can be attributed to the poor performance. Further there is need to critically understand how the BOMs perceive involvement and engagement that can lead to increased performance in public secondary schools. Public schools in Nakuru County have shown either a decline or stagnation in performance as indicated by their means score.

The BOMs being a new phenomenon has strong mandate yet the roles are not clearly understood by its members. Further there is minimal empirical evidence to underpin school management boards and performance of schools. Improved performance requires active participation by members of BOM. There is low strategic actions by stakeholders despite the basic education Act of 2013 giving powers to BOMs in the management process. However Sadker and Sadker (2008) are of the view that BOM participation is not tied towards school performance. This can be attributed to inadequate training and experience. The control of these boards is vested in a few members who are familiar with education policies as stipulated by the ministry of education. Further Kindiki (2009) argues that BOM in public schools lack the necessary strategies that can be implemented towards improving performance of schools. It is expected that with the BOMs set in place there would be recorded increased performance in schools since some of the BOM members are parents in the school. This has not been the case necessitating a need to understand the strategic actions used by school boards. This study therefore aimed to understand strategic actions of board of management and the performance of public secondary schools in Nakuru County, Kenya.
1.3 Objective of the Study

The study was guided by both the general and specific objectives

1.3.1 General Objective

To assess strategic actions of board of management and the performance of public secondary schools in Nakuru County, Kenya.

1.3.2 Specific Objective

i. To examine the effect of decision making on performance of public Secondary schools in Nakuru County.

ii. To establish the effect of resource management on the performance of public Secondary schools in Nakuru County.

iii. To analyze the effect of allocation of responsibilities on the performance of public Secondary schools in Nakuru County.

iv. To investigate the effect of risk management on the performance of public Secondary schools in Nakuru County.

1.4 Research Questions

i. What is the effect of decision making on performance of public secondary schools in Nakuru County?

ii. What is the effect of resource management on the performance of public Secondary schools in Nakuru County?

iii. What is the effect of allocation of responsibilities on the performance of public Secondary schools in Nakuru County?

iv. What is the effect of risk management on the performance of public Secondary schools in Nakuru County?
1.5 Significance of the Study

The study was significant in a number of ways

1.5.1 Scholarly Disciplines

The study added to the body of knowledge on the discipline of strategic management. Numerous studies have been undertaken on strategy formulation and implementation. However, there are few studies that have looked at how school board of management can use strategy to ensure performance is enhanced. This study therefore is important as it has its underpinnings in the discipline of strategy and could be used by future scholars. It will add to the body of knowledge especially on the management discipline by giving empirical insights that can be used by scholars and researchers.

1.5.2 School Boards of Management

The study might be beneficial to BOM in public schools as they can link strategy and performance of public secondary schools. This can aid in their decision making abilities of the boards. There has been political interference of school boards that has rendered schools to take decisions that are not pro academic which have impacted on their negative performance. The study could be significant as it would shed light on some important aspects of BOM engagement such as: benefits of stakeholders’ engagement, levels of engagement, principles of engagement, process of engagement, method of identification of relevant stakeholders which can be beneficial to the academic sector.

1.5.3 Policy Makers

Further the findings of the study would provide important information on education policy formulation and how education can be generally improved using a participatory method.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study was carried out in Nakuru County targeting Public Secondary Schools in the area. The study limited itself to four variables namely: BOMs decision making, BOMs resource
management, BOMs risk management and BOMs responsibilities. The study narrowed its focus to BOMs who are stakeholders in public secondary schools.

1.7 Limitation of the Study

The target population for the study was too wide in that each school had 14 Board Members comprising of the principal of the schools as the secretary of the board, two teachers as members of the board, parents, school sponsor and members of the community. These individuals proved hard to get for the purposes of filling the questionnaire. This limitation was however contained by the researcher visiting the selected schools for the study and obtaining the contact details of school board members. The researcher then made appointments with the various individuals for the purposes of data collection.

1.8 Organization of the Study

The study was organized in five chapters. The first chapter gave an introduction of the study by expounding on the background of the study. It is then followed by the statement of the problem, objectives of the study, scope of the study, limitation and organization of the study.

Chapter two of the study looked at the literature review of the study. Both empirical and theoretical reviews were presented. A conceptual framework touching on the study variables was drawn from the variables of the study. A summary of the literature and research gaps were also presented in the study.

The third chapter of the study presented the methodology of the study whereby the research design, empirical model, target population, sample design, data collection instruments, data collection procedures and finally data analysis and presentation were given.

Chapter four of the study was concerned with research findings. It gave an interpretation of the results by presenting them into tables, charts and graphs for ease of interpretation. Chapter four divided the analyzed data into descriptive and inferential statistics. Discussions for the analyzed data was also presented in this chapter. Lastly chapter five was presented where it gave a summary of the findings of the study presented in chapter four. Conclusions and recommendations were then drawn.
CHAPTER TWO  
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

Two theories were used to explain the underpinnings of the study; these include; Stakeholder Engagement Theory by Ed Freeman and Agency Theory by Ross and Mitnick

2.1.1 Stakeholders Engagement Theory

The stakeholder’s theory was popularized by Darden Professor Ed Freeman in his book strategic management published in 1984. Stakeholders are any group or individual who affects or is affected by achievement of organizational purpose. Stakeholders are classified as financiers, customers, suppliers, employees and communities (Jensen, 2001). Freeman advances that stakeholders should not be looked at as “externalities” by management as they hold intrinsic value of their own. Three basic premises of the theory are: Descriptive- the way things are done, Normative –the way things out to be done and instrumental- doing it for business.

Taking into account a broad view of stakeholders’ interest and concerns is positively correlated with maximizing long term shareholders values (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). Engaging with stakeholders is an effective way of that delivers results. Five ways in which stakeholders can contribute to company’s performance include; solving problems, helps management see the future, facilitates trust, stakeholders are potentially influential partners and lastly stakeholders can improve a company’s public image. Smith, Ansett and Erez (2011) give five key steps of engaging stakeholders. These are: stakeholder mapping to get internal engagement, identification of material issues, defining objectives, resolving issues collaboratively and embedding engagements.

To link the theory to the study, it is important to understand that BOM in the education sector should be seen as holding an intrinsic value towards attainment of educational goals. The boards are concerned with the way things are done. This could help in guiding towards future endeavors and the desired goals the boards wants to achieve. BOMs should be careful not to get stack in the
descriptive position for too long. Efforts should be made to forge ahead towards normative and instrumental objectives of education progress.

Using the five steps as advanced by Smith, Ansett and Erez (2011), mapping of boards is usually done to determine their suitability. During meetings and in the process of any engagement, issues ought to be tabulated and critically understood. Objectives are then set where any arising issues is resolved through collaboration and dialogue and lastly the discussed issues are made binding. Having this steps followed will result to positive BOM strategic decisions that have a trickling down effect on the performance of public schools in Nakuru County.

2.1.2 Agency Theory

Agency theory is grounded on an economic model that is a combination of economics and institution theory that emerged in 1970. The theory was originated by Ross and Mitnick (Ross, 1973; Mitnick, 2013) and further developed by Jensen and Mecklin (1976). This theory is concerned with the relationship between managers and stakeholders. An agency relationship is whereby the principle engages the agent to perform some service on their behalf that involve decision making authority. The rationale behind the principal-agent model is that the Principal is too busy doing a given job and so hires the Agent. At times monitoring the agent becomes hard for the principle thus a number of strategies are used to motivate the agents into compliance.

This theory assumes that both the principle and the agent are motivated by self-interest which is bound to escalate in conflict. With self interest in place, agents are bound to deviate from the principles goals. This theory thus assumes the divergence of the interest of the agent and the principle (Hills & Jones, 1992). This divergence can be reduced by having appropriate incentives to agents and further by monitoring the actions of the agents to reduce their opportunistic actions. Agents are given a bonding costs which is a guarantee that they would not engage in behavior that harm the principle.

Further agency loss comes into interplay while examining this theory. This is the difference between the best possible outcome for the principal and the consequences of the acts of the agent (Donaldson & Davis, 1991). Deviation of an agent from the interest of the principle increases agency loss while acting consistently with a principles interest minimizes agency loss. Having a desire to have a similar outcome by both the agent and the principle imply a common interest
which minimizes on the agency loss. Further, Wright, Mukherjiand Kroll (2001) notes that the theory assumes that the principle is aware knowledgeable on the likely consequences of the agents activities. Agents are therefore expected to set aside their personal interests and work towards maximizing the interests of the principles.

The theory can be linked to the study by comparing the principles of public schools as the government. The basic educations act and appointed the BOM who are individuals drawn from different sectors to act as agents in the management of public primary schools. Agents are expected not to act on their self-interest in order to avoid agency loss. Likewise it is assumed that the government who is the principle is aware of the consequences and the extent that the interest by agents can have. Consequently they are supposed to monitor and at the same time come up with strategies that can be used to motivate the agents and enable them work efficiently. This theory best explains the actions of BOM on decision making, allocation of responsibilities and resource management. When these variables are checked and geared towards the good of the school, conflicts reduces hence BOMs do not deviate from the goal of ensuring performance is achieved.

2.2 Empirical Review

2.2.1 BOMs Decisions and Performance of Public Schools

Examining the decisions made by stakeholders Fullan and Watson (2000) urge on the need to reconceptualize school based management in order to improve learning outcomes. Despite the increased hype on decentralization of education, authority is still retained at the regional and central level. Further they continue to state that decentralization focuses on structural elements negating the needed day to day capacities and activities needed for school improvement. For decisions in school to be sound there is a need to understand the conditions that enable school based management to produce results. Further there is also a need to understand the roles and relationship between the school/community and the region/center.

Stevenson (2001) examined the core values of schools in relation to shared decision making. The study indicated that second order changes in structures and relationships do not necessarily result in second-order changes in teaching and learning. School issues that entail process and norms
that govern behavior in schools cannot be assumed to come into play when complex issues concerning curriculum and teaching are encountered.

Having head teacher support groups helps in better decision making in the schools by providing mechanism for excellence in provision of quality education which further has positive changes in the lives of communities (Herriot, Crossley, Juma, Waudo, Mwirotsi, & Kamau, 2002). Head teachers support groups (HTSGs) have been developed through training and the head teachers are encouraged to form small clusters consisting of six schools within reasonable reach. These forums bring together head teachers, community members and education officials to share ideas, come with ways of supporting each other and also manage their knowledge which lead to improved decisions in schools. The authors view that through training and learning, a rippling effect is created at the grassroots which enables a bottom up approach of ideas and strategies.

Appraisal of teachers produces competency leading to decisions in schools that can be trusted. Using a qualitative approach that adapted multiple methods in his study, Odhiambo (2005) scrutinized at the appraisal experiences of Kenyan secondary teachers. The study argues that teacher appraisal policies and practices in Kenyan secondary schools exhibit weaknesses, which need to be urgently addressed if teacher appraisal is to be used to improve the quality of teaching and education in Kenya. This only serves to hamper decision in schools hence reflects in the general performance in schools.

In a different study, Odhiambo (2008) investigates on the quality education in Kenya by narrowing the focus on quality assurance and teacher accountability. By examining conditions of significant changes in government policies and educational restructuring. Reasons why the Kenyan government has difficulties in achieving quality education is traced through teachers accountability. The findings indicate that teacher accountability does not lead to poor quality education. Instead it is revealed that management practices and other government policies forms part of the decisions made in schools hence have a role to play towards the quality of education. Quality development depends on the participation of all persons involved in teaching and learning. Education in Kenya needs complete overhaul and not piecemeal reforms.

Ndiku, Simiyu, Achoka (2009) examines how decision making in schools can be improved through participation of teachers. To them schools have a hierarchical structure that place the head teacher at the top and solely gives them decision making powers. They are of the view that
this arrangement can negatively impact on efficiency and productivity of schools as teachers are not involved in decision making. They further opine that there is a need to decentralize decisions to the lower levels where teachers would be part of decision making. Their study indicated that teachers had a desire to be greatly involved in decision making. They thus recommend the need for school managers to increase the extent to which they involve teachers in decision making to improve on the quality of decisions and boost their morale in their performance of duty.

To understand how stakeholders undertake decisions in schools, Nyaga (2009) examines the effectiveness of boards of governors in curriculum implementation in secondary schools in Kenya. For curriculum implementation to be effective, the BOG members need to be trained as they play a key role in supporting the schools. Involving them on a daily basis will further enhance sound decisions in schools.

To better understand decision making in public secondary schools, Kiumi, Bosire and Sang (2009) examined the relationship between principals' management approaches and students' discipline in public secondary schools in Nyandarua and Laikipia districts. Students discipline in school translates to positive school outcomes thus if school principals enlist the support of teachers and parents in discipline management then high levels of discipline can be achieved. The findings of the study reveal that principles heading large schools tend to be inclusive compared to their counterparts in small schools. Increase in school size also leads to increased level of teacher and parental input on discipline management. Thus principles can make a conscious decision of involving different stakeholders in discipline management for better performance.

Better decisions are made when stakeholders are prepared. To this effect, Sang (2010) assess the preparedness of secondary school head teachers as leaders and managers of schools in Kenya. The recent school strikes in Kenya have led to scrutiny in management practices. Different reasons have been advanced as a course for these strikes which include overloaded curriculum; autocratic school administration; drug and substance abuse; poor living conditions in schools; excessive use of corporal punishment; lack of an effective school guidance and counseling services among others. These has led to the concerns on the preparedness of head teacher to face such challenges in terms of the decisions they make. The findings reveal that there is leadership and managerial ineptitude by head teachers. It is recommended that head
teachers need to be trained on school management which will improve on their decision making abilities.

Mokoena (2011) studied the perception of school stakeholders in participative decision making in South Africa. Participative decision making (PDM) has increased and it is an agreed upon model around the world for operation of schools especially in the public sector. The decisions are devolved to schools although it has been noted that rural schools take time to embrace this new phenomenon. Factors that hinder the implementation of PDM in rural schools were considered. The study recommends that principals should create a space for debate and dialogue for all stakeholders to participate sufficiently in the school governing body (SGB) structure. Such a platform would allow stakeholders to air out their dissatisfaction and ensure their right to participation on issues dealing with school governance.

2.1.2 BOMs Resource Management and Performance of Public Schools

Hanushek (1996) gives a more complete picture of school resource policies and how it relates to students performance. The study indicated that resources are at times used effectively by schools although this happens infrequently. Conclusion is made that lack of resources is not the largest problem facing schools and that more fundamental reforms are needed in schools. Hanushek (1997) picks from his previous study and looks at the effects of school resources on student performance. It is viewed that this relationship can be considered as controversial because it calls into question a variety of traditional policy approaches. Looking at other empirical work, it is noted that there is not a strong or consistent relationship between student performance and school resources.

Lack of resources in schools is attributed to negative impact of education to students (Hanushek, 1997). Further, Gamoran, Secada, and Marrett (2000) view that the impact of professional development on teaching depends in part on the level of resources available for implementation and for diffusion of new ideas and practices. School resources determine the learning environment and these provide opportunities for students to explore ideas and knowledge, collaborate, solve problems and develop knowledge and skills (Lage, Platt & Treglia, 2000). For a student to learn through a rich and varied selection of instructional materials a variety of resources are needed. Some examples of school resources include: Instructional materials, curriculum resources, financial resources, technological resources, teachers and support staff,
building and facilities, instructional space and resources for students with disabilities. The learning environment provides ample opportunity for planned student interactions and engagement.

Although resources are diverse, many tend to give financial resource priority to other types of resources. Koross, Ngwareand Sang (2009) looks at Principals and students' perceptions on parental contribution to financial management in secondary schools in Kenya. It was noted that parents were involved in financial management of schools and this had positive financial influence on financial management outcomes. Due to the importance of school finances more parents need to be involved to increase on accountability of management of finances in schools. Parental involvement greatly influence the way finances in schools are managed. Further parental participation can have positive impact on the teaching and learning process. This strengthens the partnership between parent teacher associations, community and school administration in addition to democratizing school governance.

Ikianya (2013) study is on the influence of stakeholders’ involvement in resource management on pupils’ performance in Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) in public Primary schools in Imenti South District. Her study is guided by three objectives which concentrate on four different stakeholders: involvement of school management committee (SMC) involvement of teachers, involvement of parents and lastly involvement of sponsors in resource management. The findings of her study established that pupils’ academic performance was affected by involvement of school management committee (SMC) in resource management. Further involving parents, teachers and sponsors in resource management influence pupils’ academic performance. They recommend a need for coordination between the different roles of the stakeholders on resource management.

Wagithunu, Muthee, and Thinguri (2014) critically analysed the competence of school Principals’ Comp financial management in Kenya. The authors are of the opinion that while competency is acquired through training and experience, accountability on the other hand which is a moral issue is acquired through schooling, theory and practice. Proper management of school funds translates to overall performance in schools. Financial management in schools is facilitated through planning and proper utilization of funds. Checks and balances that help principles in their day to day financial management practice is provided by stakeholders who participate in
financial management. Their responsibility include Monitoring and evaluation, credit control and auditing of financial records.

A prescription of managing of school funds is given in the South African School Act. Further the roles of school governing body (SGB) on management of school finances is given. Some of these functions include adopting a constitution, drafting a mission statement, drawing up policies such as an admission policy and financial policy. This governing body is given a responsibility of managing the finances of the school such as establishing a school fund, preparing a budget annually, collecting and administering school fees, keeping the financial records, appointing an accountant and supplementing the school's resources. Having challenges in in giving practical solutions to financial problems has led head teachers and SGB to manage school finances yet they do not have practical skills and expertise. This further creates a chance of misappropriation, fraud, pilfering and improper control of financial records (sama, Yende&Arenstein, 2003).

Mestry (2006) while examining the functions of school governing bodies in managing school finances opines that some members of school governing body and principles have either little knowledge of the schools Act or their interpretation of the act is not correct which results to financial mismanagement. The study revealed that various education stakeholders have a misconception on school governing body.

2.1.4 BOMs Risk Management and Performance of Public Schools

Any decision maker should be fully informed on the various risks that they might face and strategies to mitigate these risks should also be undertaken. Risk management can be beneficial in schools as they enable new ideas to be explored and further minimize their impact. Breyer (2009) is of the view that risks are effects of uncertainty which might be either positive or negative on a given objective. Due to risks being an avoidable, there is need to coordinate all activities with an aim of controlling the risk. The importance of risk management in schools include: reduced disruption of children education, reduced damage to a school's reputation, reduced negative effect of incidents on staff and pupils' morale, reduced time lost in reacting to incidents, handling claims etc, reduced stress and anxiety that always accompanies accidents and losses and lastly reduced cost of insurance cover as premiums reflect claims history (The Audit Commission, 2001).
According to Bryan (2005), there is need for individual schools and their SBMs to explore the possibilities of working with other schools to form collaborative arrangements within cluster schools with the aim of spreading the risk and its cost of insuring against the risk. Severe consequences can be experienced due to failure in the management of risks. Some consequences are so dire and are not recoverable through any type of insurance (School Business Manager, 2016). Precedence financial decisions over sound financial risk management has led short and long term repercussions which are never recoverable.

For risks to be successfully tackled and managed effectively, there is need to come up with meaningful policies. Policies gives direction on what to be done in case of risk occurrence. Schools have faced a challenge trying to balance educational needs of learners and mitigation of any unseen eventuality. Wallace (2001) views that a risk management policy document tailor made for schools and reflecting intended strategy and spelling out respective responsibilities of individuals is important. This policy document should be aligned with educational goals and objectives of a school. This will help in analyzing the risk taking characteristic of a school.

To effectively engage all key stakeholders in education, the Public Administration Act of 2004 of Victorian State Government states that school councils must inform the Minister and the Departmental Head of known major risks to the effective operation of the school and the risk management systems that it has in place to address these risks. Further there is need for schools to maintain a risk register which give details of all risk to school visions objectives and goals as well as risks to governance and any other business activities. This register should be reviewed regularly to ensure controls remain effective. Risk management training programs should be put in place to enhance risk management application and culture. Need (2006) notes that risk management is about better planning and decision making to improve educational outcomes.

Everard, Morris, and Wilson (2004) advices that risk management in schools needs to take account of all three groups of risks which include: (1) Strategic risks- those risks that need to be considered in striving to achieve goals, targets and objectives (2) Operational risks- those risks that need to be considered in order to avoid accidents and incidents during the various operational activities carried out by the school, including educational visits and field trips (3) Statutory risks- those risks that need to be directly addressed because failure to do so is in direct
contravention of the law. Means and resources to address each of the risk category in a competent manner should be set aside.

Espinoza (2012) examined the challenges of risk management in school districts. Political pressure at times come into play hence it becomes difficult to balance the risk obligation insurance and risk needs. Further parents are not known to demand for better risk management, instead they priorities on teachers competencies and educational opportunities. With reducing budgets in schools, priorities are given to “high essential” activities hence risk management is never given first priority. Risk management in public schools is unique compared to the private sector (Ball, 2007)

Everard, Morris and Wilson (2004) while examining effective school management indicate that there is a misconception of risk management in schools. They opine that limited school funding school employees must learn to know more about risk management. To them this is a complex concept that comprises of several functions. They give their definition of risk management in schools as the process of managing uncertainty of exposures that affect a school district’s assets and financial statements using the five steps: identification, analysis, control, financing and administration. The author’s give risk identification as the most important part of risk management. It is the responsibility of every stakeholder and individual to effect risk management. Important to note is that risks come in many shapes and sizes hence being proactive in risk management is key.

2. 1. 5 BOMs Allocation of Responsibilities and Performance of Public Schools

Implementation of school based management has seen key stakeholders participate in the management of schools (Knight, 2014). Yu (2005) is of the view that Teachers, parents, alumni and community members can serve as managers in the management committee and participate in decision-making of the school. Management of schools and formulation of policies are some of the functions of a school manager. They are also bestowed with the responsibility of school planning aimed at creation of an ideal learning environment thus they require to have a good understanding of the school itself as well as the trend of education development.

To better educate students and improve on their performance, Cheng and Chan (2000) argue that boards need to be constantly engaged. School based management offers a way to promote
improvement through decentralization. Thus members need to be allocated with responsibilities basing on their capabilities. Many schools are opting to use high involvement management where work is done in teams and it involves various stakeholders. This implies ideas are shared and lessons learnt are adapted.

For responsibilities to be allocated to stakeholders, two important strategies are usually put in place (Leung, 2004). The first one is streamlining of administrative procedures and devolution of responsibilities where schools are allowed to be flexible enough in managing their own operations and resources according to the needs of students to facilitate quality education using their own parameters. Here the stakeholders become partners rather than controllers. The second strategy is ensuring transparency and accountability. Involving different stakeholders will lead to an improvement in the two attributes. Key stakeholders here are involved in the formulation of major policies and they also evaluate how effective the school is.

The school boards are charged with two major roles of while managing schools. These are policy formulation and management. According to (Leung, 2004) policy making entails development of strategies aimed at attaining the schools vision and educational goals towards effectiveness. These policies are supposed to be drawn to guide in the meeting of stipulated goals. The second role which is management can be broken down in three important aspect. These include personnel management that deals with appointment of staff, promotion and dismissal. The second aspect is financial management that entails Approving school development plan, annual school plan and school budget. Managing government and non-government funds properly to ensure the appropriate use of resources. Lastly is the curriculum management where they ensure the curriculum is in line with government education policies.

According to Caldwell (2005) allocation of responsibility is based on their knowledge of the school and their knowledge on their given responsibilities. The responsibilities are based on active participation in school activities and making use of opportunities to understand the latest education development. Decisions reached by a stakeholder while undertaking a responsibility should be made while taking the students interest as a priority (Leung, 2004). Stakeholders should be objective and rational while undertaking discussions that are aimed towards reaching a consensus. (Caldwell, 2005) argues that there is need for education stakeholders to attend
courses to improve their knowledge and skills in school management as this will help building team spirit and promote homeschool-community cooperation.

2.3 Summary of literature and Research Gaps

Stakeholders theory looks at the way things are done (descriptive) the way things ought to be done (normative) and doing things for business. Most of the variables used for the study have indicated how things are done and how things ought to be done. However, much has been left when it comes to instrumental way of running schools towards improved performance. School boards are comfortable in both descriptive and normative way of doing things and not striving to do business in a different perspective creating a theoretical gap.

Most of the literature reviewed in the study concentrated on school based management and how they can lead to performance in schools. Quality of management and quality of stakeholder engagement has also been looked at. Additionally board composition and outcomes of an enterprise strategy indicate that presence of stakeholders result to positive performance by stakeholders. Conditions considered as enabling towards good stakeholder engagement include principal facilitation of decision making through sharing power with council members, school wide networking facilitating “bottom-up” problem solving with staff and parents, a focus on student achievement through use of assessment data, and promotion of staff collective accountability for student achievement. There is a general agreement that involvement of stakeholders in education set up is a way of devolving key decision from central government to school level. Most studies have concentrated on parental involvement as the missing link towards stakeholders’ engagement.

On the gaps identified, it was clear that having legislative and policy framework does not guarantee implementation of active stakeholder involvement. Most studies have looked at stakeholders’ engagement and concentrated on the types of stakeholders’. However, this study was different as it departed from looking at the stakeholders only but looks strategic actions of board of management towards the performance of public secondary schools. The strategic actions include BOM decisions, resource management, allocation of responsibilities and risk management. Further, other studies tried to look at quality of education and pupils’ performance.
This study looked at the overall performance in school through indicators like students’ mean score, transition to higher learning institutions and overall students’ discipline. Further research has shown that engagement of BOM through strategic actions is very important but many educational reforms have not been able to contain this challenge. Thus there is need of coming up with a strategic programs that allow for BOM actions towards better performance in public secondary schools.
2.4 Conceptual Framework

Independent Variables

**Decision Making**
- Financial management
- Curriculum delivery
- Students discipline
- Performance Management
- Personnel Management

**Resource Management**
- Budget preparation
- Monitoring and supervision of Budgets
- Managing human resources
- Time utilization

**Allocation of Responsibilities**
- Training on resource management
- Level of awareness of responsibility
- Ways of allocating responsibilities
- Levels of responsibilities
- Skills and expertise
- Training
- Availability

**Risk Management**
- Strategic risk
- Financial risk
- Operational risk
- Reputational Risk

**Dependent Variable**

- Performance Indicators
  - Mean Score
  - Students discipline
  - Enrolment

Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework

(Research Data, 2017)
The conceptual framework presents the relationship between the independent and dependent variables of the study. The independent variables included: decision making, resource management, allocation of responsibilities and risk management while the independent variable is performance of public Secondary schools. Performance was measured by indicators such as: mean score, enrolment, and student’s discipline.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

Descriptive research design was used for the study. According to Mugenda and Mugenda(2003) this research design provides an empirical inquiry where the researcher does control the independent variable directly. Further this type of research design produces statistical information that could be used to explain involvement of stakeholders in schools and how they can translate to performance. This type of research design is concerned with questions that answers what, where and how hence describe phenomenon as they occur.

3.2 Target Population

The target population for the study included all public secondary schools in Nakuru County. The BOMs comprised the target population. There are 25 secondary public secondary schools in Nakuru Sub-County and each school has 14 BOM members hence the target population for the study was 25 public secondary schools with a population of 350 BOM members. This target population had a stake in education matters hence were chosen by virtue of being in the school BOMs.

Table 3.1 Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of public schools in Nakuru Sub-County</th>
<th>Number of BOM members per school</th>
<th>Total number of BOM members/Target population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(County Director of Education, 2017)

3.3 Sampling Design

Mugenga and Mugenda (2003) define a sample as a small portion of a target population. Sampling is the process of selecting a given number of subjects from a defined population as representative of that population. Purposive sampling technique which is non probability in nature was used for the study. This type of sampling enabled the researcher to use specific
predefined groups, further it is very useful in situations where one needs to reach a targeted sample quickly. Three members from the 25 public schools were purposely selected, these member included: the chairperson, secretary and one member. This will bring the sample size to 75 individuals. Since the study is on performance of public schools, the respondents were purposely chosen from the academic committee. A sampling frame with all the names of the secondary schools had been provided as an appendix IX in this study.

3.4 Data Collection Instruments

Structured questionnaires were used for the study. Orodho(2005) opines that questionnaires are more efficient, less expensive and permits collection of data from a wide population. The questions were organized according to the variables of the study. The open ended questions were useful in explaining the closed ended questions and further used in the discussions for the study. Both categorical measurements and likert scales were used in question construction.

3.4.1 Validity of Research Instrument

Validity is the extent to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure and performs as it is designed to perform (Orodho, 2005). A pilot test was undertaken in one public secondary school in NakuruSub-County where five board members were engaged in the pretest. The respondents who were in the pilot test did not form part of the final study.

Face validity was obtained through looking at the questionnaire keenly to analyze how it had been phrased. By using face validity, the researcher placed themselves in the position of the respondents and tried to determine the suitability of the research instrument. Face validity ensures putting into consideration the research expectations that goes into questionnaire construction.

Content validity of the questionnaire was obtained by the researcher working closely with the university supervisor in framing the questions and wording of the questionnaire to enable quick generalization of responses that could be easily understood. External validity further will help in generalization of the instrument to a larger population.
### 3.4.2 Reliability of Research Instruments

Reliability of research instruments deal with consistency of the intended measurement. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) look at reliability as a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent result or data after repeated trials. To test reliability of the questionnaire, the researcher used split half reliability analysis. Where an alpha value of 0.7 and above was considered as valid. The Cronbach alpha value was .854 which was very high hence indicated high reliability. George and Malley (2004) explain the reliability values as follows; a value of below 5 is unacceptable, 5 is poor, 6 in questionable, 7 is acceptable, 8 is good while 9 is excellent. The .573 value of the split half coefficient further indicated the questionnaire was reliable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2 Reliability Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N of Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Between Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spearman-Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guttman Split-Half Coefficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 Data Collection Procedure

An introduction letter was obtained from Kenyatta University. The researcher then visited the office of the County director of education to introduce herself and further gave an overview of the research. This helped create the needed rapport and further gave access to the schools in Nakuru Sub-County. The researcher then visited the schools where the study was conducted and obtain the contacts of the BOM members.

Phone calls were made to book appointments and this were followed by administration of the questionnaire by the researcher. The respondents were encouraged to fill the questionnaire and
hand it back to the researcher. But where this was not be possible the researcher and the respondent agreed on a specific date in which the questionnaires would be picked.

3.6 Data Analysis and Presentation

The returned questionnaires were sorted and checked for their consistency. Data entry was done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Both qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed. Qualitative data entailed using a thematic analysis where themes were drawn and presented in a summary. Quantitative data on the other hand was analyzed descriptively using percentages, counts, cross tabulations and descriptive summary. Inferential statistic using a multiple regression analysis was performed to check on the relationship between the dependent and the independent variables of the study. The presentation of the analyzed data was done using tables, charts, graphs and summaries.

3.6.1 Empirical Model

The study used an empirical model that presented the dependent and independent variables, the intercept, coefficients and the extraneous error. The model was tested using a multiple regression analysis. The model of the study was thus presented as:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \varepsilon$$

Where $Y$- is the dependent variable

$X_1$,$X_2$,$X_3$, $X_4$— are the independent variables

$\beta_0$ – is the constant (intercept)

$\beta_1$-$\beta_4$ – are the regression coefficients or change induced in $Y$ by each $X$.

$\varepsilon$ – Is the extraneous error term.

3.7 Ethical Consideration

An introductory letter was sought from Kenyatta University before the researcher embarked on undertaking the field work. A permit to carry out research will sought from National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation(NACOSTI). The researcher then made a courtesy call to the County Director of Education (CDE) to inform the office on her intentions to
carry out research in public secondary schools located in Nakuru Sub-County. The researcher then visited the schools to get the telephone contacts of the respondents for the study.

Upon conducting research, the respondents were informed that the research was purely for academic purposes and at no point was the information obtained be used for any other purpose. Confidentiality was guaranteed and incase the respondents do not wish to be part of the study were given a willing volition to withdraw.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Questionnaire Response Rate

The study utilized 97 questionnaires, out of these, 75 were filled and returned representing 77% questionnaire return rate which was considered accurate for generalization of the study. Cummings, Savitz and Konrad (2001) indicate that any response rate that is above 50% is considered good enough and can be used in generalization of the study. The information provided is presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Questionnaire Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Questionnaires Issued</th>
<th>Questionnaires Returned</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2017)

4.2 Background Information

To understand the study better, there was need to establish the back ground of the study. The respondents were asked on their gender, age, education information, position in BOM and the type of school.

4.2.1 Gender of Respondents

Table 4.2 Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the study, there were more male (56%) than female (44%). However the difference did not bear a wide margin implying that BOMs are inclusive and do not discriminate based on individuals gender.

### 4.2.2 Age of the Respondents

Figure 1 presents the age of the respondents in the study.

![Age of Respondents Graph](image)

**Source: Research Data (2017)**

Figure 4.1: Age of Respondents

Majority of the respondents (46.7%) were between 45 and 50 years, this was followed by 26.7% who were between 41-44 years. 5.3% who were considered a small fraction were between 25-30 years. From the study, it could be deduced that the composition of BOM is made up of older individuals. Young people and the youth had the smallest percentages, implying that the schools are interested with older people who may have more experience and time to offer their services to school.
4.2.3 Education Level

Table 4.3 presents the findings of the study on level of education.

**Table 4.3: Level of Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors’ degree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Research Data (2017)**

Majority of the respondents (48%) had bachelor’s degrees. This was followed by 24% who had a post graduate qualification while 20% had attained a college education. Only 8% has secondary school certificate. The findings illustrate that the respondents are well educated hence were able to read and interpret the contents of the questionnaire which imply that information given was well understood. Further their levels of education imply that they are able to soberly discuss issues raised at the BOM and come up with the best and desirable practices.

4.2.4 Position in the BOM

There was need to understand what positions the respondents held at the BOM. This is presented in figure 4.2.
A great majority of the respondents were members as indicated by 84%. This was followed by 14.7% who indicated they acted as secretaries in the board. Only 1.3% of the representation were chair person. From the study, it could be deduced that it was easier to reach members of the board unlike the chair persons. Members could be easily reached as they are many presenting a high probability of them being part of the study.

4.2.5 Serving in Other Boards

The respondents were required to indicate whether they had served in any other school board of management. Figure 4.3 presents the findings.
A great majority (72%) had not served in other school boards while 24% indicated they had served previously in other school boards. Those who had served in other school boards could be said to bring experience in their current boards. Additionally the study wanted to know the positions the respondents held while serving in these boards. Most of the respondents indicated they had served as members in the previous boards. This imply that they bring a vast experience to the BOM which can translate to better decisions.

**4.2.6 Type of School**

Lastly on the back ground information, there was need to understand the type of school that the respondents were now serving as board members. Table 4.4 presents the findings.

**Table 4.4: Type of School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed School</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day School</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2017)
A slight majority (42.7%) were from mixed schools. This was followed closely by 41.3% who were from day schools while 12% were from boarding schools. The findings imply that BOM members were sought from all schools which meant the information from the study could be easily be generalized to future studies of similar nature.

4.3 Descriptive Statistics

4.2.1 Decision Making
On the first objective of the study, there was need to examine the effect of decision making on performance of public secondary schools. To this effect, the respondents were required to indicate whether they felt they were fully involved in decision making at the school. A presentation has been done in figure 4.4

Source: Research Data (2017)

Figure 4.4: Involvement in school decisions

A great majority (77%) affirmed that they felt they were involved in schools decisions. Only a small fraction indicated they were not being involved. This imply that most schools involved their BOMs while making decisions. This study resonates well with the writings of Ndiku,
Simiyu, Achoka (2009) who are of the opinion that there is a need for decentralization of decisions in order to produce efficiency and productivity in schools. In their study they recommended that school managers ought to increase the extent in which they involve teachers in decision making to improve on quality of decisions and further boost their morale in their performance of duty.

There was need to understand the extent of involvement in decision making by the BOMs. Table 4.5 presents the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Involvement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large extent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small extent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Research Data (2017)**

The respondents indicated that they were moderately being involved in decision making at the school as indicated by 68%. The other 20% were of the opinion that they were to a larger extent involved in decision making. Only 12% revealed they felt they were involved towards a small extent. It was thus deduced that the BOMs were moderately involved in decision making. Sang (2010) is of the opinion that better decisions are made when stakeholders are prepared thus preparation would lead to involvement in decisions on a larger extent. Mokoena (2011) further view that for there to be increased levels of involvement, there is need for participative decision making (PDM).

There was need to determine the decisions that the BOMs felt they were greatly involved in. A presentation has been done on figure 4.5 as follows.
The study revealed that the school boards were mostly involved in decisions regarding student’s discipline (23%). This was followed by curriculum delivery decisions (21.7%). Performance management decisions had 16.1% while 11.2% indicated that they were involved in all the decisions of the school. It could be deduced that the boards were involved in different types of decisions however students discipline was given more priority. This finding agrees with the view of Stevenson (2001) who indicates that the core values of schools are usually reflected in shared decision making.

There was need to understand decisions making in the different schools. Figure 4.6 presents the findings of the study.
It was established that decisions are made in board meetings that are attended by all BOMS as indicated by 75%. A few respondents (13%) were of the opinion that decisions are made solely from the head teacher while 12% indicated that the decisions were made by the teachers and head teachers. It was thus deduced that most decisions are done in BOM meetings that are attended by all members. The study resonates with Nyaga (2009) who examines the effectiveness of BOGs in curriculum implementation. The author is of the opinion that for curriculum implementation to be effective, there is need to involve BOG in a daily basis in order to enhance decisions at the school.

Source: Research Data (2017)
The study sought to determine transparency in decision making. Figure 4.7 show the presentation of the findings.

![Bar chart showing transparency of decisions made.]

Source: Research Data (2017)

**Figure 4.7: Transparency of Decisions Made**

A great majority of the respondents (73.3%) were of the opinion that the decisions made were very transparent. Only 21.3% indicated that they were not aware whether the decisions were transparent while 5.3% indicate the decisions were not transparent. The findings implied that the decisions at the board meetings were transparent.

A descriptive summary was undertaken to check how BOM decisions impacts on the performance of public Secondary schools. Table 4.6 presents the finding.
Table 4.6 Impact of Decision Making on the Performance of Public Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The rate of absenteeism of board members during meetings is high</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider most board members passive during meetings</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is high political influence in the decisions made by the board</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ministry of education interferes in decision making of the school</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions regarding the school are reached through a consensus</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2017)

From the study, it was established that the ministry of education somehow interferes with the decisions made at the school (Mean of 3.4), the variation in decision making due to the interference is low (standard deviation of 0.975). It implies that the BOMs are not free to make decisions.

Politics has a moderate influence on the decisions made by the BOMs (mean of 3.27) leading to a low variation in decision making (standard deviation of 0.953).

On average the board members were not passive (mean of 2.8) and its outcome is a low variance in decision making (standard deviation of 0.973).

The rate of absenteeism by the board members was low (mean 2.12) and the variation in quorum was low (standard deviation 0.986).
4.2.2 Resource Management

The second objective of the study sought to establish the effect of resource management on performance of public secondary schools. There was need to determine the individuals who were mostly involved in budget preparation in the particular schools. Figure 4.7 presents the findings of the study as follows:

![Bar Chart: Individuals Involved in budget preparation]
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Figure 4.7: Individuals Involved in budget preparation

The study noted that principles were mostly involved in budget preparations in schools as indicated by 26.1%, this was closely followed by heads of department (21.3%). The board of management were slightly involved in budget preparations (20.2%) while none teaching staff were the least involved when it came to budget preparations. The findings of the study concurs with Kahavizakiriza and Walela (2015) viewed that school principals were in charge of coming up with budgets and were assisted by heads of departments (HODs) and bursars.
There was further need to understand whether the school undertakes monitoring and supervision of their budget. Figure 4.8 presents the findings of the study.

Source: Research Data (2017)

**Figure 4.8: Monitoring and Supervision of Budgets**
The study noted that monitoring and supervision was undertaken as indicated by a greater majority (77%). Only a small fraction indicated that there was no monitoring and supervision of budgets. This imply that most BOMs are keen towards undertaking monitoring and supervision of budgets.

The 77% who indicated that they undertake monitoring and supervision of budgets were required to specify the individuals who undertake this duty. Table 4.7 presents the findings as follows:
Table 4.7 Individuals who Undertake Monitoring and Supervision of Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person responsible</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOM</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Teaching Staff</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursars</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Department</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2017)

It was noted that most monitoring and supervision of budgets were undertaken by the BOMs (45.9%). Principles were also involved in monitoring and supervision of budgets (33.9%). The least individuals to be involved in monitoring and supervision were the heads of department (5.5%). The findings resonate with Kahavizakiriza and Walela (2015) work who indicated in their study that Monitoring and supervision of these budgets were done by principals and B.O.Gs.

The study further wanted to establish the individuals who were mostly involved in budget approvals in the schools. Figure 12 presents the findings of the study.

Source: Research Data (2017)
Figure 4.12: Individuals Involved in Budget Approvals in School
The study noted that the BOM were mostly involved in budget approvals of schools as indicated by 63.5%. This implies that any resource function passes via the BOM before being implemented. 17.7% indicated that principles were involved in budget approval of schools. The least involved Individuals in budget approvals was the government (3.1%). Having BOMs being involved in budget approvals imply resources can be closely monitored and priority given to the most important budgets. In their study, Kahavizakiriza, Walela and kukubo (2015) indicate that budget approval was mainly carried out by B.O.Gs while the government was not consulted. These finds paints a similar picture to the current study hence generalization is applicable in this case.

There was need to understand whether there were guiding principles on how resources should be used in the particular schools. A presentation has been done on figure 13 as follows:

Source: Research Data (2017)

Figure 4.9: Guiding Principles on uses of Resources
A great majority of the respondents (89%) were of the view that there were guiding principles on how resources should be used. Only a small fraction (11%) indicated that there were no guiding principles for utilization of resources. Having guiding principles ensures that funds are utilized in
the right way. Sama, Yende and Arenstein (2003) indicate that South Africa has an act that serve to prescribe how school funds should be used. The school governing body gives guidelines that include: Managing the finances of the school such as establishing a school fund, preparing a budget annually, collecting and administering school fees, keeping the financial records, appointing an accountant and supplementing the school's resources.

There was need to understand the extent to which the BOMs manage different given human resources in the school. Table 4.8 gives a presentation of the findings.

**Table 4.8 Extent of Managing Human Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>moderate</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary staff</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>premises</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resources (books, stationary)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery and equipment (computers, laboratory)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Research Data (2017)*

The BOM mostly managed the school learning resources which included books and stationaries. Premises were also managed to a moderately large extent. The least largely managed resource by the BOM included machinery and equipment such as computers ad laboratory. This might be attributed to the resources needing a high expertise to be able to manage the given resources. Of importance to note is that at least all the school resources are being managed although the extent of management differs.

The study sought to understand whether attributes of time utilization in BOM meetings is usually discussed. Table 4.9 presents the findings of the study.
Table 4.9 Attributes of Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Attributes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time table and time for groups</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocating time for individuals</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to use time</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School day activities</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2017)

From the study the attributes of time discussed were fewer than those not discussed. The most discussed attribute was allocating time for individuals (45.3%). Time table and time for groups was the least discussed time attribute. Discussing time attributes by BOM helps in management of time as a resource and further leads to its proper utilization.

4.2.3 Allocation of Responsibility

The third objective sought to analyze the effect of allocation of responsibilities on the performance of public Secondary schools. To this effect, the respondents were required to indicate whether the BOM had been trained on how to manage resources. Figure 4.10 indicate that 66.7% had been trained on resource management while 32% had not been trained. This implies that training on resource management has been done. According to Mestry (2006), some principles and members of school governing bodies have little knowledge of the schools Act or their interpretation of the act is not correct which results to financial mismanagement. Due to this, there is need to train BOMs on how to manage resources effectively.
Further, there was need to understand where the BOMs had received their training. Table 4.10 indicate that majority had received the training from personal initiative (25.3%), this was closely followed by 21.3% who had received their training from the process of schooling. The least training received was from the current school the members serve as BOM members (2.7 %). This imply that the schools have not invested in training their BOMs on resource management. The findings of the study resonates well with Ikianya (2013) who argues that pupils’ academic performance is determined by involvement of different stakeholders in resource management. It is thus prudent to coordinate the roles of the different stakeholders towards resource management.

**Table 4.10 Place of Training on Resource Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Training on Resource Management</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process of schooling</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal initiative</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work life</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized by current school that I serve as a BOM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was further need to determine where the school mostly obtained their funds from. Figure 4.11 presents the findings of the study.

**Source: Research Data (2017)**

**Figure 4.11: Sources of Funds**

From the findings, fees from the schools were the major source of funding (39.4%) this was followed by government funding (38%). Sources of funds from the church and Leasing of school assets had 7% respectively. The least source of funding was income generation (1.4%) implying that most schools do not rely on income generation projects to raise their fund. The findings of the study resonates well with Kahavizakiriza and Walela(2015) who also established in their study that schools mostly depended on funds from parents and the government and dint not generate their own funds.
Different types of resources were listed and the respondents were to indicate their level of awareness of the availability of the resources. Table 4.11 presents the findings.

**Table 4.11 Level of Awareness of Responsibility of Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials (e.g., textbook)</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget for supplies( e.g., paper, pencil, lunch and other financial obligations)/ Financial resources</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School buildings and grounds</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating/cooling and lighting systems</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional space (e.g., classrooms)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special equipment for disabled students</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological resources ( e.g., Computers)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Research Data (2017)**

The respondents were mostly aware of the school buildings and grounds (mean 3.44), the variation in the awareness had a low standard deviation of .683. Awareness of instructional space followed (mean 3.37) and a standard deviation of 8.41. There was further greater awareness of instructional material (mean 3.31, SD .661) and support staff (mean 3.30, SD .697).

The level of awareness of special equipment for disabled students was very low (mean 2.25) with a slightly high variance in responses as depicted by a standard deviation of 1.079. This implied either the schools did not have students with special disabilities or the schools did not simply have the equipment’s. Technological equipment also lagged behind in terms of respondent’s
awareness (mean 2.79). It could be deduced that there were different levels of awareness by the respondents on availability of resources with instructional space, school building and grounds and budget for supplies having the highest levels of awareness while special equipment for disabilities and technological resources having the least level of awareness. Lage, Platt & Treglia (2000) give importance of school resources, to them these resources determine learning environment and further provide opportunities for students to explore ideas and knowledge, collaborate, solve problems and develop knowledge and skills. For a student to learn through a rich and varied selection of instructional materials a variety of resources are needed.

The study required the respondents to indicate ways of allocating responsibilities to BOM.

Source: Research Data (2017)

Figure 4.12: Ways of Allocating Responsibilities to BOM

The study established that responsibilities are majorly allocated based on a person’s knowledge on the subject matter (64%). This implies that more of expertise knowledge is sought will allocating responsibilities which translates to efficiency in delivery of an allocated duty. Only a small fraction, (8%) indicated that responsibilities are allocated through vetting. Leung (2004) is of the opinion that through allocation of responsibilities, different stakeholders become partners rather than controllers which help in getting work done.
There was need to rate the respondents understanding on different elements in line with allocation of responsibilities. Table 4.12 presents the descriptive summary as follows:

**Table 4.12 Levels of Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of your understanding of this school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of understanding of the trend of educational development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>2.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Research Data (2017)**

It was established that the respondents had a high level of understanding of the schools as indicated by a mean of 7.51. Additionally the level of understanding of the trend of educational development was also high with a mean of 7.18. This means that with a great understanding of both the school and trend of educational development, responsibilities can be allocated with ease and the expected outputs an outcomes can also be achieved. The findings of the study resonates well with the study by Caldwell (2005) who is of the view that allocation of stakeholder’s responsibility is based on their knowledge of the school and their knowledge on their given responsibilities. The responsibilities are based on active participation in school activities and making use of opportunities to understand the latest education development.
It was prudent to understand how responsibilities are allocated to the BOM. A presentation has been done on Table 4.13

Table 4.13 Allocation of Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both Teams and Individuals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t Know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2017)

Responsibilities at the BOMs are majorly allocated both to teams and individuals (64%). Other respondents however felt that responsibilities are allocated to individuals only (28%) while a very few individuals indicated they were not aware on how responsibilities are allocated. It was thus deduced that the schools allocate responsibilities to both teams and individuals. Leung (2004) notes that all the decisions reached by virtue of engaging teams and individual stakeholders should be made while taking the students interest as a priority thus a need for stakeholder’s objectivity and rationality while undertaking discussions that are aimed towards reaching a consensus.

The respondents were required to indicate whether they had ever been allocated responsibilities that they were unable to undertake. Figure 4.13 presents the findings.
A greater majority of BOMs have never been allocated responsibilities that they could not undertake as indicated by 93%. This imply that responsibilities are allocated based on individuals capabilities. It is to this effect that Cheng and Chan (2000) give a best practice for matching duties allocated and capabilities. They are of the view that there is need for stakeholder involvement where work is shared with teams and various stakeholders are engaged.

To better educate students and improve on their performance, Cheng and Chan (2000) argues that stakeholders need to be constantly engaged. School based management offers a way to promote improvement through decentralization. Thus stakeholder need to be allocated with responsibilities basing on their capabilities. Many schools are opting to use high involvement management where work is done in teams and it involves various stakeholders. This implies ideas are shared and lessons learnt are adapted.

Lastly on allocation of duties, there was need to understand the responsibility that the BOMs were mostly involved in. Table 4.14 presents the findings.
Table 4.14 Mostly Involved Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial matters</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student discipline issues</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student performance issues</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and delivery of curriculum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2017)

It was noted that financial matters was the responsibility that the BOM was mostly involved in (25.3%). This was closely followed by students discipline issues (24%) and student’s performance issues (21.3%). The BOM indicated that they were not mostly involved with designing and delivery of the curriculum as this falls under the domain of the ministry of education and teachers. It was thus deduced that the BOM are involved with the different aspects of responsibility all geared towards a better management of the school. Leung (2004) is of the opinion that two important strategies are usually put in place when allocating responsibilities to stakeholders. Streamlining of administrative procedures through devolution of responsibility and ensuring transparency and accountability. All the responsibilities allocated can thus be broken down into two major roles: policy formulation and management which have been clearly been captured by the study.

4.2.4 Risk Management

The last objective of the study sought to investigate the effect of risk management on performance of public Secondary schools. On strategic risk, the respondents were thus asked if the school has a policy on risk management. The responses have been presented in figure 4.14.
Majority of the respondents (87%) affirmed that there was a school policy in place for risk management, only 13% were of a contrary opinion. This implies that the school is keen in its risk management practices. The study resonates well with the works of Breyer (2009) who is of the opinion that since risks are uncertainties with positive and negative impacts, there is need to coordinate all activities with an aim of controlling the risks thus a policy for risk management becomes very crucial while making any mitigation strategy.

The 87% who indicated their schools have a strategic policy on risk management were required to state the extent in which they followed the given policy. A presentation of the findings has been done in figure 4.15 as follow:
It was established that the given policy was followed by the BOMs moderately (53.3%). Only a small fraction 9.3% followed it to a large extent. Wallace (2001) is of the opinion that for risks to be successfully tackled and managed effectively there is for a meaningful policy. He further continues to state that a risk management policy document tailor made for schools and reflecting intended strategy and spelling out respective responsibilities of individuals is important. This policy document should be aligned with educational goals and objectives of a school. This will help in analyzing the risk taking characteristic of a school.

The study sought to determine whether the BOMs had knowledge on financial risk management. Table 4.15 presents the findings.

**Table 4.15 Knowledge on Financial Risk Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Research Data (2017)*
It was noted that the great majority of the BOM (70.3%) had knowledge on financial risk management, only 26.7% indicated they did not have the knowledge. There is therefore need to come up with more training opportunities to enable the BOM be at a breast while discussing the different elements of risks in schools. The Public Administration Act (2004) of Victorian State Government indicate that risk management training programs should be put in place to enhance risk management application and culture.

The 26.7% BOM members who indicated they had knowledge on financial risk management were required to indicate where they acquired the knowledge. Figure 4.16 presents the findings.

![Figure 4.16: Place of acquired Financial Management Training](image)

**Source:** Research Data (2017)

**Figure 4.16: Place of acquired Financial Management Training**

Most of the BOMs had acquired knowledge on financial risk management as a result of personal initiative (14.7%), the individuals who indicated they had acquired knowledge as a result of the schooling process were 8%. Apprenticeship was the least used way to acquire knowledge on risk management. It is important to note that no member had acquired this knowledge as a result of being a member of BOM in the school they serve. This imply schools have not given training on risk management a serious priority.
There was need to determine whether the BOMs were aware of operational steps to risk management.

Source: Research Data (2017)

Figure 4.17: Awareness of Operational Risk Management Steps

It was noted that more people (58%) indicated that they were not aware of the risk management steps. 42% however on the other hand indicated they were aware of this steps. It is important for all the BOM members to be aware of this steps in order to help the school with ideas and ways of managing risks in the school. According to Need (2006) risk management is about better planning and decision making to improve educational outcomes thus there is need for BOMs to understand the whole process of risk management.

The study further sought to understand the most common type of risk in the schools. Being a qualitative question, the responses were analyzed and presented thematically as follows: Field activities where students can be injured, other injuries and accidents, drug abuse and trafficking due to location of the school, Loss of property and school books, Damage and destruction of property, theft, lack of communication and students discipline. Lastly, a likert scale was presented with ideas on stakeholders risk management. Table 4.16 presents the findings as follows:
The reputational risks in form of skills, qualifications and safety arrangements of all staff, volunteers and external providers have been identified, verified and documented (Mean = 3.26, SD = .760). Further, there were individuals who had been nominated by BOM to be responsible for risk management in this school (Mean = 3.19, SD = .902) implying risk management is taken seriously and individual responsibilities are usually assigned to enable risk management. Risk assessment is further conducted regularly in the school (Mean = 3.11, SD = .869). It was however noted that all the relevant stakeholders had not been encouraged to be part of the risk management process and their understanding of needs and objectives was limited (Mean = 2.88, SD = .865). The Public Administration Act (2004) of Victorian state government puts its emphasis on engagement of all key stakeholders in education towards management of risks. The act stresses on the need for a risk register which gives details of all risks to school visions.
It was further noted that the school had not obtained all necessary approvals for risk management (Mean = 2.76, SD = .934). This puts the chances of risks in the schools to be very high. It is for this fact that Everard, Morris and Wilson (2004) give the five steps of; identification, analysis, control, financing and administration that can be used in the process of empowering the schools on risk control measures and further can be used to obtain all the necessary risk approvals.

4.2.5 Performance of Public Secondary Schools

The last variable for the study was based on performance of public secondary schools in Nakuru. A number of performance indicators were used to get responses from the BOM. Presentation of the findings is presented on Table 4.18 as follow:

Table 4.17 Performance of Public Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most students join higher learning institutes after completing their education in this school</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students mean score in national examinations in this school have continually improved</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is great improvement in the behavior of students now compared to when they joined this school</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student in this school are more disciplined than when they joined</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2017)

From the findings, it was revealed that students in the school were more disciplined than when they joined (Mean = 4.96, SD = 7.41). Further, there is great improvement in behavior of students now compared to when they joined school (Mean = 4.79, SD = .682). This imply that an improvement in school discipline can be used as a measure of improved performance in public secondary schools. It was further noted that the student’s grades in the national examination had
improved in the school (Mean =3.99, SD=.985). All these indicators of performance show an improvement as a result of involving stakeholders who are mostly BOM.

4.3 Regression Analysis

Finally in a bid to predict the value of the dependent variable based on the independent variables, the study performed a multiple regression analysis to assess’ board composition and the performance of public secondary schools in Nakuru County.

Table 4.18 Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.765a</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>1.653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Research Data (2017)

The model summary revealed R = 0.765 which indicate that there is a good level of prediction. R² implied 58.5% of the variations could explain board’s composition on performance of public secondary schools.

Table 4.19 ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4.384</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>2.567</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Residual</td>
<td>28.602</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.986</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Predictors: (Constant), Decision Making, Resource Management, Allocation of Responsibilities, Risk Management

On statistical significance, Table 4.19 indicate that F (4, 67) =2.567, p (.000) <.005 thus an indication that the model is a good fit therefore significant in explaining board’s composition on performance of public secondary schools.
Lastly, the study sought to examine the relationship between all the variables and their contributions towards performance of public secondary schools. The presentation has been done on Table 4.20

**Table 4. 20 Regression Coefficient**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.751</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>5.203</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>3.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation or Responsibility</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>3.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>3.456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Performance of public schools

Based on the model coefficients on Table 4.20 the relationship between strategic actions and performance of public secondary schools can be expressed as:

\[ Y_i = 2.751 + .721X_1 + .540X_2 + .674X_3 + .353X_4 \]

where \( X_1 = \) Decision Making

\( X_2 = \) Resource Management

\( X_3 = \) Allocation of Responsibility

\( X_4 = \) Risk Management

The findings of the study indicate that all the four dependent variables under investigation had significant effect on performance of public schools as indicated by their significance levels: Decision Making 0.00, Resource management 0.02, Allocation of responsibility 0.001, Risk management 0.001. However, decision making, followed by allocation of responsibility, resource management and risk management rated in levels of importance.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Summary of Findings

The study had a questionnaire return rate of 77% which was good enough for generalization of other studies on board composition and performance of public secondary schools in Kenya. There were more male than female in the study. Majority of the respondents were between the ages of 45-50 years and had bachelor’s degree. A great majority of the composition of the BOM was made up of members. Further, a great number of respondents had not served on previous school boards.

5.1.1 Decision Making and Performance of schools

On decision making, the study established that a great majority of the BOMs were fully involved in school decisions towards a moderate extent. The great area of involvement was on student’s discipline, this was followed by curriculum delivery. Decisions are usually made in board meeting attended by all BOMs. The BOMs moderately followed the stipulated guidelines while making decisions. The decisions made are considered transparent. The board members were not passive when it came to decision making, they were always present during board meetings and decisions on the school were reached through a consensus. It was also noted that there were levels of interference by the ministry of education.

5.1.2 Resource Management and Performance of Schools

Principles were mostly involved in budget preparations in schools. BOM were slightly involved which implied that school budgets squarely was a responsibility of the principles. Monitoring and supervision was undertaken in schools by BOMs. Budget approvals were also done by BOMs. There were guiding principles on how resources should be used in schools which implied planning is considered important in the BOMs. On resource management, it was established that the BOMs mostly managed the school learning resources which included books and stationaries. The least largely managed resource by the BOM
included machinery and equipment such as computers and laboratory. The attributes of time discussed by the BOM were fewer than those not discussed.

5.1.3 Allocation of Responsibility and Performance of Schools

Majority of the BOMs had been trained on resource management through personal initiatives followed by process of schooling. Schools had not invested in training their BOMs. Most schools obtained their funds from fees, followed by government funding while income generation was the least source of funding. There were different levels of awareness by the respondents on availability of resources with instructional space, school building and grounds and budget for supplies having the highest levels of awareness while special equipment for disabilities and technological resources had the least level of awareness. Responsibilities in the BOMs were allocated based on a person’s knowledge on the subject matter. The respondents had a high level of understanding of the school and also a high level of understanding of the trend of educational development. It was noted that responsibilities at the BOMs are majorly allocated both to teams and individuals. Respondents had never been allocated responsibilities that they could not undertake. The BOM were mostly involved in financial matters which was closely followed by students discipline issues. The BOM are involved with the different aspects of responsibility all geared towards a better management of the schools.

5.1.4 Risk Management and Performance of Schools

The study established that the school has a strategic policy put in place for risk management which the school follows it moderately. It was noted that the great majority of the BOM had not been trained on financial risk management. The few who indicated they had been trained on financial risk management revealed that they had acquired the training as a result of personal initiative. There was no member that had acquired this training as a result of being a member of BOM in the school they serve. More BOM members indicated that they were not aware of the operational steps on risk management. Risk management however in schools has not reached the desired levels. Further, relevant stakeholders had not been encouraged to be part of risk management process and schools had not obtained the necessary approvals for risk management.
5.2 Conclusion

The study concludes that most schools involve their BOMs while making decisions. Different types of decisions are usually presented to the board however students discipline was the major decision undertaken. Decision are taken during BOM meetings where a stipulated guideline is moderately followed. It was concluded that decision making by the BOM affects performance of public secondary schools.

On resource management, BOMs were not involved in budget preparations bur were involved in budget approvals. This might be a control measure to ensure proper management of resources. Guiding principles for use of resources was an indicator of proper planning in the schools. Machinery and equipment was the list managed resources by the BOM. Management of resources influenced on the performance of public secondary schools.

The study concludes that responsibilities are allocated to most BOMs basing on their expertise knowledge implying individual capabilities is very important. This means that with a great understanding of both the school and trend of educational development, responsibilities can be allocated with ease and the expected outputs and outcomes can also be achieved. Responsibilities are allocated to both individuals and teams. However, most BOMs had not trained its members on effective utilization of resources. Conclusions are drawn that BOM are involved with the different aspects of responsibilities all geared towards a better management of the school. Allocation of responsibilities influences on performance of public secondary schools.

The study concludes that risk management is very important in secondary school, there is a school strategic policy in place for risk management. However the schools have not given training on financial risk management a serious priority as there are no BOMs who have been trained by schools to undertake financial risk management. More BOM members were not aware of the operational steps involved in risk management implying they might not have idea on ways of managing risks in school.
5.3 Recommendation

Decisions made during board meetings should be shared with other key important stakeholders to help avoid any unseen conflict that might arise. If a decision made has not followed a stipulated guidelines, proper communication should be made to the relevant authorities explaining the rationale of the decisions made.

The BOMs of public schools need to come with external financial checks which can be used in monitoring, evaluation and auditing on how resources are used. This will enable an objective process of financial management in public secondary school that will enhance accountability.

The BOM needs to involve all its members and assign them responsibilities that they can handle effectively. Involvement of board members in different responsibilities enables them take a proactive role in the development of school related issues. Responsibilities should be allocated basing on individual capabilities and willingness to volunteer to school based activities.

The BOM needs to encourage all its members to be part of the risk management process. This will make them understand the needs and objectives of the process hence be proactive in risk management. Further, the public secondary schools should obtain all necessary approvals for risk management.

5.4 Recommendations for Future Research

There is need for future research on board of management selection and the well-being of public secondary schools in Nakuru County. The recent selection of board of management has led to antagonism of schools, school heads and the school community hence a study need to be undertaken to determine the influence of selecting board members on the general well-being of schools.
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APPENDICES

Appendix i: Letter of Introduction to Respondents

Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
Tel: 020-2213306
Email: info@ku.ac.ke
22nd August, 2016

Dear Respondent,

RE: COLLECTION OF DATA BY NYABOKENYAMWEMBE

I am a masters’ program student at Kenyatta University. In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Degree of Master of business Administration Strategic Management Option, I am undertaking a research project on Board of Management (BOMs) involvement in the performance of public secondary schools in Nakuru Sub-County. By virtue of being a BOM member, you have been selected to participate in this study. I kindly request you to assist me to collect data by filling out the accompanying questionnaire. The information provided will be used exclusively for academic purposes and will be held in strict confidence.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

NYABOKENYAMWEMBE
D53/0L/23964/2013
Student
Appendix ii: Questionnaire

Instructions

Kindly answer all the questions by ticking in the appropriate box or filling in the spaces provided.

Section A: General Information

1. Gender..........................................................................................................................

2. What is your age bracket (Tick whichever is appropriate)
   
   18 – 24 Years [ ] 25 - 30 Years [ ]
   31 - 34 years [ ] 35 – 40 years [ ]
   41 – 44 years [ ] 45 – 50 years [ ]
   Over 51 years [ ]

3. What is your education level? (Tick as applicable)
   
   Primary [ ] Secondary [ ]
   College [ ] Bachelors’ degree [ ]
   Post graduate [ ]
   Others-specify…………………………………………………………

4. Position in the BOM
   
   Chairperson [ ] Secretary [ ] Member [ ]

5. Have you ever served in any other school board before?
   
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

6. If yes under which position______________________________

7. Type of school
   
   Boarding School [ ] Day School [ ] Mixed School [ ] Girls School [ ] Boys School [ ]
Section B: Independent Variables

BOM Decision Making

8. Do you feel you are fully involved in decision making at the School?
   [ ] Yes [ ] No

9. Rate the extent of involvement
   Small extent [ ] Moderate extent [ ] Large extent [ ]

10. In what decisions do you feel *Greatly* involved
    [ ] Personnel management
    [ ] Financial management
    [ ] Curriculum delivery
    [ ] Students discipline
    [ ] Performance management
    [ ] All of the above
    [ ] None of the above

12. How are decisions in this school made
    [ ] While in a board meeting attended by all BOMs
    [ ] Head teachers sole decisions
    [ ] Teachers and head teachers decisions
    [ ] any other specify

13. To what extent do you follow stipulated guidelines while coming up with decisions?
    Small extent [ ] Moderate extent [ ] Large extent [ ]
14. Are the decisions made for the school transparent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Indicate level of agreement or disagreements in the following statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Strongly Agree- 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider most board members passive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rate of absenteeism of board members during meetings is high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions regarding the school are reached through a consensus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ministry of education interferes in decision making of the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is high political influence in the decisions made by the board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resource Management

16. Indicate your level of awareness of the availability to the following resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials (e.g., textbook)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget for supplies (e.g., paper, pencil, lunch and other financial obligations)/ Financial resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School buildings and grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating/cooling and lighting systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional space (e.g., classrooms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special equipment for disabled students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological resources (e.g., Computers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Have you been trained on how to manage resources?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

18. If yes, where did you receive this training?

[ ] Process of schooling

[ ] Personal initiative

[ ] Experience

[ ] Work life

[ ] Organized by current school that I serve as a BOM

19. Where does this school mostly get its funds? (Multiple questions not allowed)

[ ] Government [ ] Church [ ] Fees

[ ] Fund Raising [ ] Income generation [ ] Community

[ ] leasing of school asset [ ] Sale of farm produce

[ ] Any other {Specify} ________________________________
20. Which individuals are mostly involved in budget preparation in this school {multiple responses allowed} 

[ ] Bursers  [ ] Teachers  [ ] Heads of department  [ ] Parents 
[ ] none teaching staff  [ ] BOM  [ ] Principle 

21. Does this school undertake monitoring and supervision of the budget 

[ ] Yes  [ ] No 

22. If yes, who does this duty? 

[ ] Bursars  [ ] Teachers  [ ] Heads of department  [ ] Parents 
[ ] none teaching staff  [ ] BOM  [ ] Principle 

23. Which individuals are mostly involved in budget approvals in the school? 

[ ] Parents  [ ] Government  [ ] Heads of department 
[ ] Board of Management  [ ] Principle 

24. Are there guiding principles on how resources should be used in this school? 

[ ] Yes  [ ] No 

25. To what extent do you manage the following human and physical resources? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>moderate</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Resources (books, stationary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery and equipment (computers, laboratory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Do you discuss the following attributes of time utilisation in BOM meetings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time table and time for groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocating time for individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to use time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School day activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allocation of Responsibility**

27. How are responsibilities allocated to BOM?

[ ] Through Voting

[ ] Through Volunteering

[ ] Through Suggestions

[ ] Based on a person’s knowledge the subject matter

28. Rate the level of your understanding of this school. Circle the appropriate response. 1 indicates low while 10 is high

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

29. Rate your level of understanding of the trend of educational development 1 indicates low while 10 is high

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

30. How are responsibilities allocated to the BOM

[ ] Teams  [ ] Individuals  [ ] both teams and individuals  [ ] I don’t know

31. Have you ever been allocated a responsibility that you could not undertake?

[ ] Yes          No  [ ]
32. Which of the following responsibility were you **mostly** involved in? { chose only one}

- [ ] Personnel management
- [ ] Financial matters
- [ ] Design and delivery of curriculum
- [ ] Student discipline issues
- [ ] Student performance issues

**Stakeholders Risk Management**

33. Do you have a school policy on risk management?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

34. If yes, to what extent do you follow the policy?

Small extent [ ] Moderate extent [ ] Large extent [ ]

35. Have you ever been trained on risk management?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

36. Where did you get this training?

- [ ] Process of schooling
- [ ] Personal initiative
- [ ] Experience
- [ ] Work life
- [ ] Organized by current school that I serve as a BOM
- [ ] Apprenticeship

37. Are you aware of the steps to risk assessment?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
38. If yes, which of the following is not one of the steps

[ ] Identify the hazards.

[ ] Decide who might be harmed and how.

[ ] Evaluate the risks and decide on precautions.

[ ] Record your findings and implement them.

[ ] Review your assessment and update if necessary

[ ] Stop the process

39. What is the most common type of risk in this school?

_________________________________________________________________

40. Indicate your sentiments in the following statements provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Indicate level of agreement or disagreements in the following statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td>Strongly Agree- 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school has obtained all the necessary approvals for risk management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals or group have been nominated by BOM to be responsible for risk management in this school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All relevant stakeholder have been encouraged to be part of the risk management process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and they understand their needs and objectives

Risk assessment in this school is regularly conducted

The skills, qualifications and safety arrangements of all staff, volunteers and external providers have been identified verified and documented

All those involved in risk management have been advised of their roles and responsibilities

There is a process for monitoring and reviewing the risk treatment plan

**Performance of Public Secondary Schools**

41.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Indicate level of agreement or disagreements in the following statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Students grades in national and internal examination in this school have continually improved.&quot;</td>
<td>Strongly Agree- 5 Agree-4 Neutral-3 Disagree-2 Strongly Disagree-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Most students join higher learning institutes after completing their secondary education in this school.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;There is a great improvement in the behaviour of students now compared to when they joined this school.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Students in this school are more disciplined than when they joined.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix ii: List of Public Secondary Schools in Nakuru Sub-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NAKURU BOYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NAKURU GIRLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MENENGAI HIGH SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NAKURU DAY SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AFRAHAA HIGH SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FLAMINGO SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>KENYATTA SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LANET SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LANGALANGA SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NAKURU WEST SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MOI SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>UPPER HILL MIXED SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>TUMAINI HOUSE SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CRATER VIEW SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>URHURU SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MOGOON SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NAKURU CENTRAL SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>HILLCREST SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>KELELWET SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ST. MARY’S GIRLS SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>NAIROBI ROAD SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>NGALA SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>MWARIKI SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>NATEWA HIGH SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>RHINO SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>KIMATHI SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>KIVAMBUNI SECONDARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ST. VERONICA MARIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For: DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICER
NAKURU DISTRICT

23/09/2016
## Nakuru Sub-County 2015 KCSE Overall School Ranking as per Mean Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>ENT</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>A+</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>D-</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Mean 2015</th>
<th>Mean 2014</th>
<th>Mean 2013</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30002</td>
<td>Nakuru High</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6059</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>-0.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30009</td>
<td>Nakuru Girls</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5228</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>-0.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>311001</td>
<td>Mpendi High</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7937</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>-0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>311015</td>
<td>Christ the King</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7992</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>-0.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>311125</td>
<td>Langalanga High</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7938</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>-0.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>311221</td>
<td>Nakuru Day</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7436</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>-0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>31130</td>
<td>Jittegenie</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6265</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>311520</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Girls</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5057</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>-0.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>311641</td>
<td>Arapata High</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6663</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>311879</td>
<td>East Njoro</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6997</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>-0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>311425</td>
<td>L.K. High</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7112</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>312272</td>
<td>St. Giles</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7151</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>311111</td>
<td>L.A. High</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7212</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>-0.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>311815</td>
<td>Hillcrest</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5776</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>312215</td>
<td>Ushuru High</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4824</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>311862</td>
<td>Taimani</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7475</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>311574</td>
<td>Wogogo</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7338</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>-0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>311235</td>
<td>Nakuru West</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7357</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>-0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>311299</td>
<td>Flamincio High</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6820</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>-0.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>311353</td>
<td>Narobi Road</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7548</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>311313</td>
<td>Upper Hill</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>-0.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>312352</td>
<td>Loreto Nakuru</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7392</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>-0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>311105</td>
<td>St. Xavier</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8801</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>-0.388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>