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ABSTRACT

Safety of students in schools is not only vital but central to provision and acquisition of quality education in any country. The ministry of Education in Kenya has issued to schools, Safety Standards Manual that should serve as guide to school administrators to ensure there is safe and conducive learning environment in schools. The purpose of the study was, to investigate the implementation of the recommended Safety Standards in public Secondary Schools in Borabu District, Kenya. The objectives of the study were to determine the safety standards, establish the level of implementation and identify factors influencing implementation of safety standards in public secondary schools of Borabu District, Kenya. The study using survey design targeted all the 21 public secondary schools in Borabu District, Nyamira County, Kenya. Stratified random sampling method was used to select the required sample of 11 public secondary schools. Structured questionnaires were used to collect data from key respondents comprising 11 Head teachers and 44 Teachers from the 11 sampled public secondary schools. Observation schedules were used to supplement the questionnaires. The researcher personally collected data from the field. A pilot study was conducted in two schools to assist the researcher in improving the validity of the tools. Descriptive statistics inform of frequencies, counts, percentages and mean were used to analyze data, which was then presented using tables, charts and graphs. The findings of the study revealed that most public secondary schools in Borabu District, Kenya were aware of the existing MOE safety standards, but majority of the schools had not implemented them fully. The study revealed that the status of School Safety was wanting, and that the public secondary schools that tried to implement the MOE Safety Standards faced number of challenges and obstacles, key among them lack of funds. Based on these findings the schools should be advised to establish school safety committees, train their staff on Disaster Management and involve the community in school safety programmes. Government should step up school safety inspection and seek ways of advancing funds to school to help them enhance safety measures. This study may be useful in establishing the rate at which the secondary schools are implementing the recommended safety standards, encourage the community and society to be positively involved and contribute in enhancing safety in schools. The study will as well assist policy makers to be aware of the challenges facing schools in the implementation of the MOE Safety Standards.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Introduction
This chapter contains the following sub-topics, background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives, research questions, assumptions, theoretical framework, conceptual framework and operational definitions.

1.1 Background to the study
From time immemorial human beings have usually sought to protect themselves against disasters. They always put in place measures to control diseases, improving their environment, protecting food and water supplies, Creswell Jr et al (1993). Controlling communicable diseases, improving the physical environment, providing medical assistance to the sick and maintaining safe and adequate supplies of food and water are therefore never ending tasks in the history of mankind.

Injury and accidents continue to rank among the leading causes of death and burden of disease, and occur in all regions and countries, affecting people of all ages, WHO (2000). According to WHO (2000) injury as cause of death has increased among children in many regions and it comprises of road traffic injuries, drowning, interpersonal violence and fire. For students they spend roughly one third of their lives or most of their hours engaged in school activities. Although the school is relatively safe, the school environment presents its own hazards and safety concerns. All children deserve school environment
that is safe and nurturing, one that will allow them grow, thrive and maximize their full potential, Management System International (2008).

Due to the importance of school safety various countries have developed strategies and put in place measures to promote and ensure student safety in their countries. In the United States for example, according to Redican et al (1986), more than six thousand school-age children are killed in accidents every year and over half of these accidents would be prevented if safety measures were observed. The United States Department of Education (2004) indicates that school wide policies are implemented to systematically address needs of students, school personnel, community and physical plants of the school. The U S Department of Education therefore requires safety policies in school to be strictly enforced in view of the threats posed by terrorism, drug related violence and natural disasters.

Safety of schools is very serious since it affects children’s lives. Aware of this, the French government has set up a National Agency for Safety in Schools whose main duty is to deal with and handle issues of school safety in the country, beside ensuring that the school safety procedures are followed, Dwyer et al(2000).

In Australia, according to Shaw (2002) state initiatives addressed school safety issues by partnering with commonwealth to develop a consistent approach to school safety across all states. The Australian government has invested in long term projects that aim in strengthening the capacity of schools, their staff and
communities to handle and tackle issues to do with student safety in school. Shaw (2002) indicates that the government has undertaken comprehensive review of school based prevention projects and polices.

In order to avoid incidents that endanger students’ safety like the India school fire of 2004 and 1995 that caused the death of over 400 students, the Indian government has established a school safety program, Gol UNDP (2006). The objective of the school safety program in India is to promote a culture of safety in schools by sensitizing children and school community on issues of disaster preparedness, safety measures and to motivate key stakeholders through participation in activities that would foster disaster resilient community.

African continent has not been spared cases of unsafe schools, in South Africa unsafe schools cases are reported in form of gang activity, rape and sexual assaults. Omollo et al (2010) indicated the South African government has adopted approaches to enhance school safety by initiating a school safety program involving local community partners, national government guidelines and support materials for school managers and safety committees to manage safety in schools. In Uganda one of the East African countries the government, community, parents and private partners have tried to respond to infrastructural aspects of education and quality, but safety of the learning environment is still a hindrance, Omollo et al (2010). The Uganda government in trying to address the problem partnered with the USAID in 2008 and introduced in over 200 schools
Safe School Contract Program which aimed to strengthen the aspects of school safety in Uganda, Omollo and Simatwa (2010)

The Kenyan government through the Ministry of Education has given guidelines of establishing Safety Standards in school to ensure safety of learners. The laws of Kenya clearly outline that all administrative institutions and all those in charge of children should treat interests of the child as paramount, by safeguarding and promoting the rights and welfare of the child, ROK (2001).

The Children Act 2001 clearly states that every child has a right of protection from any hazardous act or interference to a child’s education, health or physical, mental, spiritual, moral or social development. Therefore the Kenyan constitution requires that children are protected from child abuse, drug abuse, sexual harassment, torture and the like. The law tries to emphasize the importance of providing children with safety against any adverse happenings which endanger their lives.

According to Safety Standards manual (MOE 2008), unprecedented insecurity from personal threats, in appropriate school facilities and infrastructure, whereby poorly constructed classrooms, and playground, insufficient and broken down toilet facilities, gender insensitive location of toilet and bathroom facilities, and inadequate and inappropriate desks and other furniture can cause the insecurity of learners. Therefore enhanced school safety is necessary for both student and teachers for promotion of effective teaching and learning.

Threats to learners require to be addressed through careful thought out measures and strategies. It is in this context the Ministry of Education has provided a
Safety Standards Manual (2008) to be followed by the school administrators and the community to ensure that their schools put in place measures that promote student safety.

The Ministry of Education (2008) therefore, outlines standards and guidelines to be implemented to ensure safety of learners in schools, they include:

- Safety of school grounds well secured and neat
- Safe physical infrastructures and buildings.
- Safe Health and hygiene for student safety.
- Safe school environment.
- Safe Food for Learners in school.
- Safety against drug and substance abuse.
- Safe Social-cultural environment of the school.
- Safety of children with special needs (disabilities).
- Safety against child abuse.
- Safe school Transport.
- Disaster risk reduction and management in school.
- Safe School community relations.

In launching the Ministry of Education Safety Standards Manual (MOE 2008), the Minister for Education called upon all the school stakeholders to ensure that they put up measures to ensure that safety standards are upheld in their schools in order to avoid disasters in schools. Cornacchia et al (1984) clearly stated that,
schools have both a legal and a moral responsibility to provide a safe, sanitary and healthful living environment for students and school personnel.

However it is important to note that accidents and disasters will always occur in schools, but it is how prepared the schools are, and which safety measures have been put in place that creates that greater difference. As Creswell Jr et al (1993) noted, the school requires a system for preventing, as well as handling and dealing with disasters immediately and effectively when they occur. Ozigi (1977) also said that school accidents can happen anytime; nevertheless maximum precaution should be undertaken to avoid accidents that can be prevented.

Lunenburg et al (2004) said that, to protect students and school from liability, an enlightened administrator learns to identify and eliminate accident causing dangers. Therefore having seen the necessity of Educational Administrators to take measures to ensure safety and handle disasters in schools, there was need to establish, whether the schools had made any effort to be prepared to handle accidents in schools when they occur in Borabu district Nyamira county by implementing MOE School Safety Standards

1.2. Statement of problem
There is an emerging concern of the rising cases of disasters in secondary schools. Cases of accidents and incidents that threaten student safety in schools are recorded and reported in local media and others go unreported. The St.Kizito incident of 1991 where 19 girls perished, Gicheru(1998), the gang raping of Hawinga school girls in 1993, Oriang (2001) the Bombolulu fire tragedy of 1998
where 25 students were burnt to death, Gicheru (1998), the Nyeri high school burning of 4 prefects by fellow students in 1999, Mwaniki (1999), the Kyanguli fire of 2001 which killed 67 students, Odalo(2001) and the burning of a student at Upper Hill in 2008, Ombati (2008), are such examples among many.

The numerous student strikes lead to burning of schools, lives of students and property continue to be destroyed due to failure to take necessary steps to control these disasters. In all these cases it should be noted that some form of safety measures was lacking otherwise the lives of the students would have not been lost. The reporter in the case of Nyeri high school noted that the doors of the room in which the students were burnt were locked from outside, Mwaniki(1999). According to, Wambugu of the East African Standard newspaper (august 2008) over 60% of schools in Kenya did not have fire fighting gadgets and less than 20% of the schools in Nyanza alone had installed required safety gadgets. In Borabu District according to the records in the office of the D.E.O there were 5 cases of school fire incidents reported.

Even after the MOE outlined the safety measures to be implemented and followed by schools in 2008; the schools in Kenya continue to experience disasters which endanger students’ lives such as the burning of 2 boys in Enderasha School Nyeri, Otieno (2010). Angwenyi (2010) outlines a chronology of disasters in Kenyan schools from the year 2010 and after as follows, electrocution of a boy in Kisii School, October 2010, the Sameta school fire February 2011, collapse of building in Kereri school, June 2011 and fire at Nakuru High School, June 2011 all in which property and in some cases lives were lost. This persistence recurrence of disasters and continued destruction of lives and property in Kenyan schools clearly indicates that the MOE Safety Standards have not been fully implemented.

Due to these arguments there was a need to assess issues of safety in schools and establish the extent to which schools have implemented the MOE Safety Standards in Borabu District, Kenya.
1.3 Purpose of the study
The purpose of this study was to establish the effectiveness of the implementation of the Ministry of Education’s Safety Standard measures in public secondary schools in Borabu District, Kenya.

1.4 Objectives of the study
The following objectives were to guide the study:

1. To determine the safety standards programs in public secondary schools in Borabu district.
2. To establish the level of implementation of the government’s safety guidelines in public secondary schools Borabu district.
3. To determine the factors influencing the implementation of Ministry of Education’s Safety Standards in public secondary schools in Borabu District.

1.5 Research questions
The study was guided by the following questions:

1) What were the safety standards programs public secondary schools in Borabu district?
2) How far have the public secondary schools implemented the governments’ safety guidelines in Borabu district?
3) Which factors have influenced the implementation of MOE safety standards in public secondary school of Borabu district?
1.6 Significance of the study
The researcher hoped that the findings will indicate how far Kenyan secondary schools had gone to establish the outlined MOE Safety Standards in readiness to handle and tackle disasters of various magnitudes. On the other hand it was hoped the findings to assist policy makers to be aware of some challenges the schools face in the implementing Government guidelines on Safety Standards in schools. The researcher also believed that results of the research would inform school managers on their level of implementation of safety standards hence advice them to enhance preparations of making their schools safe zones.

To the public, community, parents and society in general the results of the research to be an eye opener of the existing safety conditions in their schools and maybe could have acted as a starting point for their contribution and participation in enhancing safety in schools. Besides, the researcher had hoped that the study was to form a basis for further research on the topic.

1.7 Assumptions of the study
The researcher made the following assumptions:

a) All schools required common safety precautions irrespective of the status or category of the school.

b) School authorities were aware of the Ministry of Education’s safety standards.

c) Respondents were to cooperate and provide honest answers.
1.8 Limitations of the study
1. The study was confined to selected public secondary schools in Borabu
district. Generalizations of the findings therefore were to be done to other
regions in the country with caution.

2. The study targeted the principals and teachers of public secondary schools of
Borabu district since they were the immediate officers on the school set up. The
study did not include the students or parents, who could have provided useful
information on safety in the schools.

1.9 Delimitations of the study
1. The study mainly dealt with aspect of implementation of safety standards in,
public secondary schools because the public schools’ governance falls directly
under the ministry.

2. The study only covered Borabu district and not the wider Gusii region of
Nyanza province in Kenya due to time limit and vastness of the region.

1.10 Theoretical framework
The framework of the study was built from Maslow’s hierarchy theory which
arranges human needs in hierarchical model with basic needs at the bottom and
higher needs at the top, Okumbe (1998). Abraham Maslow a leader in
development of humanistic psychology according to Parter et al (1975) proposed
a hierarchy of classifying human motives. These motives ascend from the basic
biological needs present at birth to more complex motives that become important
only after the more basic needs have been satisfied. According to Benjamin jr et
al (1987) Maslow proposed a need schema comprising of five interrelated levels. In order for needs of higher scale to become relevant, needs contained in the lower levels must be satisfied. Consequently immediate concerns for an individual are bodily demands and safety assurance, only when these fundamental requirements are satisfied and well addressed is one free to consider other needs such as reading and entertainment.

**Fig 1.1 Maslow’s Hierarchy of needs**

![Maslow’s Hierarchy of needs](image)

**Source:** Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. Okumbe (1998) pg45

Okumbe (1998) say that according to Maslow; a person will be concerned with self actualization needs only if physical; security (safety) love and esteemed needs are well satisfied. According to Okumbe (1998), therefore a need which
has been satisfied is no longer motivating, however if the satisfaction of lower order need is threatened that need will again become preponderant and efforts to satisfy all higher order needs will be reduced.

This hierarchy of needs can be referred to as physical or psychological conditions that improve the well being of human beings and one can become less motivated when they are lacking. This theory of Maslow formed the theoretical base for the study because it explained safety needs as being paramount to the well being of human beings and his achievements (education included).

Creswell jr. et al (1993) observes that students learn more effectively when their basic emotional and physical needs are met, those includes their physiological needs for food, the emotional and psychological needs for safety and emotional safety. Cornacchia et al (1984), observes that, an atmosphere conducive for learning is one that is friendly, comfortable and safe, since it motivates and meets the needs of students and minimizes stress situations in school.

Educational Managers should realize that learners who feel insecure will not have a drive towards learning, since motivated students learn more readily. Creswell Jr. et al (1993),makes an observation that, students may feel less threatened by or be motivated when they are protected against a potential safety threat. Like all human beings when students suffer illness or injury, their pain and discomfort make them seek relief instead of learning.
1.11 Conceptual framework

Fig. 1.2: The conceptual framework of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School safety program (Independent variable)</th>
<th>School (Moderator variable)</th>
<th>Safe schools zones (Dependent variable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In form of MOE safety standards, to address safety risks in school such as:</td>
<td>Implementation process at school by:</td>
<td>Successful school safety program implementation in school is indicated by characteristics such as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Unsafe school grounds.</td>
<td>Head teacher assisted by School safety committee, Staff and Students.</td>
<td>i) High levels of students’ safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Unsafe school health and hygiene.</td>
<td>Implementation process which entails:</td>
<td>ii) High student retention rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Risky physical structure</td>
<td>i) Identifying safety needs</td>
<td>iii) Reduced delinquency among students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- classroom</td>
<td>ii) Mobilizing resources for program.</td>
<td>iii) High participation of community in school activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Laboratory</td>
<td>iii) Staff training and development.</td>
<td>iv) Quality teaching by staff and good results among students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dormitory</td>
<td>iv) Monitoring and evaluating</td>
<td>v) High level disaster preparedness and awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Unsafe foods at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Drug abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Risks for disabled students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Unsafe transport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. Disasters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s own (2012)

The school safety program in form of safety standards set by MOE act as an independent variable in school safety system. Once introduced in school the safety program guide the school administrators in implementing the safety of students in school. These standards are implemented by the school administrator in the school set up as school’s safety program. This is done by identifying the safety needs for the schools and setting up a safety committee. Besides, the
process requires mobilizing resources for the safety needs implementation, training staff, students and all stakeholders and in monitoring and evaluating the safety program.

The implementation process takes place in school set up, hence school act as moderator variable. Successful implementation of the safety programme in school creates safe schools which are characterized by high student retention, quality teaching among teachers improved student performance, reduced delinquency among many other benefits. Safe schools and benefits associated with will only be witnessed if there is successful implementation of school safety program in form of MOE safety standards by school administration.

Borrowing the agricultural language, the safety standards can be likened to seeds which are planted in good soil (school) and taken care of (nurtured) by school administrators which in turn produce high yield (benefits of safe schools). Therefore it shows that if there is no implementation of safety standards measures in schools we will have unsafe school zones which have their negative results and which in turn endanger student safety.
Operational Definitions of Central Terms.

Accident: Refers to an unplanned act or destruction of life and property.

Disaster: Refer to occurrence in school that may cause damage to property, injury or death of somebody.

Effectiveness: Refer to ability to provide safety for prevention of discomfort, injury and anything endangering life.

Head teacher /principal: Refer to a teacher with overall administrative responsibilities in a secondary school.

Implementation: Process of putting into work/place to already accepted standards.

Preparedness: Refer to a state of being ready to handle and cope with a safety demand/disaster.

Public secondary school: Refer to a school run by public funds where education is offered from form one level to form four levels.

Safety: Refer to a situation free from disasters.

Safety standards: Refers to recommended measures of promoting safety in schools by Ministry of Education.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction
This chapter is discussed under subheadings, definition and significance of school safety, the school safety programs, maintaining and evaluating school safety programmes.

2.1 Definitions of school safety programs

According to Redizan et al (1986), school safety is the prevention of accidents and the mitigation of personal injury or property damage which may result from accidents in school set up. Safety therefore is seen to be made up of two components of prevention and mitigation of events that lead to accidents.

Ministry of Education (2008) defines school safety as the measures undertaken by learners, staff, parents and other stake holders to either minimize or eliminate risky conditions and threats that may cause accidents, bodily injury, as well as emotional and psychological stress. Therefore, school safety becomes an integral and indispensable component of teaching and learning process. Many students in developing world face different daily realities when it comes to their safety. The physical, psychological and sexual violence and other dangers they face and experience in school compromise their ability to fully realize benefits of education, MSI (2008).

Safe and secure school environment facilitates and fosters quality teaching and learning M.O.E (2008). On the other hand insecure school environment
promotes delinquency, truancy, disdaining of learning activities which in turn affect the access, equity, participation, retention, completion and quality of education in school.

According to Eric (2001) unsafe schools are those that may manifest the following characteristic:-

- Poor designs ,
- poor use of school space ,
- lack of caring ,
- unfair and inconsistent disciplinary procedures ,
- student segregation ,
- insensitivity to multicultural factors and
- issues of diversity of anger and resentment at school routine.

Walker et al (2004), associates unsafe schools with, lack of cohesion, chaos, disorganization, ineffectiveness, violent incidents, unclear behavior, high risks, gang activity and unclear academic expectations.

On the other hand, according to Dwyer et al (2000), safe schools possess these characteristics:-

- Strong leadership ,
- Cares and involve various categories of people in the designing of programs and policies,
- Have prevention and intervention programs that are sustainable,
- Trained support staff to promote implementation of program and approaches.

For Walker et al (2004), characteristics of safe schools include high effectiveness, accepting freedom from potential and psychological harm, nurturing, protective and absence of violence in school. The Ministry of Education (2008) adds more of these characteristics as: high retention rates of enrolled learners, active participation of community in school program, adequate and well maintained facilities and clearly demarcated school grounds. How do safe schools and orderly schools function? According to Sadker et al (2000), in these schools, there is focus on academic achievement, families and communities are involved in school activities. In such schools students and staff treat each other with respect and student’s concerns and interests are supported, while students’ problems are identified and attended to before they deteriorate into violence.

Creswell Jr (1993), says that safety in school does not imply that physical environment to be converted into an accident proof situation or that children’s action be completely retained so that accident cannot happen, rather it means pursuit of the normal demands of life in an environment in which hazards are reduced to practical minimum and the behavior of pupils is adapted to safe and effective living.

Anderson et al (1980), further acknowledges that safety does not eliminate all risks, some risks are inventible and even necessary, but needless risks can be
eliminated. Safety extends the scope of human experience by anticipating and preventing conditions that would otherwise be injurious and even fatal. Therefore if it is possible for children to extend their adventures without mishaps, the end result will be effective and enjoyable living and studying in school.

**Significance of School safety program.**
The school requires a system for preventing accidents, as well as formula of dealing with them immediately and effectively when they occur. As Creswell (1993) notes, all accidents can be anticipated and not all situations that cause accidents can be foreseen. Yet most hazardous conditions and unsafe practices can be recognized through use of a well organized school safety program. The school program must be understood in the total context of safety programs and services. To be effective the goals and functions of school safety must be integrally relate to all levels of all safety standards including international, federal, state and local level, Creswell Jr (1993). Accidents loom greater risk to health and life than to do infectious diseases, so just as the most effective prevention of communicable diseases, is the positive approach of immunization, the most effective prevention of accidents is the positive approach that is safety promotion for effective living, Anderson et al (1980), hence a special need to put into place a school safety program. Safe schools implement a variety of programs and social services. Sadker et al (2000) say that, school psychologists, special education programs, family social workers and school wide programs,
instituted in school to increase communication and reduce tension are all components of improving school safety.

Injury control program is a useful model for school administrators and teachers to use in the prevention and control of accidental injury and death; Lunenburg et al (2006). Therefore school safety program will help school deal with accidental injury and in three ways according to Creswell jr (1993). First by teaching students to avoid and deal with risky situations, secondly it will help reduce hazards in the school’s environment and finally the program will be used to teach skills to cope with accidents and care for accident victims when accidents occur.

A guide for present and future school plans may be influenced by use of safe plan framework. A school safety program should be long term, systematic and very comprehensive to involve the effective community, Redican et al (1986). A school safety plan should conduct a school safety assessment, formulation of safety team, establishment of strategies and implementation of violence prevention strategies, Department of Education (2004 (a)). Therefore, like Cornacchia et al (1984) observed, every school regardless of size should have a carefully organized written plans and procedure for the safety of students.

In India, for example, the school safety program essentially targets in promoting a culture of safety in school and draw the commitment of providing safe learning environment for children and professionals. Primary strategies are to help inform, persuade and integrate the issues of safety to create safe schools. The goal of the program is to promote a culture of disaster preparedness in schools in
The School Safety Program in India according to Gol-UNDP (2008), adopted the following strategies in its implementation process:

- Promoting Awareness and Education; this is where the safety program takes a task of educating school community to integrate school safety in educational program, since an enlightened society will be more receptive to risk reduction measures.

- Disaster Management in school; this strategy involves integrating disaster management in India’s education system, therefore creating awareness and sensitizing students and teachers on various hazards, how to prevent them and take precautionary measures.

- Demonstrating Disaster Risk Management; this is a process of making the staff and students to acquire skills to handle disaster through simulation, activity and training.

- Training and Capacity building; this strategy involves organizing training programs, capacity building workshops for key people in education department, such as teachers, students and members of school safety committee. The training touches areas such as first aid, fire drill, search and rescue.
According to Ministry of Education (2008), the safety of the school depends on measures taken to organize, plan and manage such a safety, hence every school should create a specific school safety committee whose specific duties and responsibilities should be:

i. Identify safety needs of the school with a view to taking the necessary action.

ii. Mobilize resources required by the school to ensure a safe, secure and caring environment for learners, staff and parents.

iii. Form sustainable networks with all stakeholders to foster and sustain school safety.

iv. Keep learners, parents and other stakeholders informed about school safety policies and implementations of activities.

v. Monitor and evaluate the various aspects of school safety with a view to enhancing school safety.

This idea is echoed by Redican et al (1986), that the school administration should establish a student safety committee, whose responsibility will be to keep alert for hazards, safety violations as well as situations that have the potential of becoming dangerous to well being of the students. Consequently the prevention of accidents according to Redican et al (1986), relies upon a comprehensive safety program that is strong and critical, hence it is important that the school safety committee be involved in the development of the program philosophy of the school safety, and helps establish school safety policies.
Redican et al (1986) summarizes that an effective school safety program encompasses many areas within the school system. First, there should be constant awareness to potential hazards of new products being introduced into the school environment. Secondly, there should be specialized training and drills for school personnel. Thirdly, school safety concerns should be integrated into appropriate school curriculum designs. Finally, there should be safety education conducted to teach students safety skills. It is therefore imperative for educational administrators to ensure that they maintain Safety Program in their schools.

According to Rono et al (2009), findings of the study conducted in Turkana district found out that all (100%) the head teachers and teachers interviewed had not participated or been trained in fire drills and fighting skills. The study also revealed that 85.7% of teachers interviewed indicated that they had not been trained on how to handle disasters. Nderitu (2009) indicated in her findings conducted in Kiambu district that none (0%) of the principals interviewed admitted to have carried out fire drill exercises in their schools. The study continues to show that only a small percentage of 27% of the principals interviewed acknowledged have having some form of knowledge on fire drills and fighting skills.

The study therefore was to establish if the secondary schools in Borabu district had put in place a school safety programme. The study as well researched if schools in their safety programme entailed training teachers to handle disasters in school. Mugo (2005) acknowledged that, the teachers’ knowledge in first aid
skills during disasters is important since it promotes quick recovery and safety of students when disasters occur in school.

2.3 Maintaining and monitoring school safety program
All school members should go round their duties uninterrupted, hence it is very important to maintain school safety program to take care of emergencies and disasters that occur in school, and ensure activities in school go on uninterrupted. All schools according to Creswell et al (2001) should have written plan of procedure, together with facilities needed in the event of an emergency.

School safety programs financially speaking are not costly, they do demand a vision, organization, leadership and cooperation, they should be enacted and not exist just on paper, Creswell Jr et al (1993). It has been observed by Okumbe (2001) and MOE (2008) that, the best way of maintaining safety programs in school organization is to conduct monitoring and evaluation on the school safety program.

2.3.1 Evaluation of school safety program in enhancing school safety.
A well planned program begin with an evaluation of the school conditions and practices related to the schools safety and accidental prevention program, Creswell Jr.et al (1993). Monitoring and evaluation are essential components of the school safety programme, MOE (2008). Evaluation according to Redican, (1986) is appraising something according to a set of values or criteria. In school there should be a process of determining the progress the school is making towards achieving the predetermined objectives which rate school safety. The
evaluation should be done in terms of technical and human causes of accidents. The technical accidents causes are usually due to poorly designed plant and equipment, on the other hand human caused accidents occur due to, lack of proper training on the use of various equipment, boredom, negative attitudes, fatigue among others, Creswell Jr et al (1993) concurred that, adequately trained personnel will prepare the school to deal effectively with emergency situation and offer a good defense in the event of mitigation.

Monitoring and evaluation of school safety programs should be a continuous exercise MOE (2008). It should involve assessment of various components of the safety programme through observation, planned and organized efforts of gathering information using predetermined data collection tools such as questionnaire and checklists. According to Redican (1986) and MOE (2008) the process of monitoring and evaluating school safety programmes should be based on the following principles:

i. Evaluation and monitoring should be a process which is continuous and co-current with programme activities.

ii. Monitoring and evaluation focuses and embraces all components of the school safety programmes.

iii. The monitoring and evaluation process is participatory and cooperate, by involving all stakeholders such as learners, staffs, parents and community members.
iv. Monitoring and evaluation process should be simple and clear to be understood by everyone involved.

v. Monitoring and evaluation process should be focused upon the important values that underlie the concept of school safety and expressed in objectives and goals of the whole programme.

vi. Evaluation results (data and records) should form the basis of taking the necessary action.

2.3.2 Purpose of monitoring and evaluating school safety programme
Evaluation and monitoring process are important for various reasons, Cornacchia et al (1992) and MOE (2008) shared some of the purposes of such a process has being:

i. To use it as a diagnostic device, that is assessing prior knowledge of learners regarding safety issues and determining what they now need to know.

ii. To determine progress towards objective attainment that is, to determine whether or not safety objectives are being achieved in schools.

iii. To motivate learners by creating awareness and stimulating their curiosity about various school safety components.

iv. To guide and counsel students towards avoiding unsafe and dangerous habits such as drug abuse.

v. To provide data useful for continuous review of school safety programme.

vi. Using data collected during evaluation forms the basis to sensitize parents and community members on issues and challenges relating school safety.
vii. To acquire important information this is useful for school safety programme planning.

It is worth noting that a comprehensive and meaningful evaluation should encompass all the components of the school safety programmes. MOE (2008) offered three main techniques of monitoring and evaluating school safety programmes. First, that observation done by the head teacher or teachers responsible for school safety, Redican (1986) notes that, observation may be formal or informal but key is the fact that teachers should make observations of students within more “natural” surroundings while engaged in school activities. The teacher therefore should continually evaluate component of school safety programme on day to day basis using an observation schedule/checklists design for the purpose, MOE (2008). The study was trying to establish if this was being done in public secondary schools of Borabu district.

The second technique identified by MOE (2008) is that one of using monitoring instruments specifically designed to cover all components of the school safety programmes. Finally the assessment can be undertaken by designated or educational officers and the Quality Assurance Standard Officers (QASOs). Evaluation on the school safety programmes enable the school administration to come up with mechanisms which go along way towards treating the actual causes of disasters in schools. Nderitu (2009) reports in her findings of her study in Kiambu secondary schools that, 100% of the principals interviewed acknowledged awareness of MOE Safety Standards; however the same
principals admitted to have only partially implemented the safety policies in their schools. The study therefore tried to establish the challenges faced by principals of secondary schools in Borabu district in establishing, maintaining and evaluating school safety program.

Having noted the importance of conducting the evaluation of school safety program, the researcher went out to establish if the secondary schools in Borabu had put in place school safety programs. The study wanted to find out if evaluation of safety took place in secondary schools of Borabu district, since safety assurance in schools raises the motivational level of both students and teachers, Nderitu (2009).

2.4. Factors influencing school safety implementation.
Number of factors has been identified as consistently associated with successful and sustainable implementation of safe schools programs and strategies. While many factors facilitate sustainable safe schools programming research has found out that commitment, enthusiasm and leadership from all partners in education, and from both staff and school administrators are critical elements in sustainable change, Crooks et al (2008).

The support from the staff and administration in the implementing strategies of safe schools is important. Fullan (1991), says that “educational change depends on what teachers do and think”, according to him, getting the school staff on board is essential in implementing and sustaining change for they will support it fully. Furlong et al (2006), echoes the same that readiness and willingness of
school centers and the teachers to undertake a new invention is very important. It is essential to obtain the principals’ support for the program because it particularly determines how well teacher’ efforts in program implementation will be supported.

A lot of educational administrators endorse the importance of professional development and training on staff to handle school safety programs. School staff should receive appropriate training and resources towards school safety management, Crooks et al (2008). Initial and ongoing training and professional development on the staff help create a proactive atmosphere towards school safety programs. Furlong et al (2008), say that well trained staff is needed in all administrative roles in our school system and safety program is not an exception and the provision of technical support and training involving principals and teachers dramatically improves the nature of implementation and help them address challenges of school safety. Therefore without training and ongoing professional development, motivation and enthusiasm among staff will drop and safety program will suffer.

Good communication is the back bone of ensuring an ongoing success of any program, in the school the initial messages and measures of the safety program come from the top and trickle down. By regularly communicating the safety messages the school principal ensures that the safety program is ongoing and has the commitment of the various members of the school safety team, Redican et al (1996). According to Crooks et al (2008), school safety programs need to exist at
all levels; board, staff, students, parents and community members and the school should think how to pass the safety messages by using policy statement and motto to address the challenge of implementing and sustaining safe school environment. Luneburg (2006), conquers that school administrators have a lot of information on school safety to give to staff and need to ensure that everyone hears, sees and understand the same thing so they can work as a team.

Priority and support from the key stakeholders such as the ministry and school board play a major role in the successful implementation of the safety program in school, Crooks (2008). Once the ministry and the school board make school safety program their priority, they will put effort to provide and organize the funding; staffing; training and professional development and resources required for the implementation of school safety programs, Furlong et al (2006). Creswell (1993) says that such support may be obtained from other organizations such as educators, recreational organizations and community to support and finance the school safety program implementation and sustainability.

Embedding and integrating safe schools into school curriculum and culture is another way to ensure the success of the school safety program. Crooks et al (2006), identifies some of the ways through which this can be done;

i. Forum Theatre and Drama workshops.

ii. The Write Stuff- using writings and printing to teach safety.
iii. Inter disciplinary studies, which students to develop safety skills and knowledge.

iv. Including safety in the school’s daily pledge.

The inclusion of safety studies in school curriculum will help students develop skills, knowledge, provide opportunity to put the skills into practice and provide feedback.

Incorporating planning and step by step implementation into a safe school program is a sixth way to help sustainability, for this process ensures consistency. It is important to ensure that the development of school safety program goals is appropriate and reasonable to the specific school and not merely a copy of another, Creswell (1993).

Crooks (2006), notes that school safety program implementation needs to be evaluated and monitored so as to know if the program is a success, since successful implementation motivates people both in the school and the community.

**Summary of the Literature Review**
The literature reviewed focused on meaning and significance of school safety, its importance in school set up. It also dealt with school safety program, how to maintain school safety program. The literature review revealed that school safety is necessary and important in running of school, and that is why the government had put in place measures and standards that need to be introduced in schools to
guarantee students safety. It was indicated that schools must put in place safety program, which need to be well maintained and run. The literature reviewed showed how to evaluate school safety program and importance of monitoring and evaluating these school safety programs. Finally the literature revealed that there various factors that influence and affect effective implementation of school safety programs.

After looking through the literature studied the researcher therefore intended to address the following issues in his research:

i. Had schools put in place the MOE recommended safety measures and standards?

ii. Establish if schools had established school safety program.

iii. Whether teachers had been trained on how to handle and maintain student safety.

iv. The existence of school safety monitoring and evaluation mechanism in schools of Borabu district.

v. The problems and challenges faced while trying to establish, maintain and evaluate school safety program.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction
This study sought to evaluate the implementation of safety standards measures of the MOE as a way of promoting student safety in secondary schools. This chapter contains research design, location of study, target population, sampling procedures, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis techniques.

3.1 Research design
The researcher employed descriptive survey method of research, to describe the current situation of school safety without manipulating the variables. According to Orodho (2005), survey method is used to collect information about the popularity or success of a particular program. It is on this and of the already given reasons for study, that the design was found suitable.

3.2 Location of study
The study was undertaken in Borabu district which forms the south eastern part of Nyamira County, Kenya. The area boarders Bureti and Sotik districts to the East,Transmara in the South and Kisii County to the West. Borabu district headquarters are located in Nyansiongo town. The area of study had been chosen since it was convenient to the researcher in terms of accessibility and familiarity. Singleton et al (1993) says that, the ideal setting for any study should be easily accessible to the researcher. More so a number of schools had been involved in disaster related issues in the past as indicated by the record of the DEO office.
3.3 Target population
According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), the population of study refers to a group of people, events or place who share same characteristics that a researcher wants to study. The target population was the public secondary schools in Borabu district, Nyanza province. Principals and teachers of these schools were targeted for interview. Principals are in charge of implementing safety standards set by MOE in their respective schools. Teachers assist principals in ensuring that safety of students is maintained in school set up.

There were 21 public secondary schools in Borabu district with 21 head teachers and approximately 200 teachers according to DEO records.

3.4 Sample and sampling procedure
A sample is a small part of anything which is intended to stand for or represent the whole, Wellington (2000). Orodho (2005) says that, sampling is a process of selecting a sub-set of cases and draw conclusion from the active set. The schools in the district had been categorized into 1 boy’s boarding, 1 girl’s boarding, 1 girl’s day, 10 mixed boarding and 8 mixed day schools hence 21 in total. All these categories formed different strata from which the schools for the study were selected from as indicated in table 3:1.

The researcher picked all the three schools in the categories of boy’s boarding, girl’s boarding and girl’s day since they were few in number. These three categorized schools represented 14% of all the public secondary schools in Borabu district. For the category of mixed boarding schools four schools were
randomly sampled through balloting out of the 10 schools available hence represented 19% of all public secondary schools in Borabu. Four schools out of the total 8 representing 19% of all secondary schools in Borabu district were sampled from the category of mixed day schools.

Wisker (2001) suggests that a fraction of at least 20% of the total population of less than 100 is acceptable. The 11 selected schools from the five categories in this study represented 52% of the total population of public secondary schools in Borabu district.

Table 3.1: Sample of schools for study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Category</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys boarding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls boarding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed boarding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed day</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 11 principals of the sampled schools representing 52% of the total number of principals in the district formed the sample for the principals’ questionnaires. The researcher haphazardly sampled 4 teachers from sampled schools on the basis of those available in the school during time of study; this gave rise to 44 teachers who represented 22% of the total population of teachers in Borabu.
district. According to Gay (1992), descriptive research considers a sample of 10% of the total population as the minimum.

3.5 Research instruments
The research instruments to facilitate the collection of data from the study sample included questionnaires and observation schedules.

3.5.1 Questionnaires for principals and teachers (appendix I and II)
Questionnaires that comprised of both open ended questions and structured questions were administered to the head teachers and teachers. The researcher used questionnaires since they are instruments that gather data from a large sample, besides it the best way to uphold confidentiality and cover a wide area, Kombo et al (2006). The questionnaires also act as the best tool of correcting comprehensive information about a particular case, Orodho (2005).

3.5.2 Observation schedules (appendix III)
Orodho (2005) observes, that observation schedules provides information about actual behavior, it can reveal more information than other data collection methods.

Field observation schedules gives the researcher an opportunity to collect data first hand, there by preventing contamination of the factors standing in between researcher and the object of research, Frankfort et al (1996).

The observation schedules were designed to observe:

- The safety measures existing in the school.
• The conditions were of safety measures for the safety of students of secondary schools of Borabu?

3.6 Piloting
Before embarking on data collection, the research instruments were piloted in two schools in Borabu district which were eventually not included in the study sample. According to Orodho (2005) piloting with small representative sample identical to but not be included in the survey will help the researcher to ensure that the questions asked are measuring to desired answer to check ambiguity and provide clear wording.

Therefore piloting will help researcher to reveal deficiencies of the tools for research, Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) and as well assist the researcher to check the length of time taken to fill the questionnaire, Bell (2005).

3.6.1 Validity of Instrument
Validity is the degree to which imperial measure of a concept accurately represent that concept, Orodho (2005). Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), asserts that professionals or experts be used to assess the content validity. Hence the validity of the questionnaires and observation schedules were accessed by the researcher’s supervisors and lecturers of the department of Education Management, Policy and Curriculum planning of Kenyatta University, their suggestions and recommendations were considered and well incorporated.
3.6.2 Measurement of Reliability
Reliability of measurement is concerned with the degree to which a particular measure, measuring procedure gives equivalent results over a number of repeated trials, Orodho(2005). Reliability indicates the extent to which a measuring instrument contains variable errors; Frankfort et al (1996). The researcher administered developed questionnaires to 2 head teachers and 8 teachers from the 2 schools which were not included in the final study.

Reliability was assessed using a split half technique which requires only one testing session, Mugenda (1999). The researcher divided each of the research instruments to two comparable values in terms of odd and even numbers, after the researcher administering developed questionnaires to 2 head teachers and 8 teachers. The researcher using Spearman Brown Prophecy formula computed the correlation coefficient obtained between the two halves. After computation, the correlation coefficient of the instruments was 0.819. According to Mugenda (1999) research instruments with a split-half coefficient of 0.80 or more shows that there is enough reliability.

3.7 Data collection procedure
The researcher obtained a letter of introduction from Kenyatta University; which was presented to the Ministry of Education, for permit issuance. The researcher presented the permit to the District Commissioner Borabu district and the DEO, Borabu, who gave him permission to conduct research. The researcher presented the questionnaires to the principals and teachers of schools he visited in person. While the researcher visited the schools he sought permission and made
observations which he recorded in his observation schedules. The researcher collected the questionnaires as soon as they were filled by the respondents.

3.8 Data analysis plan
According to Mugenda (1999) data analysis is the process of bringing order, structure and meaning of the mass information collected from the field. Orodho (2005) say that this process involves classifying collected data into some purposeful and usable categories. Data analysis commenced first by checking if all the questionnaires were obtained back. Editing of the gathered raw information contained in the completed questionnaires and filled observation schedules for accuracy, usefulness and completeness followed. The information given by respondents was analyzed by using descriptive statistics such as mean, mode, median, frequencies and percentage. The analyzed data was then presented using tables, charts, graphs and inferences made.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction
In this chapter data is presented and analyzed. The purpose of this study was to establish effectiveness of the implementation of the ministry of education’s safety standards meant to step up disaster preparedness in public secondary schools. The information analyzed was collected through questionnaires administered to two categories of respondents (11 Head teachers and 44 teachers) and observation by the researcher recorded in observation schedules; during his visit to the sampled schools.

1) The study was guided by the following research questions:
   1) what was the status of public secondary schools’ safety standards in Borabu district?

   2) What was the level of implementation of governments’ safety guidelines in public secondary schools of Borabu district?

   3) What problems were being faced by secondary schools while implementing governments’ safety standards in Borabu district?

Data gathered by the study was integrated, presented and analyzed under the following headings based on the specific objectives of the study.

- Respondent’s contextual characteristics.
- Status of the public secondary schools’ safety standards.
- Level of the implementation of the safety standards.
- Problems faced in the implementation of safety standards.

4.2 Respondents’ contextual characteristics:
Data was collected from the 11 randomly selected public secondary schools, all the 11 principals from the schools and 4 teachers from each sample school responded to the questionnaires therefore giving return rate of 100%.

4.2.1 Gender
Regarding the sex of respondents the number of male verses female Head teachers, male versus female teachers was as follows as indicated in the Table 4.01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teachers N = 11</th>
<th>Teachers N =44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The head teachers who responded to the questionnaires were 11 in number, 7 (64%) were male while 4 (36%) were female. For the respondents of teachers’ questionnaires 19 (43%) were female and 25 (57%) were male. This enabled both gender representations in the study.
4.2.2 Level of respondents’ qualification and experience

All the respondents were professionally trained teachers though at different levels as represented in table 4.02.

**Table: 4.02. Respondent’s Level of Professional Qualification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teachers N = 11</th>
<th>Teachers N = 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BED</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study revealed that all the head teachers were trained at B.ED and M.ED levels. Those with masters degree were 2 representing 18% while those with bachelors’ degree were 82%. The TSC requires that all public secondary schools principals should be trained graduates. For the teachers 7 (16%) were M.Ed holders, those having B.Ed qualification were 66% while those with diploma qualification were 19%. The study therefore revealed that the personnel were qualified enough to understand and be involved in governments’ desired efforts of establishing safety standards in secondary schools.
4.2.3 Head teachers’ Experience

Of the 11 Head teachers interviewed 4 (36%) of them had headship experience of five years and below while those with an experience of over 6 years but below 10 years were 4 (36%) and those above ten years of headship experience were 3 (28%). The information is well illustrated in figure 4.01

Figure 4.01: Head teachers’ Headship Experience

Given their length period in headship, the head teachers were well placed to be conversant with the MOE policy on safety and therefore able to provide reliable information.
Figure 4.02 illustrates that 12 (27%) of teachers had a teaching experience of five years and below while the rest 32 (73%) had a teaching experience of six years and above. The period served in their present status showed that the highest was 11 years while the shortest period served was 2 years. This according to the observer was considered adequate experience to enable the teachers to provide reliable information concerning safety situation in their present schools.

4.2.4 School’s Type and Status
The findings indicated that 4 (36%) of the sampled schools in the district were mixed boarding schools and those mixed day schools represented 4 (36%) while in boys boarding school category there was one (9%), Girls boarding was also one (9%) and in Girls day school category the school was one (9%). These categories of schools and their varied status adequately represented secondary
schools in the district and hence the findings obtained can be viewed as a fair representative of the situation of the ground.

With regard to status of safety standards, the researcher using the observation schedules, questionnaires to principals and questionnaires to teachers, gathered the following:

4.3.1 General details and knowledge on the status of MOE safety standards.
The study revealed that all the 11(100%) principals acknowledged being aware of MOE Safety Standards. Of the teachers interviewed, 25 (75%) acknowledged to be aware, while 19 (43%) indicated that they were not aware of the MOE safety standards.

When asked if their schools had a copy of MOE Safety Standards Manual 7(64%) of the principals answered affirmative, while 4(36%) indicated otherwise. Teachers responding on the same 15(34%) acknowledged that their schools had a copy of the Safety Manual however 29(66%) indicated that their schools did not have the manual. Of the 7 principals who agreed to have copies of the Safety Standard manuals 4 (58%) of them had made it available by displaying it at the library while 3 (42%) kept the manuals in their offices. According to researcher this made it difficult for other school members to access the manual, hence likely to hinder successful implementation of safety measures in schools. MOE, (2008) advises that, successful implementation of safety
standards in schools, partnership among all stakeholders such as learners, teachers and the school community is required.

For the teachers who agreed that their schools had a copy of safety standards manual 9 (60%) indicated that they could access the manual since it is in the library while 6 (40%) indicated that the manual remained in the principals’ office making it difficult to access it. When asked about the existence of school safety committee in their schools, 9 (82%) principals indicated of not having formed any whereas 2 (18%) agreed having to have formed one in their institutions. All the teachers interviewed 44 (100%) responded that their schools did not have school safety committees. The few principals who agreed to have school safety committees did not include parents and students as part of the members of the safety committees a required by MOE.

The researcher wanted to know how often the schools conducted students’ roll calls since it is one of the safety standard recommended in the MOE Safety Standards Manual for schools.

**Table 4.03: Frequency of Students’ Roll Calls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Headteacher Frequency</th>
<th>Teachers Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very frequent/weekly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent / monthly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare / once a term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rare/ annually</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.03 shows that all 100% head teachers and 100% of the teachers agreed that their schools conducted students’ roll call frequently that ensured effective monitoring of students by school authorities.

4.3.2 Safety on School Grounds
All the 11 (100%) head teachers interviewed responded affirmative that their schools were officially registered, but when asked to state if their schools had land title deeds as required by Ministry of education, 8 (73%) of them agreed to having had them whereas 3 (27%) didn’t.

The researcher using the observation schedule made the following observations concerning the safety of school grounds. All the 11 (100%) sampled schools had sign posts clearly indicating the existence of the schools, 10 (91%) of the schools had their school compounds clearly fenced off from the public while 1 (10%) did not have the school compound fenced off from the public. Of the schools observed by the researcher, only 4 (36%) had visitors sign in at the gate while 7 (64%) did not ask visitors sign in as they entered the school compound. The researcher observed that 6 (55%) schools had their gates guarded by watchmen. Concerning if the school compound had trees, the researcher observed that 8 (27%) schools had trees around their compounds while 3 (27%) did not have adequate trees in the compounds. The researcher observed that only 4 (36%) schools had flowers, well kept lawns and leveled grounds / terrain, while the remaining 7 (64%) did not have.
It was the feeling of the researcher that most schools had not provided safe school grounds especially by not having all visitors entering the school compound provide personal details at the school gate, as the MOE Safety Standards dictates. These therefore exposed students to physical danger and possible bad influence from individuals with bad characters, who would have entered into the school unnoticed. This is well supported by Omollo et al (2010) who says that while fences are not 100% tamperproof, they define the extent of the school plant and act as a deterrent to intruders, strong and sturdy fence is symbolic of safe and secure school.

4.3.3 Safety of School Buildings
Concerning the safety of school buildings, the researcher wanted to know if school buildings were safe for students, hence asked the respondents if their school buildings had emergency exits that could be used in case of a disaster. Response from the head teachers showed that those who admitted that their school buildings had such exists were 3 (27%) while 8 (73%) said they did not have. When teachers were asked to respond on the same issue, their response revealed that only 10(23%) positively affirmed while those who said the buildings lacked the emergency exits were 34 (77%). The researcher making observation on the same issue of emergency exits, observed that out of all the 11 schools only one 1 (9%) had elected emergency exits to their buildings while the majority 10 (91%) did not have emergency exits in all their buildings.
To determine if the schools were prepared to handle fire out breaks the researcher inquired if the schools had fire extinguishers in the buildings, the findings are shown in table 4.04.

### Table 4.04: Existence of Fire Extinguishers in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teachers N = 11</th>
<th>Teachers N = 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7 63</td>
<td>20 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 37</td>
<td>22 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 100</td>
<td>44 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.04 showed that 63% head teachers were affirmative that there existed fire extinguishers while 37% admitted that their schools did not have them. When asked on the same, the teachers respondent thus, 46% affirmed that their schools had fire extinguishers while 54% indicated that their schools did not have fire extinguishers in their schools. By observation the researcher noted that at least 45% schools had fire extinguishers in their buildings while 55% did not have them.

The researcher further tried to determine on the students’ safety in schools buildings by inquiring about congestion of students in schools buildings, 9 (82%) of the head teachers interviewed admitted to be facing a shortage of room for students. Teachers were asked the same issue of room shortage and 32 (73%) admitted that there is shortage of room for students in these schools while 12
(27%) respondent that their schools did not face shortage of room for their students. Noting on the same issue through his observation schedule the researcher observed that 7 (63%) schools had their classes and rooms congested with students while 4 (37%) had adequate room for their students.

From the data presented it can be inferred that though emergency exits in buildings were essential requirements for disaster preparedness in schools especially fire, all the schools except one had not created the emergency exits in the buildings. According to the findings conducted in Kisumu east and west districts, over 55% of the schools had elected emergency doors, where by the researcher recommended that the achievement be replicated in other schools, Omollo et al (2010). Lack of emergency exits in school buildings exposed the users of the school buildings to danger in case of disasters, MOE (2008).

4.3.4 Safety Education and Health
The researcher sought out from the respondents if students were being taught safety and health education in schools, since it is an important strategy to manage disasters in schools by creating awareness and sensitizing students how to have safe schools, UNDP (2008). Ten of the head teachers interviewed acknowledged that students are taught health and safety education, only one said that students were not taught health and safety education. The teachers were asked on the same issue, 26 (59%) positively affirmed that, while 18 (41%) declined that their schools did not teach health and safety education.
The researcher further asked those who acknowledged teaching health and safety education in school, if it was included in normal school curriculum or through special programme. For head teachers 4 (40%) said that the teaching of health and safety education was included in the normal school curriculum, 6(60%) indicated it being taught through special programs. The teachers who had acknowledged teaching safety education in their schools, 16 (62%) of them indicated that it was taught through special programmes whereas 10 (38%) of them said it was included in the curriculum. These responses indicated that most schools did teach their students safety and health education, though the researcher observed that the present Kenyan secondary school curriculum do not teach health and safety education as an independent subject in schools. The researcher noted that those who taught safety and health education had special programmes, special organizations in schools such as girl guides and scouting and talks from the experts.

The best way to monitor students health is to keep an up-to-date students’ medical record, Creswell (1993), on that basis the researcher asked the head teachers if their schools kept up-to-date medical data for every students, 6 (55%) Head teachers were affirmative while 5 (45%) said they did not keep the records. When asked about students’ medical records, the teachers responded thus, 16 (36%) said their schools did keep such records while 28 (64%) of teachers interviewed indicated that their schools did not keep up–to-date medical records for their students. The researcher inquired from the respondents if their schools
had a ‘sickbay’ and qualified medical staff in the school, table 4.05 shows the study’s findings.

**Table 4.05 Sickbay Managed by Qualified Medical Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Headteacher N = 11</th>
<th>Teacher N = 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.05 shows clearly that only one school out of total sampled schools had qualified medical staff and “sickbay” for sick students. As cited in the literature review the best way to monitor the students’ safety and health is to have up-to-date student medical records. From the data it can be observed that many of the schools 91% did not keep up-to-date student medical records. This implies that without proper medical records (data) for students it was difficult to trace and monitor students with health problems and health complications in school.

The absence of “sick bay” and qualified medical staff in most schools as affirmed by the researcher through his observation schedule, further implied that students could not receive emergency medical attention in case of disaster in school. Creswell (1993) recommends that schools should have trained personnel to attend students in case of sickness. According to Mugo (2005), findings on
cases of accidents among school children in West lands Nairobi recommended that there should be a school nurse to attend students’ physical and emotional emergencies. The findings agree with MOE guidelines which says that schools should have sanatoria (sick-bay) equipped with first line treatment drugs and run by a medical personnel, MOE (2008).

4.3.5 Food Safety
As observed by Okumbe (1998), Maslow identified food as one of the basic requirement for human beings without which, other needs such as safety will not thrive. The researcher therefore inquired from the head teachers of the sampled schools, if they ran a feeding programme is their schools and all the 11 (100%) answered in affirmative that they conducted feeding programmes and this was reinforced by the 44 (100%) teachers who also agreed that their schools offered food to their students. The researcher wanted to confirm if there were other sources of food for students while in school, 5 (45%) of the head teachers said that their schools sold food stuffs, besides the food offered to students through the feeding program via food stores (canteens) within the school, 6 (55%) said that they did not allow selling of foods stuffs within the school. On responding on the same question, the teachers interviewed 21 (48%) acknowledged while 23 (52%) refuted that their schools allowed carrying and selling of food stuffs, outside the official school feeding programme.

The private food programme other than the official school feeding can easily offer an avenue for, unsafe food for students such as, food poisoning and drugging, due to the fact that such foods do not receive very serious monitoring
from school authority. On the safety of the handling of food offered to students by school personnel the researcher sought to find how often the personnel handling students’ foods underwent medical checkup.

Table 4.06: Medical Checkup for Personnel Handling Students’ Food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Headteachers N = 11</th>
<th>Teachers N = 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very frequency (weekly)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent (Monthly)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare (once a term)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rare (annually)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.06 highlights that majority of the head teachers, 82% response showed that their schools conducted medical check up on the personnel, on weekly, monthly or on term basis while 18% did it once a year. The teachers on the other hand sharply differed with their head teachers as majority 43% showed that there has never been medical check-up for personnel handling students’ food in their schools, those who said that the check-up was conducted once a year were 38%, just a few 19% indicated either monthly or once a term.

The opinion of the researcher according to the data of table 4.06 the persons who handle students food did not undergo regular medical check-up as required so as to reduce any chances of contaminating students’ food.
Table 4.07: Main Sources of Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teacher</th>
<th>N = 11</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>N = 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream/rain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher sought to know the main source of water for students in schools as table 4.07 shows, only 18% of the head teachers and 20% teachers interviewed identified piped water as the main source of water for their schools. Majority of the head teachers 46% and 43% of the teachers identified rain harvested water as the major source of water in their schools. Those who identified stream (river) as main source, 18% were head teachers while teachers were 20%, the remaining 18% of head teachers and 18% of teachers interviewed identified the borehole as their main source of water in their schools.

From the data presented in table 4.07 it can be inferred that, most schools depend on rain harvesting to get water for use, but this can be seen as dangerous in case there is rain failure, thus exposing students to water shortage and likely to causes problems and danger of unsafe drinking water for students while in school. In making observation on the availability of drinking water within the school compound, the researcher observed that out of the sampled schools only
36% had put up clean drinking water points, while 64% did not have such water points within their compounds. This is reflected in the pie-chart fig 4.03.

**Fig. 4.03: Schools with Clean Drinking Water Points**

These findings implied that school members of those schools without clean water points would be at risk of drinking contaminated water hence endanger their health.

4.3.6 **Clean Environment**

A safe, secure and clean environment facilitates and fosters quality learning MOE (2008) hence the researcher wanted to observe how schools disposed refuse which would cause dirty school environment.
Table 4.08 Waste Disposal in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of waste dumpsite/disposal site</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of disposal bins/ bins along pathways or building</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of sanitary room (toilets/latrines)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of sanitary room from buildings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data obtained through observation schedules of the researcher, as reflected in table 4.0 shows that all sampled schools 100% had set aside a place where waste disposal is dumped. But it was observed that out of the 11 schools only 8% had located waste disposal bins along the pathways and near buildings within the school compound, the other 82% did not have the bins. This therefore according to the researcher, posed the challenge to school members when disposing refuse, hence creates a higher chance and temptation of littering the compound by the school members. Table 4.08 also indicated that all the 100% schools had proper sanitary rooms for human waste disposal, it further reflected that the sanitary rooms especially pit latrines were located away from buildings therefore the chances of bad smell, disturbing school members while in class were minimal.
4.3.7 Safety Against Drug Abuse

The researcher sought to know if schools had guidance and counseling departments, all the head teachers 11 (100%) and the 44 (100%) teachers jointly acknowledged existence of Guidance and Counseling departments in their schools which were responsible of guiding students in drug abuse. The researcher wanted to establish if members were sensitized about drug abuse and how often. All the head teachers 11 (100%) and 40 (90%) teachers said that school members were sensitized in drug abuse, only 4 (10%) of teachers interviewed refuted the statement. On responding on how often or frequent did sensitization take place in school, there were varied responses as shown in table 4.09.

Table 4.09 Sensitization on Drug and Substance Abuse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Headteacher N=11</th>
<th>Teacher N=44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very frequent (weekly)</td>
<td>1 9</td>
<td>4 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent (monthly)</td>
<td>5 46</td>
<td>15 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare (once a term)</td>
<td>4 36</td>
<td>13 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare (annually)</td>
<td>1 9</td>
<td>12 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 100</td>
<td>44 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data from the table 4.09 showed that, 91% of all schools conducted, some form of sensitization, where by 91% of the head teachers and 73% teachers agreed that this sensitization took place between weekly and on term basis, 19% of the head teachers and 27% of teachers said the sensitization took place annually. The findings by Nderitu (2009) in Githunguri concerning Guidance and Counseling services in school showed that 73% of schools had not adequately responded in establishing Guidance and Counseling departments in their schools while the others were struggling to make them functional. The findings agree with Ngesu et al (2008) who reported that the best strategy for intervention in drug abuse in schools is the administration to strengthen guidance and counseling services and training teachers who handle it.

The researcher sought to establish the best methods through which this sensitization took place in the schools.
Table 4.10 Methods of Sensitizing Drug Abuse in Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teacher</th>
<th>N = 11</th>
<th>Teachers N =44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed materials</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/ counseling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational speakers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films/ videos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 clearly showed that 100% head teachers and 91% teachers identified guidance and counseling as the major method of sensitizing school members about drug abuse. The other popular method identified by 100% head teachers and 77% of teachers was the use of motivational speakers. The least used method in sensitizing school members about drug abuse as identified by 18% of the head teachers was seminars.
teachers were seminars, whereas for teachers the least used method was films and video, 36%. The use of printed materials was identified by 73% of head teachers and 41% of teachers. Still on the issue of drug abuse, the researcher sought from the respondents if parents and community were involved in drug abuse control programme and the respondents said thus as data of table 4.10 showed.

Table 4.11. Involvement of Parents and Community in Control of Drug Abuse in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teacher N = 11</th>
<th>Teacher N = 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data contained in table 4.11 it showed that most schools, as indicated by 36% of the head teachers and 27% of the teachers, schools did not involve parents and the community in drug abuse control programme in their schools.

It can be deduced from the data that, most schools had sensitized their students on drug abuse especially through the Guidance and Counseling. But as noted in literature review there should be combined efforts and strategies in informing and protecting students against drug abuse. In the researcher’s opinion, failure to
involves community in schools drug abuse control could create a great challenge to control drug abuse in schools, since society acts as the source of these drugs and parents are the best to monitor students especially when students are out of school. These findings are supported by Wanyama (2001) who found that the main sources of drugs amongst students in schools are slums around school set up, touts and street boys in his study of the causes of drug use amongst secondary schools student in Kenya.

4.3.8 Safety of Students with Special Needs
The researcher sought out to know if the schools have set up Safe and caring requirements of students with special needs in their schools.

Table 4.12 Assessment of Students with Special Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teacher N = 11</th>
<th>Teacher N = 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If school conducts Survey of students with special needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If teachers are in serviced on issues of special needs students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If school has facilities for special needs students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.12 shows that 36% of head teachers and 36% of teachers interviewed agreed that their schools conducted a survey on students with special needs, majority of the head teachers 64% and 64% of the teachers indicated that, their
schools did not conduct the survey. On whether the teachers were in-serviced or trained to handle students with special needs, again the majority head teachers 91% and 82% of the teachers indicated that they were not trained. The information acquired can meant that most students with special needs in schools went unnoticed since most schools did not conduct the assessment exercise to identify them. Without proper in-servicing of teachers who handle them, these special needs students might not receive proper teaching.

The table 4.12 clearly showed that most schools had not put in place facilities that are friendly with students with special needs since the majority of head teachers 91% and 93% of teachers indicated that they did not have such facilities in their schools. These information agreed with the researcher’s observation on the ground since he noted that no school among the sampled ones had put in place runways, pavements and stairways appropriate for the students with physical challenges. Besides he observed that in all the 11 (100%) schools, facilities were not labeled, indicated or clearly demarcated for students with special needs as government policy is to integrate children with disabilities and special needs into regular school programs, MOE (2008). The researcher wanted to know if schools were making efforts to inform school members and sensitize them on how to handle and assist students with special needs.
Table 4.13 Sensitization on Students with Special Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teacher</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very frequent (weekly)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency (monthly)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rare (annually)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.13 shows that very little sensitization on issues students with special needs took place in schools, only 18% of head teachers and 9% of teachers indicated that it took place in their schools and very rarely either once a term or once a year.

Failure by majority schools to conduct special needs assessment, not putting in place facilities for special needs students and limited sensitization of school members about them, were breach to basic rights of children according to Children Act (2001). More so leaving majority of the school community members not informed about students with special needs reduced chances for these students to receive necessary assistance from the rest of the school members while in school.

**4.3.9 Safe Social-Cultural Environment**
The researcher sought to know if there existed a good social-cultural environment in school set up. The Table 4.14 shows the findings.
Table 4.14 Schools’ Social-Cultural Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teacher N = 11</th>
<th>Teacher N = 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Response Count %</td>
<td>Count %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the school has conflict</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution mechanism</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If school has suggestion box</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If schools has pastoral</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed from the data in table 4.14 that 91% of the head teachers and 73% of teachers admitted that there existed some forms of conflict solution mechanism in their schools, while 9% of the head teachers and 27% of teachers indicated that their schools did not have such mechanism. On whether the schools had suggestion boxes, 45% of the head teachers and 45% of the teachers said yes, while a larger 55% of head teachers and 55% of teachers said otherwise. These findings would be of concern since suggestion boxes in school are the best way to allow members express opinions, dissatisfactions, complains and recommendations on various issues including safety, Lunenburg et al (2006).

On the question if there were pastoral programmes in their schools 100% of the head teachers and 82% of teachers affirmed. On the issue if members of different religions and cultural background were allowed to conduct their services and programmes in school, 73% of head teachers and 64% of teachers said yes, while 27% of head teachers and 36% of the teachers said that they did not allow such meetings. From the foregoing observation, it can be deduced that most schools
had created a conducive atmosphere for school members of different social-cultural to co-exist peaceful in line with national objectives of Education.

### 4.3.10 Safety against Child Abuse

The researcher sought to know the status of safety against child abuse in schools by asking the respondents if there were cases of child abuse reported in their schools.

**Table 4.15 Cases of Child Abuse in Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teacher N = 11</th>
<th>Teacher N = 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data from table 4.15 showed that all the head teachers 100% and 84% of teachers indicated of having no knowledge of any reported case on child abuse in their schools. Only 16% of teachers indicated that some form of child abuse had been reported in their schools, when asked further the forms of reported child abuses, 71% of those teachers, identified sexual harassment of students while out of school. The findings of Jerop on sexual abuse of school age children, Kenya (2009) that most people who harass students sexually are found out of school compound especially when students are at home, Sara (2009). The researcher asked the level of sensitization on the same issue of child abuse and respondents answered as shown in table 4.16.
Table 4.16  Sensitization about Child Abuse in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Headteacher N = 11</th>
<th>Teacher N = 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitization on child abuse</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very frequent (weekly)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent (monthly)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare (once a term)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rare (Once a year)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data from the table 4.16 showed that head teachers who accepted to be conducting sensitization exercise at least in a term were 91% while teachers represented 73%, the low cases of child abuse indicated would be as a result of members of the school had been informed through sensitization process hence taken precaution.

4.3.11 Transport Safety

The researcher sought out from the head teachers if their schools had vehicle (school bus). The respondents gave the data indicated in table 4.17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teachers N = 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information from table 4.17 shows that only 18% of the schools admitted to having had a vehicle (bus) while the majority 82% of the schools did not have a bus for transporting students. The information was confirmed by observation of the researcher on the ground and presented in fig. 4.04.
According to researcher’s conclusion the schools faced a lot of challenges while trying to transport their students to various destinations and must have spent a lot of resources to hire private means. The researcher further inquired from head teachers of the school with school buses, on their safety.
### Table 4.18: Condition of School Buses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition of the bus</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is bus comprehensively insured</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it serviced and maintained</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does driver have PSV qualification certificate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is vehicle filled with belts and speed governor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does school have code of rules guiding students using the vehicle?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data indicated in table 4.18, 100% of the head teachers accepted that their school buses were comprehensively insured, well serviced and maintained, the driver was qualified with a certificate of good conduct and the vehicles were fitted with safety belts and speed governor gadgets. This was confirmed further by the researcher while conducting research through observation on the vehicles. He noted that up-to-date insurance certificates were displayed on the vehicles; the vehicles looked well maintained and labeled with name of the school as
required by the government’s safety regulations on school buses. The observer confirmed that the vehicles were also fitted with safety belts.

The researcher noted from the table 4.18 that among the two schools with buses 50% of the head teachers agreed that their schools did not have rules and guidelines for students using the bus. This on the researcher’s opinion would easily lead to students misbehaving and misuse of the vehicle and more likely end up endangering their lives while on board. The researcher also noted that only one school displayed sign of speed limit at the schools’ entrance to warn in coming visitors to drive slowly as they drove into the school compound, whereas 10 (91%) schools did not display the speed limit sign. Lack of speed limit signs greatly exposed to danger to speeding vehicles as they went about their activities in school.

4.3.12 Safety against Disaster Risk Reduction
The researcher wanted to establish the status and ability to manage disasters in schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.19. Disaster Management in Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained in disaster management skills:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If school held/practiced drill session on disaster:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does school have Evacuation maps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data from table 4.19 showed a consensus agreement that 27% of the head teachers and 7% of the teachers had undergone training on disaster management. From the data it was deduced that despite the fact that the head teachers and teachers were charged with responsibility of enhancing disaster management in schools majority of them were not trained on disaster preparedness. This therefore, might have made it difficult for teachers to offer guidance and assistance to students incase disasters occurred in school. The findings conquered with those of Rono (2009) that over 85% of teachers in Turkana district, Kenya had not been trained to handle disasters in school when they occur. Omollo et al (2010) identifies the strategies of organizing workshops and training staff enables schools to cope with they occur, besides increasing awareness amongst the staff.

Only one head teacher said that his school held scheduled drills / practices on disasters, 91% of head teachers and 100% of the teachers indicated that their schools did not conduct such exercise. This showed that in case of a disaster like fire in school, school members might not be able to react appropriately to the disaster at hand. Using the observation schedules, the researcher recorded the following data concerning disaster reduction in the schools visited. The significance of the fire drills in schools should be taken serious since according to Comolotti (1999) school fire drills prepare students and staff for what they need to know in case of fire outbreak.
### Table 4.20 Disaster Reduction Measures (N = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If school displayed evacuation maps in all buildings:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the school had fire Assembly points?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had school installed lightening/thunder arresters on buildings:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.20 shows that only 9% of the schools had displayed evacuation maps within the school. It also shows that 100% of the schools visited not one had elected fire assembly points. This clearly showed that in case of disaster members of these schools would find it difficult to move or run away from the disaster points to safety, besides due to lack of fire assembly points, it would take long to account for all members during an occurrence of a disaster.

From table 4.20 it is noted that 36% of the schools had installed thunder (lightening) arrester gadgets. Given that Nyanza region is prone to occasional thunder (lightening) strikes the researcher felt that the low number of schools installing the lightening gadgets, leave majority of schools and their students exposed to risks and danger in case of thunder strikes their schools.

#### 4.3.13 Safety in School Community Relations

On the school community relations the researcher sought to know if such relation existed within school set up.
Table 4.21 School Community Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teacher</th>
<th>N=11</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>N=44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do school hold regular meetings with parents</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has school ever held, joint, social, cultural activities with community?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.21 showed that there was a consensus in whether there were regular meetings between parents and school members 100% of the head teachers and 82% of the teacher interviewed responded affirmative. When asked about holding joint social-cultural activities with the community, 27% of the head teachers and 18% of teachers agreed, while 73% of the head teachers and 64% of teachers indicated to have not held such activities in their schools.

From that information it shows that parents were most likely informed and aware of their students’ well being in school. The researcher further inquired the frequency of holding such activities with the community and the data is shown in table 4.22
Table 4.22. Schools’ Joint Activities with Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teacher N=11</th>
<th>Teacher N=44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response to joint activity</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very frequent (weekly)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent (monthly)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare (once a term)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22 showed that rarely did school organize joint activities with the community, 10% of the head teachers and 7% of the teachers showed that such activities took place in school once a term. It can be noted that 45% of the head teachers and 25% of teachers indicated that, joint activities with the community took place only once a year, 45% of head teachers and 68% of teachers indicated that such activities never took place in their schools. The researcher interpreted these to mean that, the relations between the school and community was not well developed. In case the school was hit with a disaster and needed help or assistance from the community, the assistance was not guaranteed since members of school community had not interacted highly with school community.

4.3.14 Monitoring and Evaluating School Safety

The researcher sought from the head teachers if they did monitor and conduct evaluation of safety in their schools, since that is the best way to determine if the school is secure MOE (2008).
Table 4.23 Monitoring and Evaluation of School Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If they conducted safety evaluation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who participated: i) Headteacher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Teachers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) School safety committee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) QASO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If evaluation results were made available to school:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 4.23 the researcher noted that 100% of head teachers agreed that they conducted safety evaluation in their schools. When asked about those who participate in evaluation exercises they responded thus, 100% of the head teachers were involved, 91% of them also accepted to involve teachers in evaluation of school safety. Majority head teachers 91% indicated that they did not involve school safety committee in the exercises. Only 9% of the head teachers admitted having involved school safety committee. When asked if students were involved in the evaluation exercises 45% said yes while 55% of them indicated otherwise. On if QASO official were involved 36% admitted while 64% indicated otherwise. The researcher asked the head teachers if they
made evaluation results available to school members and 91% said yes while 9% said no.

The study sought to know how frequent the QASO officers conducted this exercise of monitoring and evaluation of school safety in schools, the researcher recorded the following data in table 4.24.

**Table 4.24. Evaluation of School Safety by QASO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teacher N=11</th>
<th>Teacher N=44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very frequent (weekly)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent (monthly)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare (once a term)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rare (annually)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.24 showed that 64% of head teachers and 25% of teachers agreed that QASO did conduct safety evaluations in their schools at least once per term. Otherwise 36% of head teachers and 52% of teachers showed that QASO officials conducted safety evaluation in their schools only once a year, 23% of the teachers said that they had never seen QUASO officials conduct safety evaluation in their schools.

This data therefore showed that QASO who have a very important role in evaluating school safety might have not frequented schools to access safety as they ought to since QASO is the official government agency supposed to conduct inspection schools and report findings, MOE (2008).
4.4 Level of Implementation of Safety Standards

The researcher sought to know from the head teachers and teachers if their schools had implemented the safety standards. The respondents were supposed to indicate if the various items of safety standards had either been; implemented, partly implemented or not implemented in their schools and their responses are highlighted in table 4.25.

Table 4.25 Level of Implementation of Safety Standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Head teacher N = 11</th>
<th>Teachers N= 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Safe Grounds:</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly implemented</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Safe Infrastructure:</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Safe school Environment:</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly implemented</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Safe Health and Hygiene for students:</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly implemented</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Safe Foods in school:</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly implemented</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Safety against Drug and Substance abuse:</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partly implemented</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Safe Teaching and Learning Environment:</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly implemented</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| h) Provision of Safe Social-cultural Environment in school: | Implemented | 3 | 27 | 16 | 36 |
| Partly implemented | 5 | 46 | 22 | 50 |
| Not implemented | 3 | 27 | 6 | 14 |
| Total | 11 | 100 | 44 | 100 |

| i) Safety of students with special needs: | Implemented | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 |
| Partly implemented | 6 | 54 | 7 | 6 |
| Not implemented | 5 | 46 | 32 | 73 |
| Total | 11 | 100 | 44 | 100 |

| j) Provision of safety against child abuse: | Implemented | 4 | 36 | 13 | 30 |
| Partly implemented | 6 | 55 | 22 | 50 |
| Not implemented | 1 | 9 | 9 | 20 |
| Total | 11 | 100 | 44 | 100 |

| k) Safe student Transport: | Implemented | 2 | 18 | 7 | 16 |
| Partly implemented | 1 | 9 | 6 | 14 |
| Not implemented | 8 | 73 | 31 | 70 |
| Total | 11 | 100 | 44 | 100 |

| l) Safe measures to prevent, handle and reduce Disasters in school: | Implemented | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
| Partly implemented | 8 | 73 | 13 | 30 |
| Not implemented | 3 | 27 | 27 | 61 |
| Total | 11 | 100 | 44 | 100 |

| m) Creation of school safety Committee: | Implemented | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Partly implemented | 2 | 18 | 4 | 9 |
| Not Implemented | 9 | 82 | 40 | 91 |
| Total | 11 | 100 | 44 | 100 |

| n) Creation of tools or mechanisms of Monitoring and Evaluating safety in schools: | Implemented | 1 | 9 | 4 | 9 |
| Partly implemented | 4 | 36 | 17 | 39 |
| Not implemented | 6 | 55 | 23 | 52 |
| Total | 11 | 100 | 44 | 100 |
Using the data from the table 4.25, the researcher made various observations on various items that pertained school safety. On the item if the school had implemented safe grounds, 55% of head teachers and 41% of teachers indicated that their schools had implemented the requirement of safe school grounds, 27% of the head teachers and 43% of the teachers interviewed indicated that their schools had not implemented the item of safe grounds in their schools. This was supported by the recorded observation by the researcher who had indicated in the observation schedule that only one schools’ compound was not fenced.

On the item of having safe infrastructure in schools 18% of the head teachers acknowledged to have had it implemented fully, responding on the same 41% of the teachers indicated that their schools’ physical structures were safe for their students. Majority of the head teachers, 82% and 45% of teachers felt that their schools were in the process of ensuring safe physical infrastructure since they indicated the item as partly implemented. There was no head teacher who indicated that physical infrastructures were unsafe to their students, but a small 14% of teachers interviewed indicated that unsafe infrastructures existed in their schools. Contrary to the respondents’ responses, the researcher noted in his observation schedule that only 9% of school visited had created emergency exits in their buildings, majority of the schools 91% lacked emergency exits in their buildings. With emergency exits lacking in buildings, it was the opinion of the researcher that lives of the students using the buildings would be endangered in case of a disaster. And as Omollo et al (2010) suggested in his findings in the Kisumu East and West districts, the high level of the implementation of the
safety measure in the schools of the area should be replicated in all other schools in Kenya.

The researcher also sought to find if the schools had implemented safe health and hygiene for students, the data from table 4.25 shows that 100% of the head teachers and 93% of the teachers interviewed either admitted that they have fully implemented the policy or are in the process since they indicated partly implemented. Of all the teachers interviewed 7% of them felt that their schools have not put the safe health and hygiene policy in place.

With students health and hygiene being paramount, the researcher also noted from the earlier part of the questionnaire that 45% of head teachers and 64% of teachers indicated that their schools did not keep up-to-date medical records for their students, besides table 4.05 clearly showed that there was consensus between the head teachers and teachers that 91% of the schools had no qualified medical staff and a room for sick students. It was deduced from the data that most schools had not adequately addressed and tried to implement the item on students’ health and hygiene.

The other safety item the researcher inquired about was on safe school environment, 36% of the head teachers and 52% of the teachers interviewed indicated that their schools had fully implemented the policy, on the other hand 64% of head teachers and 43% of teachers responded that their schools had partly implemented the policy. There was no head teacher who indicated that their schools had not implemented the safe school environment policy, but 5% of
teachers indicated so. The information shows that most schools had put in place clean and safe environment. The researcher confirmed this through his observation schedule that all 11 (100%) schools had waste disposal points, latrines or toilets. But he noted that only 2 (18%) schools had elected disposal bins along the pathways and buildings to be used by members to dispose waste hence reduce chances of littering the environment.

Responding on the item of safe foods in school, 82% of head teachers and 66% of teachers indicated that their schools had ensured safe foods for their students, the rest felt that their schools were in the process of implementing that safe food policy and none of the head teachers or teachers indicated that their schools had not implemented the safe food policy. The researcher through the observation schedules noted that only 36% schools had put in place clean drinking water points within their compound. The researcher was of the opinion that the remaining 64% might be exposing their students to water borne diseases. The researcher noted a disparity of opinion where the majority 82% of the head teachers indicated that personnel handling students foods underwent check-up at least once a term while 81% of the teachers interviewed either indicated that it took place only once a year or it had never taken place at all. The personnel handling students’ food should be medically tested and treated regularly to avoid them acting as transmitters of diseases to students through the foods they handle.

Another item contained in safety standards is, safety against drug and substance abuse. The respondents answering if their schools had fully implemented the
policy item in their schools, 36% of the head teachers and 48% of the teachers said they had, 55% of the head teachers and 41% of teachers indicated that their schools were in the process since they had done it partly. Only 9% of the head teachers’ and 11% of the teachers indicated that their schools had not implemented at all the item on safety against drug abuse. The researcher comparing the responses of respondents with that in table 4.09, noted that 91% of head teachers and 73% of teachers had indicated that sensitization on drug abuse was done at least on term basis. On the same item the researcher using data in table 4.11 was of the opinion that schools were not doing enough to involve parents and community in drug abuse as it ought to be. Table 4.11 had shown that 64% of head teachers and 73% of teachers interviewed had indicated that their schools did not involve parents or community on issues of drug abuse in their schools at all.

It was the researcher’s opinion that as much as the school used guidance and counseling and motivational speakers as the main ways of sensitizing school members on drug abuse as indicated in table 4.10, there was a need to diversify to other ways such as printed materials, films and video among others, MOE (2008). Table 4.10 showed that only 18% of head teachers and 45% of teachers indicated seminars as a way of sensitizing drug abuse.

On the item of safe teaching and learning environment in school, all 100% of the head teachers and 93% of the teachers interviewed indicated that their schools had either fully implemented or were in the process of implementing the safe
teaching and learning environment in their schools. Only 7% of the teachers said that the safe teaching and learning environment did not exist in their schools. The researcher observed that all the 11 schools had sign posts, therefore identifying the school from the rest of the community and where they were located. With a safe teaching and learning environment, the students are most likely to concentrate and teachers motivated to teach, MOE (2008).

Table 4.25 also shows the responses of the respondents on the safety item of provision of safe social-cultural environment in school; where by 27% of the head teachers and 36% of the teachers indicated that their schools had fully implemented the provision of safe social-cultural environments in their schools. Those head teachers who indicated that their schools had not addressed the issue on safe social-cultural environment in school were 27% while teachers were 14%, majority consensus of the respondents was that their schools were in the process since they indicated that they had partly implemented the item in question as affirmed by 46% for head teachers and 50% for the teachers. Using the information from the table 4.25 and that of table 4.14 the researcher noted that, most schools had not put in place mechanism to allow school members express their views, opinions and complains, since 55% schools did not have suggestion boxes.

The next safety item that the researcher sought to know if it had been implemented in the school was the safety of students with special needs. From table 4.25 it can be deduced that 46% of the head teachers and only 11% of the
teachers indicated that their schools had fully implemented the safety of students with special needs in their schools. Of all the respondents 54% of head teachers and 73% of the teachers indicated that the item on safety of students with special needs had not been implemented in their schools. The information here is actually supported by table 4.12 whereby 91% of head teachers and 93% of teachers had indicated that their schools had not put in place facilities for students with special needs. The information further indicated that 64% of the head teachers and 64% of teachers interviewed indicated that, their schools had not conducted a survey to determine students with special needs. The researcher through the observation schedules had discovered during the visitation that not even a single school had labeled, indicated or clearly demarcated facilities for students with special needs. The researcher’s opinion is that a lot of effort should be done to main stream (integrate) students with disabilities by providing these special facilities as the policy of government requires, MOE (2008).

When asked on the implementation of the item of provision of safety against child abuse, the table 4.25 indicates that 36 of the head teachers and 30% of the teachers said that their schools had implemented the said item. Those head teachers who felt that their schools were in the process by partly implementing the item on safety against child abuse were 55% while teachers were 50%. Only 9% of the head teachers and 20% of the teachers interviewed indicated that their schools had not implemented at all, the issue of safety against child abuse in their schools. The researcher comparing information with the data in table 4.14 noted that, only 7 (16%) teachers had initially indicated that child abuse cases had
been reported in their school whereby majority of those seven teachers, 5 (71%) of them indicated sexual harassment and outside school. It was the opinion of the researcher that, schools need to scale up the sensitization programmes about child abuse to their students so as to enable them recognize various forms of child abuse as defined by Children’s Act, Republic of Kenya (2002).

On the item of safe student transport, the table 4.25 showed 18% of the head teachers and 16% of the teachers interviewed positively indicated that their schools had implemented students safety in transport, just 9% of the head teachers and 14% of the teachers indicated that their schools were in the process, by indicating partially implemented. Majority of head teachers, 73% and 70% of teachers in consensus indicated that their schools had not implemented student transport safety. The researcher attributed this to the fact that figure 4.04 clearly indicated that only 2 (18%) of the schools sampled had vehicles (buses) for students transport. The researcher’s opinion was that schools do not need to wait to purchase vehicles in order to implement the safe student transport item. They can be sensitizing students about road safety and proper usage of the road, MOE (2008).

Concerning the item on safety measure to prevent, handle and reduce disasters in schools, table 4.25 shows that none of the head teachers indicated that their schools had fully implemented the safety measure on preventing, handling and reducing disasters while 9% of the teachers indicated that their schools had implemented the safety measure in question. Majority of the head teachers, 73%
indicated that their schools were in the process of implementing the safety measure, while 30% of the teachers indicated so. When only 27% of the head teachers indicated that their schools had not done any implementation of the safety measure in question, the majority 61% of the teachers indicated that their schools had not implemented the measure to prevent, handle and reduce disasters in their schools.

Through the observation schedules, the researcher noted that, 10 (91%) schools did not have disaster evacuation maps while no school had clearly indicated fire assembly points in their school compound. The researcher also compared the information with the data of table 4.19 and noted that very few head teachers, 27% and 7% of the teachers had actually undergone training on how to handle disasters. According to the researcher this was a good indicator that most schools had not implemented the safety measure of training school members especially teachers and hence the researcher felt that they were ill-prepared to handle disasters when they occurred in schools, hence against the recommendation of Creswell et al (1993) on preparing staff to handle disasters in school.

Creation of school Safety Committee is the first step or measure schools should make in implementing MOE’s safety standards in their school, MOE (2008). The researcher sought to know how many schools had implemented the measure, table 4.25 showed the respondents interviewed were in agreement that their schools had not put in place school safety committees. A small 18% of head
teachers and 9% of teachers interviewed indicated that their schools were in the process since they said they have partly implemented school safety committee. The majority of head teachers, 82% and 91% of teachers said that their schools had not established school safety committees. The researcher’s opinion is that without a school safety committee, organizing and implementing safety measures in school would almost be impossible since according to MOE (2008) the main function of the schools safety committee is to plan, organize and implement safety issues in their respective schools.

Finally the respondents were asked to indicate if their schools had created tools and mechanisms of monitoring and evaluating safety in their schools. Table 4.25 shows that only one of the head teachers and four of teachers interviewed positively indicated that their schools had put in place tools and mechanisms of monitoring and evaluating safety in their schools. Majority of the head teachers, 55% and 52% of teachers interviewed indicated that their school did not have tools and mechanism of monitoring and evaluating safety in their schools. Just 36% of the head teachers and 39% of teachers indicated that their schools were in the process since they indicated that the safety measure in question was partially implemented.

Evaluation and monitoring of safety in schools should be put in place as it forms the basis to sensitize school members on issues of safety and help in planning for the future, Cornacchia et al (1992). It was therefore the opinion of the researcher that schools should energize themselves in ensuring that they put in place tools
and mechanisms to monitor and evaluates safe measures in their school since that the best way the schools will be able to detect any possible disaster in school since monitoring and evaluation tools assist school managers to prepare and handle disasters in school.

4.5 Challenges Faced by School in the Implementation of Safety Standards
All the respondents in the study sample were asked to identify the challenges their school faced in their endeavor of implementing safety standards, in the order as per the magnitude of the problem. Their responses were summarized and presented in Table 4.26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial constrains</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of safety manual</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained personnel</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative staff</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative students</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative BOG / PTA</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative school</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 4.26 it can be deduced that majority of head teachers, 91% and 57% of the teachers identified financial constrain as the most challenging factor
in implementing safety standards in schools. The researcher had the opinion that this can be attributed to the fact that most safety gadgets and facilities need capital to fully implement such as fire fighting gadgets, training personnel and to organize safety seminars.

There was consensus in ranking the challenge of lack of safety knowledge or untrained personnel as the second challenging issue in implementing safety standards in schools by 64% of the head teachers and 50% of teachers. This is a problem since the implementation of safety issues requires personnel who are trained and as already identify majority of head teachers and teachers had not undergone such training. As already noted by Creswell et al (1993) adequately trained personnel will prepare the school and students to deal with emergency situation and offer a good defense in the event of mitigation.

Still on the challenges facing implementation of school safety standards 45% of the head teachers and 41% of teachers ranked lack of guidelines or safety manual as the third challenging issue in implementing safety standards in school. The fact that some schools had cited that they lacked the ministry’s guidelines; might have made it difficult to implement the safety standards in schools, since the manuals are supposed to act as a guide and point of reference on schools’ safety measures, MOE(2008).

Uncooperative BOG / PTA was identified as a challenge by 36%of the head teachers and 27% of the teachers, BOG /PTA act as a link between school and community, besides they are supposed to provide resources and even personnel
to run the school, Creswell et al (1993). So if BOG/PTA is uncooperative then it might be difficult for schools to effectively implement safety standards for the already stated reasons.

The head teachers who ranked uncooperative teachers as number six challenge were two but when asked about uncooperative administrators, 23% of the teachers ranked it as number five challenge. The information shows that a few teachers and a few head teachers did not cooperate in the process of trying to implement safety standards in school. Without the fully cooperation of both head teachers and teachers, the whole process is doomed to fail since they are the officers on the ground to ensure the ministry’s safety standards are fully implemented and working.

Uncooperative students were also identified as a challenge by 27% of the head teachers who ranked it as a number five problem in their list, while 20% of the teachers identified it as a number six problem in their list. The information shows that few teachers, 20% and 27% of the head teachers felt that students can act as a stumbling block to implementation of safety standards.

It was a feeling of the researcher that there was an urgent need to address the mentioned challenges by the concerned authorities if schools were to achieve the objective of creating safe school zones.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter provides summary of the findings, conclusion and recommendations as derived from the analyzed data in the preceding chapter. The study was conducted in Borabu District and the researcher was interested in establishing how effective the secondary schools have been in implementing MOE Safety Standards meant to prepare public schools against disasters. The researcher using questionnaires sought information from the head teachers and teachers. The researcher also employed observation technique by using observation schedules to record information concerning safety standards in the schools visited.

5.2 Summary of the Research Findings
The summary of the analyzed data is presented under the following key areas of research:

- General status of safety standards in secondary schools.
- Level of implementation of MOE safety standards.
- Challenges facing schools in implementing safety standards.
5.2.1 General Status of Safety Standards in the Public Secondary Schools

On the existing conditions and status of safety standards in public secondary schools, the study found out that head teachers were aware of MOE Safety Standards and 50% of them had copies of safety manuals in their schools. For teachers 55% of them were not aware of the MOE Safety Standards and 80% of the schools did not have school safety committees. Out of all schools studied 100% of them were officially registered but only 63% had title deeds. All the 11 schools had sign posts indicating where they were located, while 10 of all the schools studied had their compounds secured away from the public by fence. The study also found out that only 36% of schools had their school compound well kept lawns and leveled terrains. An atmosphere which is conducive to learning is that which is friendly, comfortable and safe hence motivates learning in school, Cornacchia et al (1994).

The study found out that 91% of the schools did not have emergency exits, lack of which endangered lives of students in cases of emergencies. Only 45% of the schools had installed fire extinguishers in school buildings thus raising serious doubts about fire out break preparedness. Findings of the study in regard to safe and health education teaching indicated that, 91% of the schools taught their students safety and health education. Only 9% of schools studied had a qualified medical staff and special room for sick students.

The source of water are important aspects of school safety and health, Omollo et al (2010) the study found out that 46% of the schools used rain harvested water. The study further revealed that only 45% of schools had created clean water
drinking points in the school, providing clean water avoids risking water borne diseases in school like that of Chesamis school, Kasumba (2004). The study revealed that all schools had good functioning sanitary rooms, but only 18% of the schools had placed litter bins along the path ways.

On safety against drug abuse the study found out that 100% of the schools had Guidance and Counseling departments, handling various issues among them drug abuse and had their students sensitized about drug abuse. The study also revealed that majority of the schools did not involve parents and community in drug abuse control programme. The study showed that only 27% of the schools conducted survey to identify students with special needs and trained teachers on the same, besides it was found out during the study that only 9% of the schools had clearly indicated facilities for such students.

The study revealed that only 45% of the schools had put in place suggestion boxes for its member and general public and that schools did conduct child abuse sensitization sessions to school members. On student transport safety, the study revealed that 18% of the schools had buses/vehicles for student transport which had been comprehensively insured, well serviced, driven by certified drivers, and fitted with speed-governor gadgets and safety belts.

Concerning safety against disaster risk reduction, the study found out that majority of the head teachers and teachers were not trained to manage and handle disasters, as only 27% of the head teachers and 9% of teachers had undergone disaster management training. The study revealed 91% of the schools did not conduct, hold and practice drill sessions on disasters for their members; only 9%
of the schools had put in place disaster evacuation maps and fire assembly points within their compounds.

In regard to Safe School-Community relations, the study revealed that majority of the schools held regular meetings with parents, though very few schools organized joint social-cultural activities with their communities. The study found out that 100% of the schools conducted safety evaluation in their schools; majority of the head teachers did not involve school safe committees and QASO in monitoring and evaluating safety in their schools. It needs to be noted that inspection reports are useful starting point for school safety needs assessment, Omollo (2010).

5.2.2: Level of Implementation of MOE Safety Standards in Schools.

The study researched on the level at which schools had implemented the MOE safety standards and revealed the following findings concerning those schools which had fully implemented, partially implemented and those which had not implemented the MOE safety measures. On safe grounds 55% of schools had fully implemented the measures in question, while the rest were either in the process or had not implemented at all the measures. Majority of the schools according to study had either partially or fully implemented the MOE safety standard on safe schools infrastructure.

Concerning MOE safety standard on safe health and hygiene for students, the study revealed that most of the schools had been in the process of implementing the safety measure in question. The study revealed that 36% of schools had fully implemented safe school environment, while 9% of the schools had not
implemented the safety measure. The study revealed the safety standard on safe food in school had been implemented by 82%, of the schools; the rest had partially implemented the safety measure in question. The study further revealed that 36% of the schools had fully implemented the MOE’s safety measure on safety against drug and substance abuse, whereas 65% were in the process of implementation of the said measure. Only 9% of the schools had not implemented the MOE safety measure on drug abuse in school.

Whether the safety measure of students with special needs was well implemented in schools, the study revealed few schools had fully implemented the measure; majority of the schools had been in the process of implementing it. In the provision of safety against child abuse, the study showed that majority of the schools 91% had either implemented or were in the process of implementing the safety measure in question. Concerning the safety measure of safe student transport in school, the study revealed that most schools had not implemented the safety measure in question.

From the study in regard to implementation of MOE’s safety measure on prevention and reducing disasters in schools, 91% of the schools were in the process of implementing the measure on prevention and reduction of disasters. From the study it was revealed that none of the 11 schools had put in place school safety committees. Concerning the creation of tools and mechanism to monitor and evaluate safety in schools, the study revealed that 61% of had not implemented the said safety measure.
5.2.3 Challenges Facing Schools in Implementing Safety Standards
The study revealed that schools faced challenges implementing MOE’S safety standards. Financial constrain was identified as the most challenging issue in implementing the safety measures in public secondary schools. Other constrains identified by the study included, lack of safety knowledge and skills, lack of copies of safety manuals, uncooperative BOG / PTA members, uncooperative school administration and teachers. Given that most MOE Safety Standards require capital to implement it is imperative that government considers ways and means of financing safety program in school the way other governments do elsewhere, such example occurs in India as indicated by Gol UNDP (2006).

5.3: Conclusions
Based on the findings of the study, the researcher reached on these conclusions; that schools through their head teachers were aware of the MOE existing safety standards. A number of public secondary schools had tried to implement some of the MOE safety requirements despite the constrains and had made remarkable efforts especially in the area of Drug Abuse, safe Food, safe School Compound by fencing, strong Guidance and Counseling departments among others.

Some of the public secondary schools had failed to implement some of the core safety standards hence exposing school members to danger such like; failure to create school safety committees, failure to train personnel to handle disasters, failure to put in place facilities for students with special needs among others. Monitoring and evaluation of safety measures in school is poor by the schools and government mandated body QASO. This shows that though the government
launched a very good safety policy in school, the implementing and monitoring organs have not put enough effort to ensure that these policy measures on safety are adhered and followed to the letter by schools.

As much as the government policy on school safety is good and elaborate, it faces major constraints towards its effective implementation. The major constraint identified was lack of adequate capital to implement the safety standards since most of them require some money to implement. The safety standards like, training of personnel, installation of safety gadgets in the buildings and instructional materials require injections of capital into them for fully implementation. The foregoing conclusions implies that unless implementation of safety standards is hastened in schools, more lives of students will continue to be endangered and lost, property destroyed as the whole nation stares.

5.4 Recommendations of the Study
Based on the research findings, the researcher recommended that:

i. MOE conduct a mandatory in-servicing/training of head teachers and teachers on disaster management in schools, and enhance inspection in schools concerning safety matters, publish the findings in an endeavor to inform all schools’ stake holders at both local and national levels

ii. Curriculum planners like KIE should integrated and mainstream Safety Education into the curriculum of schools and other learning institutions.
iii. The government should provide funds to specifically assist schools to implement and maintain safety measures in schools.

iv. School administration and management create forum to sensitize and involve all schools’ stake holders in matters of school safety.

5.4.1 Recommendations for further research
i. The research should be replicated on other levels of learning institutions for example primary schools.

ii. There is need to conduct a similar study on private secondary schools to establish the effectiveness of MOE safety measures and possibly have comparison with the public secondary schools.

iii. A research on the role of community on school safety can be a good basis of improving and adhering to good school-community relationships.

iv. The research should be replicated in other different regions of the country so as to have a larger picture of the situation in the whole country.
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APPENDIX I

HEADTEACHER’S QUESTIONNAIRE
This questionnaire is seeking information concerning implementation of safety standards in secondary schools. The findings of this study will be used to meet the requirements for MED course. No need to write your name or the name of your institution. The information will be treated confidentially and will be used strictly for the purpose of the research.

Instructions: Please answer by putting a tick (✓) or provide information as required.

Section A: background information

1. Your gender
   Male [ ]
   Female [ ]

2. Level of education
   PhD [ ]
   Masters degree [ ]
   Bachelor’s degree [ ]
   Diploma [ ]
   Other (specify) [ ]

3. How long have you been Head teacher/Principal?
   (a) 1 – 5 years [ ]
(b) 6 – 10 years

(c) 11 – 15 years

(d) 20 years and above

4. Period served as a head teacher/principal in the present school
   __________ years

5. Type of your school
   (a) Boys
   (b) Girls
   (c) Mixed

6. Status of your school
   (a) Boarding
   (b) Day
   (c) Mixed (boarding and day)

SECTION B: SCHOOL SAFETY STANDARDS

(I) General Safety Standard Details

7. Are you aware of the Ministry of Education’s safety standards?
   Yes
   No

8. Does your school have a copy of the safety standards manual?
   Yes
   No
9. If yes, where is the copy kept: _________________

10. Does your school have a safety committee?
   Yes  
   No  

11. If yes, who constitute the committee (indicate them as teacher, students, parents)
   ______________________
   ______________________
   ______________________

12. Does the school conduct students’ roll calls?
   Yes  
   No  

13. If yes, who conducts the roll calls? (specify)
   ______________________
   ______________________
   ______________________
   ______________________

II. Safety on School Ground

14. Is your school officially registered?  Yes  No  
15. Does your school have a title deed?  Yes  No  
16. What is the size of the school land? (specify) ____________________________
III. Safety of School Buildings

17. Do all school buildings have emergency exits? Yes ☐ No ☐

18. Do we have fire extinguishers in the school? Yes ☐ No ☐

19. Do you experience shortage of room for students? Yes ☐ No ☐

20. If yes, which ones (specify) ________________________________________

IV. Safety in Health & Safety Education

21. Are students taught health and safety education in your school? Yes ☐ No ☐

22. If yes, in which of the following ways?
   (a) Through special programmes Yes ☐ No ☐
   (b) Included in the school curriculum Yes ☐ No ☐
   (c) Any other (specify)_____________________________

23. Does the school keep accurate and up to date medical data for every student? Yes ☐ No ☐

24. Do you conduct medical checkup for your students? Yes ☐ No ☐

25. Does the school have trained medical personnel? Yes ☐ No ☐

26. Does the school have a sick bay for sick students? Yes ☐ No ☐

V. Food Safety

27. What is the source of water in your school?
   (a) Piped Yes ☐ No ☐
   (b) Rain harvested Yes ☐ No ☐
(c) Collected from the river/stream  Yes [ ] No [ ]

(d) Any other source (specify) ________________________________

28. Does the school run a feeding programme?  Yes [ ] No [ ]

29. Does the school allow selling of other food stuffs in schools?  Yes [ ] No [ ]

30. If yes, who runs the food stores/kiosks? (specify) ________________________________

31. Are students allowed to bring individual food stuffs in school  Yes [ ] No [ ]

VI. Safety against Drug Abuse

32. Does the school have guidance and counselling department?  Yes [ ] No [ ]

33. Does the school sensitize the staff and students about drug abuse?  Yes [ ] No [ ]

34. If yes, does the sensitization programme entail any of the following?

(a) Seminars  Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) Printed matter (books, poster)  Yes [ ] No [ ]

(c) Guidance and counselling  Yes [ ] No [ ]

(d) Motivational speakers  Yes [ ] No [ ]

(e) Films and videos  Yes [ ] No [ ]

(f) Any other (specify) _______________________________________________________________________

35. Does the school involve parents and community in drug-control programme?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

36. If yes, how? ______________________________

   ______________________________

   ______________________________

VII. Teaching Learning Environment & Special Needs Safety
37. Does the school conduct survey to determined students which special needs?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

38. Are teachers in-serviced to handle issues related to students with special needs?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

39. Has the school put in place facilities for special needs students?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

VIII Safety against Cultural Environment

40. Does the school have in place a conflict resolution mechanism? Yes ☐ No ☐

41. Does the school have a suggestion box?
   (a) For students Yes ☐ No ☐
   (b) Staff members Yes ☐ No ☐
   (c) Community and parents Yes ☐ No ☐

42. Does the school have pastoral programmes? Yes ☐ No ☐

43. Does the school give room to students from various religious and cultural background to conduct their services/programme in school? Yes ☐ No ☐

IX. Safety against Child Abuse

44. Have there been cases of child abuse identified in your school? Yes ☐ No ☐

45. If yes
   (a) What kind of abuse? (specify them)__________ ___________ ____________.
   (b) How many cases? __________________________
   (c) Did you report the cases to the concerned authorities? Yes ☐ No ☐
(d) If yes, which authorities? (specify) ______________________________

**X. Transport Safety**

46. Does the school have a bus/vehicle for students transport?  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

47. If yes, (a) Is the bus/vehicle comprehensively insured  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

   (b) Is the bus/vehicle well serviced and maintained?  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

   (c) Does the driver have a PSV qualification and certificate of good conduct?  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

   (d) Is the vehicle fitted with speed governor gadget?  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

   (e) Is the vehicle fitted with safety belts?  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

   (f) Does the school have code of regulation guiding students while using the vehicle?  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

**XI. Safety against Disaster Risk Reduction**

48. Have you been trained on disaster management skills?  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

49. Does the school conduct/hold scheduled practice drill sessions for disasters such as fire, earthquake and storm?  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

50. Are your teachers trained on disaster management skills and first aid skills?  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

51. Does the school have evacuation maps and plans in case of a disaster?  
   Yes ☐  No ☐
52. If yes, are the maps and plans displayed and accessible to all school members?

Yes ☐ No ☐

XII. Safety in School Community Relation

53. Does the school hold regular joint meetings with parents? Yes ☐ No ☐

54. Has the school ever organized joint cultural and co-curricular activities with members of local community? Yes ☐ No ☐

XIII. Monitoring and Evaluation of School Safety Programme

55. Does your school have a safety programme? Yes ☐ No ☐

56. If yes, (a) Does the school conduct a safety evaluation exercise? Yes ☐ No ☐

(b) How often i) weekly ☐ ii) termly ☐ iii) annually ☐

(c) Do the following participate in monitoring and evaluation of school safety programmes?

(i) Head teacher Yes ☐ No ☐

(ii) Teachers Yes ☐ No ☐

(iii) School safety committee Yes ☐ No ☐

(iv) Students Yes ☐ No ☐

(v) QUASO Yes ☐ No ☐

d) Do you make the evaluation findings available to the school members?

Yes ☐ No ☐
XIV. Challenges of Implementing Safety Standards

57. What are some of the challenges/problems have you encountered while trying to implement MOE safety standards in your school? (Identify the problem in order of magnitude by numbering)

(i) Financial constraints

(ii) Lack of guidelines from the ministry/safety standards manual

(iii) Lack of knowledge on safety issues/untrained personnel

(iv) Uncooperative staff

(v) Uncooperative students

(vi) Uncooperative BOG/PTA/Parents

(vii) Any other (specify) ____________________

________________

________________
SECTION C: PERTINENT QUESTIONS

58. General rating of the implementation status of the MOE schools’ safety standards in your school.

Tick by using the key provided:

Implemented (I)
Partly implemented (P.I)
Not implemented (N.I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Partly Implemented</th>
<th>Not Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Safe grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Safe physical infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Safe health and hygiene for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Safe school environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Safe foods in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Safety against drugs and substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Safe teaching and learning environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Provision of safe socio-cultural environment in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
i. Safety of students with special needs/disabilities

j. Provision of safety against child abuse in school

k. Safe student transport

l. Safe measures to prevent, handle and reduce disasters in school

m. Creation of school safety committee

n. Creation of tools and mechanism of monitoring and evaluating safety in the school

59. Please indicate how often the following activities related to safety take place in your school by indicating tick (✓) using the provided key

- Very frequent (V.F) (weekly basis)
- Frequent (F) (monthly basis)
- Rare (R) (termly/once a term)
- Very Rare (V.R) (annually/ once a year)
- Never (N) (Not done at all)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V.F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>V.R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Meeting of the school safety committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Students roll call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Drills and training related to disaster management response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Medical check up for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical check up for personnel handling students food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Sensitization against drug and substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Sensitization and survey on students with special needs/disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Sensitization against child abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Sensitization on road safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>School-community joint activities(e.g. clean up, co-curricular, cultural activities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Evaluation of school safety status/programme by QUASO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Evaluation of school safety programme/status by administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II

TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is seeking information concerning implementation of safety standards in secondary schools. The findings of this study will be used to meet the requirements for MED course. No need to write your name or the name of your institution. The information will be treated confidentially and will be used strictly for the purpose of the research.

Instructions: Please answer by putting a tick (√) or provide information as required

Section A: Background information

58. Your gender
   Male □
   Female □

59. Level of education
   PhD □
   Masters degree □
   Bachelor’s degree □
   Diploma □
   Other (specify) □

60. How long have you been a teacher?
   (a) 1 – 5 years □
61. Period served as a teacher in the present school

__________ years

62. Type of your school

(d) Boys

(e) Girls

(f) Mixed

63. Status of your school

(d) Boarding

(e) Day

(f) Mixed (boarding and day)

SECTION B: SCHOOL SAFETY STANDARDS

I. General Safety Standard Details

64. Are you aware of the Ministry of Education’s safety standards?

Yes

No
65. Does your school have a copy of the safety standards manual?

Yes

No

66. If yes, where is the copy kept: _________________

67. Does your school have a safety committee?

Yes

No

68. If yes, who constitute the committee (indicate them as teacher, students, parents)

______________________

______________________

______________________

69. Does the school conduct students’ roll calls?

Yes

No

70. If yes, who conducts the roll calls? (specify)

______________________

______________________

______________________
II. Safety of School Buildings

71. Do all school buildings have emergency exits? Yes □ No □

72. Do we have fire extinguishers in the school? Yes □ No □

73. Do you experience shortage of room for students? Yes □ No □

74. If yes, which ones (specify) _____________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

III. Safety in Health & Safety Education

75. Are students taught health and safety education in your school? Yes □ No □

76. If yes, in which of the following ways?

(d) Through special programmes Yes □ No □

(e) Included in the school curriculum Yes □ No □

(f) Any other (specify) _________________________________________________

77. Does the school keep accurate and up to date medical data for every student? Yes □

No □

78. Do you conduct medical checking for your students? Yes □ No □

79. Does the school have trained medical personnel? Yes □ No □

80. Does the school have a sick bay for sick students? Yes □ No □
IV. Food Safety

81. What is the source of water in your school?
   (e) Piped  
   Yes 
   No
   (f) Rain harvested  
   Yes 
   No
   (g) Collected from the river/stream  
   Yes 
   No
   (h) Any other source (specify) ______________________

82. Does the school run a feeding programme?  
   Yes 
   No

83. Does the school allow selling of other food stuffs in schools?  
   Yes 
   No

84. If yes, who runs the food stores/kiosks? (specify) ______________________

85. Are students allowed to bring individual food stuffs in school?  
   Yes 
   No

V. Safety against Drug Abuse

86. Does the school have guidance and counseling department?  
   Yes 
   No

87. Does the school sensitize the staff and students about drug abuse?  
   Yes 
   No

88. If yes, does the sensitization programme entail any of the following?
   (g) Seminars  
   Yes 
   No
   (h) Printed matter (books, poster)  
   Yes 
   No
   (i) Guidance and counselling  
   Yes 
   No
   (j) Motivational speakers  
   Yes 
   No
   (k) Films and videos  
   Yes 
   No
   (l) Any other (specify) ______________________

89. Does the school involve parents and community in drug-control programme?  
   Yes 
   No
90. If yes, how?
_____________________
_____________________

VI. Teaching Learning Environment & Special Needs Safety

91. Does the school conduct survey to determined students which special needs?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

92. Are teachers in-serviced to handle issues related to students with special needs?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

93. Has the school put in place facilities for special needs students?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

VII Safety against Cultural Environment

94. Does the school have in place a conflict resolution mechanism? Yes [ ] No [ ]

95. Does the school have a suggestion box?
(d) For students [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ]
(e) Staff members [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ]
(f) Community and parents [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ]

96. Does the school have pastoral programs? Yes [ ] No [ ]

97. Does the school give room to students from various religious and cultural backgrounds to conduct their services/program in school? Yes [ ] No [ ]
VIII. Safety against Child Abuse

98. Have there been cases of child abuse identified in your school? Yes □ No □

99. If yes

(e) What kind of abuse? (specify them)________________________

(f) How many cases? ________________________________

IX. Safety against Disaster Risk Reduction

100. Have you been trained on disaster management skills? Yes □ No □

101. Does the school conduct/hold scheduled practice drill session for disasters such as fire, earthquake and storm? Yes □ No □

102. Does the school have evacuation maps and plans in case of a disaster? Yes □ No □

103. If yes, are the maps and plans displayed and accessible to all school members? Yes □ No □

X. Safety in School Community Relations

104. Does the school hold regular joint meetings with parents? Yes □ No □

105. Has the school ever organized joint cultural and co-curricular activities with members of local community? Yes □ No □
XI. Challenges of Implementing Safety Standards

106. What are some of the challenges/problems does the school encounter while trying to implement MOE safety standards in your school? (Identify the problem in order of magnitude by numbering)

(viii) Financial constraints
(ix) Lack of, guidelines from the ministry/safety standards manual
(x) Lack of, knowledge on safety issues/untrained personnel
(xi) Uncooperative administration
(xii) Uncooperative students
(xiii) Uncooperative BOG/PTA/Parents
(xiv) Any other (specify) __________________________

SECTION C: PERTINENT QUESTIONS

50. General rating of the status of the existing safety standards in various areas in your school

Tick(✓) by using Very efficient (V.E) Efficient (E) Fairly efficient (F.E) Inefficient (I.E) Very inefficient (V.I.E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>V.E</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F.E</th>
<th>I.E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Safety of students while in the school grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Safety of the students while using physical structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the school (classes, dorm, labs etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Health and hygiene safety of students in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Cleanliness and safety within the school environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Safety of food for students while in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Safety against drugs and substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>The safety of children with special needs/disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Safety for students against child abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Safety involving transportation of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Safety of students in learning environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Ability to handle disasters in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>The monitoring and evaluation of school safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
51. Please indicate how often the following activities related to safety take place in your school by indicating tick (✓) using the provided key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>V.F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>V.R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Meeting of the school safety committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students roll call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Drills and training related to disaster management response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Medical check up for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Medical check up for personnel handling students food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Sensitization against drug and substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Sensitization and survey on students with special needs/disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Sensitization against child abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Sensitization on road safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. School-community joint activities(e.g. clean up, co-curricular, cultural activities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Evaluation of school safety status/programme by QUASO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Evaluation of school safety programme/status by administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

OBSERVATION SCHEDULE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF SAFETY STANDARDS

School type: Boys ☐ Girls ☐ Mixed ☐

School status: Boarding ☐ Day ☐ Day/Boarding ☐

A) SAFETY OF SCHOOL GROUNDS

1. Does the school have a sign post? Yes ☐ No ☐
2. Is the school fenced? Yes ☐ No ☐
3. Do visitors sign books? Yes ☐ No ☐
4. Is there a gate to school manned by a watchman? Yes ☐ No ☐
5. Does the school have trees? Yes ☐ No ☐
6. Does school have flowers and well kept lawn? Yes ☐ No ☐
7. Ground terrain is it leveled? Yes ☐ No ☐

B) SAFETY OF SCHOOL BUILDINGS AND ENVIRONMENT

8. Are the classes congested? Yes ☐ No ☐
9. Do all buildings provide for emergency exits? Yes ☐ No ☐
10. Are the windows grilled from outside? Yes ☐ No ☐
11. Do we have fire extinguishers in the school buildings? Yes ☐ No ☐
12. What type of infrastructure is the sanitation?
   a) Latrines ☐ b) Toilets ☐ c) Both ☐
13. If pit latrines? Are they located away from the buildings? Yes ☐ No ☐
14. If school is mixed? Are the sanitation facilities separate from each gender? Yes ☐ No ☐
15. Do we have clean water points available in the school? Yes ☐ No ☐

16. Do buildings’ pavements and sanitation provide/cater for students with special needs? Yes ☐ No ☐

17. Does the school have waste disposal points? Yes ☐ No ☐

18. Are there waste paper/disposal bins along the pathways? Yes ☐ No ☐

C) SAFETY OF STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

19. Are runways, pathways and stairways appropriate for all students with physical challenges? Yes ☐ No ☐

20. Are facilities for special needs students clearly demarcated and indicated? Yes ☐ No ☐

D) TRANSPORT SAFETY

21. Does the school have a sign of speed limit at the gate? Yes ☐ No ☐

22. Does the school have a vehicle for students transport? Yes ☐ No ☐

23. If yes- Does the vehicle display name or address of school? Yes ☐ No ☐

24. Is the vehicle well maintained? Yes ☐ No ☐

E) DISASTER RISK REDUCTION

25. Are there evacuation maps at every entrance and exists of building, stairways and rooms? Yes ☐ No ☐

26. Does the school have fire assembly point? Yes ☐ No ☐

27. Has the school installed lightening/ thunder arresters in all buildings? Yes ☐ No ☐
APPENDIX IV
LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT,

POLICY AND CURRICULUM STUDIES.

P.O.BOX, 43884

NAIROBI

Dear Sir / Madam

REF: RESEARCH

I am a postgraduate student wishing to carry out research on safety standards in secondary schools in Borabu district. The questionnaires and observation schedules attached are meant to gather information about this study from your school. You are kindly requested to be honest in your responses and I promise that all information given will be treated confidential. I seek permission to make some observations in your school concerning the safety measures. Your positive response will highly be appreciated.

Thank you in advance.

Yours Faithfully,

Migiro A.O
## APPENDIX V

### WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE/MONTH</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCT-2009</td>
<td>Concept paper development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER 2009 - JANUARY 2010</td>
<td>Proposal writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY-APRIL 2010</td>
<td>Submission of proposal to the supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY 2010</td>
<td>Development, final and production of research instruments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2010</td>
<td>Processing research permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY/AUGUST 2010</td>
<td>Data collection from the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER 2010</td>
<td>Data analysis and report writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER 2010</td>
<td>Binding and submission of the research report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER 2010</td>
<td>Graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VI

RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION LETTER FROM GRADUATE SCHOOL.

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL

E-mail: kubps@yahoo.com
dean-graduate@ku.ac.ke
Website: www.ku.ac.ke

P.O. Box 43844, 00100
NAIROBI, KENYA
Tel. 810901 Ext. 57530

Our Ref: E55/5481/03

Date: 1st February, 2011

The Permanent Secretary,
Ministry of Higher Education,
Science & Technology
P.O. Box 30040,
NAIROBI.

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

I write to introduce Mr. Migiro Abel Oguye who is a Postgraduate Student of this University. He is registered for a M.Ed degree programme in the Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies in the School of Education.

Mr. Oguye intends to conduct research for a project entitled, “Safety Standards in Secondary Schools in Borabu District.”

Any assistance given to him will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN M. ODONGI

FOR: DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL

JMO/hkk
APPENDIX VII

RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION LETTER FROM THE MINISTRY.

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Telegram: "SCIENCETECH", Nairobi
Telephone: 254-020-241349, 2213102
254-020-310571, 2213123.
Fax: 254-020-2213215, 318245, 318249
When replying please quote

Our Ref:

NCST/RRI/12/1/SS-011/104/4

Abel Oguye Migiro
Kenyatta University
P. O. Box 43844
NAIROBI

Date: 10th February 2011

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Safety standards in secondary schools in Borabu District” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Borabu District for a period ending 30th April 2011.

You are advised to report to the District Commissioner and the District Education Officer, Borabu District before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit one hard copy and one soft copy of the research report/thesis to our office.

[Signature]

P. N. NYAKUNDI
FOR: SECRETARY/CEO

Copy to:

The District Commissioner
Borabu District

The District Education Officer
APPENDIX VIII
RESEARCH PERMIT

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT:
Prof./Dr./Mr./Mrs./Miss. ABEL OGUVE MIGIRO
of (Address) KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
P.O. BOX 43844, NBI
has been permitted to conduct research in
Location, BORABU District,
NYANZA Province,
on the topic SAFETY STANDARDS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN BORABU DISTRICT,
for a period ending 30TH APRIL 2011.

Research Permit No. NCST/RRI/12/1/SS-011/10
Date of issue 11/02/2011
Fee received SHS 1,000

Applicant’s Signature
Secretary
National Council for Science and Technology
APPENDIX IX
RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION LETTER FROM DISTRICT COMMISSIONER.

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND INTERNAL SECURITY

REF: BMD.18/2 VOL.1/42
And date

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

RE: MR. ABEL OGUYE MIGIRO

The above mentioned person has been duly authorized to undertake research in various educational institutions within this district - vide Research authorization letter Ref. NO.NCST/RRI/12/1/SS-O11/104/4 from the National Council for Science and Technology.

Kindly accord him the necessary cooperation.

Thank you.

S.K. RUTO
FOR: DISTRICT COMMISSIONER
BORABU DISTRICT

DISTRICT COMMISSIONER
BORABU DISTRICT

13th February, 2011
RE: MR. ABEL OGUYE MIGIRO

The above named person has been duly authorized to undertake a research on safety standards in secondary schools within Borabu district- vide Research authorization letter Ref: No. NSCT/RR1/12/1/SS-011/104/4 from the National Council for Science and Technology.

Kindly accord him the necessary assistance and co-operation.

Thank you.

ISABELLA OMACHE
FOR DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICER
BORABU DISTRICT.