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ABSTRACT

The search for quality education has been winding and tedious. It dates back to the days of the missionaries, who introduced the first formal education in the form of 3 R’s; a Rithmetic, Read, wRite. The Africans disenchanted by this type of education attempted to manage their “own” education but flopped due to lack of technical know-how. A reprieve came after independence when the government ensured the education of a Kenyan child was at par with that of the white. Subsequent commissions have maintained this status quo and ensured it remained a standing Government objective since then. This is because it is considered by different stakeholders as an important vehicle for self advancement, socio-economic and political development. However, this has also seen a rapid expansion of the number of schools. The government, overwhelmed by the increase in the number of schools, instituted board of governors (BOGs) in secondary schools under the Education Act Chapter 211 (1968) to help them in the management. It was hoped that, BOGs as legal managers (and agents of the M.O.E & TSC) would help the government to implement and articulate policies at school levels. Nevertheless, problems still abound. The quality of education is still low as depicted by results in many Districts. The researcher also looked at school governance in other countries vis-à-vis performance. The purpose of this study thus was to investigate the challenges faced by BOGs in secondary school management. The main objective therefore was to determine the extent to which these challenges affected BOGs effectiveness and the strategies they use to redress them. The researcher targeted Head-teachers and the BOGs in 15 public secondary schools in Taita District. However, due to logistical constraints, only 8 (eight) schools were included in the study. The researcher stratified the schools into Provincial and District and then used Purposive Sampling in each stratum to ensure uniform distribution. Only questionnaires were used. However, Piloting was done after which questionnaires were delivered and then collected by the researcher. Data analysis entailed Descriptive Statistics using the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS).
xi
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter revisits the historical genesis of the Board of Governors (BOGs) in Kenya right from the pre-colonial period to date. It provides an in-depth synopsis of the causative factors that led to the inception of the BOGs; the spiral changes thereof, for instance its embodiment in our Kenyan law, to its present state.

1.1 Background to the study

As the adage goes; plants are shaped by cultivation and men are shaped by education. The clamour for management of quality education in the country dates back to the pre-independence time when the first form of formal education was introduced in the middle of 19th century by the missionaries under the auspice of the Church Missionary Society. At first, their main focus was to train catechists for promotion of evangelism but later became an instrument for production of semi-skilled African labourers principally for servitude on Europeans farms and clerical staff for colonial administration. They therefore ensured that the curriculum education for Africans remain tailored towards producing personnel with only technical and vocational skills. Subsequent pre-independence commissions also fostered that status-quo. This led to the emergence of local bodies such as churches, communities and even individuals to manage the education affairs of Africans. They were motivated by the belief that education offered to Africans by whites was of inferior quality. However, the management was poorly coordinated as the bodies did not have the technical know-how.

The declaration of Education as a basic (human) right for all saw a paradigm shift in the provision of educational opportunities. For instance, in 1950s, there was a dramatic increase in the number of primary, intermediate and secondary school and an
accompany increase in student enrolment. This prompted the government to establish Boards of Governors –BOGs- and regional education boards in municipalities outside native land units, Beecher (1949). However, its mandate was not clear and hence decisions were made in a hunch or hush -hush approach. Nonetheless, the recommendations served as a framework for educational planning in Kenya in the 1950’s.

At independence, the Kenya Education Commission (1964) recommendations also witnessed a rapid expansion of schools and a massive enrolment of students. The Government funding of schools also increased drastically posing a serious challenge to the government in the management of these resources namely; the physical, human and financial resources. The government, foreseeing this mushrooming of educational institutions in the country, established the BOGs under an Act of parliament, Education Act Cap 211 (1968) as the legal managers of public secondary schools in the country and with devolved powers from the Ministry of Education. The Education Act (1968) repealed the 1952 Education Act and centralised the management of education to ensure equitable distribution of opportunities throughout the country. This centralised system placed the management of Education under the Ministry of Education- MOE. According to the Act, the BOGs were given specific powers in the management of secondary schools. Their decisions passing through a scalar chain of commands to reach the Permanent Secretary (PS) – MOE.

The BOG is thus a corporate body appointed by the Minister of Education and with tenure of office of three years after which they are eligible for reappointment. They are not supposed to have any interest in any school property in which they are governors. The chairperson cannot serve for more than three terms in the same institution. The Act also defines a manager as any person or body of persons
responsible for the management and conduct of a school and includes a Board. The Act, read together with the TSC Act, cap 212, confers extensive powers on the Minister for education over the management and regulation of education in Kenya. The two Acts give the Minister extensive latitude to delegate his powers to local authority DEBs or BOGs.

A review of school governance reveals that school boards are becoming an increasingly important integral part of the school management as educators begin to appreciate how crucial it is to empower the participants in educational processes. In USA for instance, the provision of school board became a requirement in Massachusetts laws of 1827 & 1989 and were required to exercise general supervision over schools, Magiri (2005). The boards were responsible for;

- Disbursement of funds.
- Certification of teachers.
- Recommendation of curricula.
- Supervising buildings & maintenance of schools.

Currently, school boards in USA are autonomous and have been left to manage schools independently. Campbell (1974) further adds; there are approximately 100,000 American citizens serving on school boards in the US. These laymen make decisions which affect the welfare of millions of youngsters enrolled in the schools. They are the people who give countless hours of their time to this particular service.

In Britain, BOGs members comprise the following groups; Parents, Religious bodies, Trustees, Teachers, representatives of North Eastern Education and Library board, Department of Education and the Principal of the school. Fellow parents and teachers elect parents and teachers respectively -Magiri (2005). Beектs (1998) notes, the school governors are nearly as old as the country’s democracy and serve for various
reasons among them; guiding the Head teacher in policy making and also publicizing the school in the wider community.

In London, the school board membership was drawn from all walks of life including women but those who are interested. These were, university dons, politicians, diplomats, industrialists, doctors, solicitors and business community. There was a lot of interest shown in school boards’ elections and high class men who become candidates and are elected. The tax payers elect these people who put education first and politics seconds, Magiri (2005). In England, Wales and Northern Ireland, every state school has a Governing Body (GB) which operates under the article of government or instruments of management. They consisting of various categories of governors depending on the type and the size of the school, namely; the voluntary aided, voluntary controlled and the country schools - Allan (2006). The Head teacher of each school is an ex-officio governor and can decline to take- up the position. The place is then left vacant. The GB holds office for a fixed period of 4 years from date of appointment except the ex-officio whose terms are dependent on the period they are in office. The Head teacher of the school is responsible for the day to day management of the school. The GB role is to provide strategic management and act as a ‘CRITICAL FRIEND’ supporting the work of the Head teacher and other staff. They are responsible for:

- Approving the school budget.
- Setting strategic direction, policies and objectives e.g. annual school targets.
- Appointing, challenging and support the Head teacher.
- Pupils’ admission.
- Reviewing progress against the schools budget and objectives.
Ozigi (1977) in his study of school administration in Nigeria stated that most educational institutions had governing boards whose members were appointed by the Ministry of Education and local education authorities or state school boards. Some boards may also have control over the allocation of the funds and expenditure. Many schools boards according to the researcher do not however have such powers. Their function is only advisory, allowing them to make recommendation on school matters but not to implement their views. In Zambia, the school governance is coordinated by Higher School Education Board (HSEB) comprising; the education office, the local administration, the school Principal and the PTA. They meet on ‘an as needed basis’ to oversee the financial and general school management. The PTA’s are elected and raise funds for schools’ materials, activities and teachers salary.

In Senegal, they have School Management Council (SMC) composed of secondary schools’ administrations, representatives of regional council, the Mayor’s office, the local treasury, the PTA and Student body. Their role is to oversee the material and “moral” activities of secondary schools spanning from academics, administrative to financial matters. In South Africa, the 1996 school Act gave the decision making power to:

1. School Management Teams (SMTs) also called the internal management groups comprising; the Principal, Deputy Principal and Departmental heads to be responsible for daily and annual school management.

2. School Governing bodies (SGBS) comprising; the principal, elected parents representative, teachers, members of non-teaching staff and learners (pupils).

The board serves for 3 years and members are eligible for re-election. The learners serve for 1 year. The constituted board then elects the executive committee consisting of a chairperson, secretary and a treasurer. The chairperson must be a
parent not employed by the school - Magiri (2005). South Africa has developed a highly expanded educational system that rivals that of the industrialised countries in terms of its complexity and competitiveness, Stevens (1995). In Papua Guinea, the board of management established in accordance with the Weeden Report (1969) comprise; mission and local government representative, two members of the public with special interest in education, District Inspector of schools, chairperson of parents and citizens plus a delegate from the District Education committee. The board is charged with handling: student’s discipline, school staffing, school buildings and school finances, writes Anyang’ (2003).

In Kenya, the secondary school governance is entrusted with the BOGs who are the MOE and TSC agents on the ground. At the Ministry of Education, the secondary school management is under the Director, Secondary schools and Tertiary institutions in whose docket is the appointment of BOGs. The Kenya Education Acts 1968 and revised in 1980 clearly stipulates the;

- The composition and membership of the board.
- The constitution of the board.
- The function of the board.
- The powers and the seal of the board.

The nomination is done by a panel comprising the MP, Councillor, Chief, Minister’s representative, School Principal, who is also the secretary and the Sponsor. The panel then selects 10 (ten) members as follows;

3. Persons to represent the interest of the community.
4. Persons to represent the sponsoring body.
3. Persons to represent the special interest group e.g. professionals.
The sponsor is further given the privilege to select a chairperson from the 4 (four). The chairperson serves for a maximum of 3 terms in a given school with each BOG term lasting a period of 3 years after which the re-appointment process begins afresh. The chairperson should NOT be appointed ‘chair’ of more than two boards. During the inauguration of the board, three (3) PTA members are also co-opted who serve for a period of one year unless re-elected during PTA /AGM. That makes a total of 13, a third of which must be drawn from one gender. The board members are required to meet at least three times in a year. Any member who misses three consecutive meetings shall be disqualified and replaced through the same channel. The board may also appoint an Executive BOG committee which can be meeting more often but the resolutions of this committee have to be approved and ratified by the full BOG. The DEO and MP (representative), the sponsor, the councillor and the chief are ex-officio members. The principal is appointed as the secretary during the inauguration. However, unlike in Britain, Senegal and S A; in Kenya, students and teachers are NOT represented in the BOGs. This may be something to be explored.

The introduction of Free Primary Education (FPE) in 2003 and Free Day secondary Education (FDSE) in 2008 has not only realised an improved access to education and a massive transition of students from primary to secondary schools but also a bloated government expenditure funding on public secondary schools—Sessional papers no 1(2005). This coupled with the current trend of MOE / TSC to devolve most of its duties and functions to the grass root level has led to the BOGs functions / mandate being revised and expanded so as to include: powers to hold both movable and immovable properties of the school and also to take measures to mobilise and manage resources (financial, physical & human) to supplement those
provided by the government for purposes of school management. Their mandate thus is:

a) **Curriculum Development implementation & Instruction**

It is the duty of the BOGs to oversee the implementation of all education policies e.g. on curriculum from the ministry in the secondary schools. Besides, they should set (develop) strategic direction, policies and objectives e.g. annual school targets, for their institutions.

b) **Management of Human Resources (but excluding the students)**

The BOG as an agent of the MOE/ TSC has been mandated to carry out the following functions: - Recruitment of teachers; by identifying staff shortages i.e. determine the Curriculum Based Establishment (CBE) of school then declare the vacancy to the PS (who into turn inform the TSC) and a copy to the DEO. It is also their duty to receive the applications; Selection of new teachers by forming BOG Academic Sub – committee with mandate to vet and shortlist applicants after which the board conduct the interviews; Recommend transfer of teacher; Discipline teachers for various forms of gross misconduct under TSC code of regulation (COR); Promote staff development by forming Teacher Development Committee (TDC) chaired by BOG chairperson to identify staff needs and then mount school based training programme; appoint, supervise, remunerate, dispense and or retire non-teaching and supportive staff.

c) **Management of physical facilities and material resources**

BOG is responsible for:- Planning and development of physical facilities; Sourcing for funds to under-take infrastructure improvement in the school; Monitoring and supervising physical projects in the school; Proper use and
maintenance of physical facilities and materials resources such as; class rooms, labs, library, fields, lab equipments and classroom text books.

d) **Management of financial resources**

The BOG is charged with: - Sourcing for funds through various ways such as Harambee; Approves the annual budget estimates; Carries out FISCAL control to ensure the school maintains proper books of accounts; Audit school accounts (internally) to determine the completeness and accuracy of the accounting procedure. In other words, BOG budgets for, collects revenue inform of fees and other monies and spend the same for the successful attainment of the schools objectives. This in line with the Education Act which states; ‘The Board shall receive all monies payable by students, grant from public funds, donations made to the school and other incomes and shall be responsible for the expenditure of all monies belong to the school.

e) **Management of students’ personnel**

The Board is empowered to; Formulate policies regarding student’s activities and services- the school culture; Discipline errant students e.g. by suspension or recommending expulsion to the PS- MOE.

f) **Promoting school community relations**

The Board can foster good school community relation through: hiring of school facilities such as; school bus, school playing ground or hall for occasion like weddings, meeting etc. This is to give the community the feeling of ownership of the school.

In short, the Education Act gives the Board full powers to run all affairs in the educational institutions they are assigned to. This was seen as a means of decentralising the day to day management of the schools hence making the management services of secondary schools quicker. The intention was to achieve an
effective school management and also maintain a high quality of education in public secondary schools in tandem with the Ministry of Education Mission of: “Quality education for sustainable development”

The GOK (1976) report also recommended the involvement of sponsors, parents, teachers and various governing bodies in secondary schools management and was viewed as a move towards improving efficiency of educational institutions. The government intention was to enhance efficiency of education management by increasing the capacity, responsibility and accountability of secondary school boards for funding arrangement and management. The secondary school boards therefore have a crucial role to play in the school management by helping in the running of the schools on behalf of the Ministry.

GOK (1999) in its Total Integrated Quality Education and Training (TIQUET) report crowns up the basic reason that prompted the establishment of these governing bodies by stating; ‘The colonial government imposed its education policies and practises on local communities thereby destroying in its wake, the Traditional African Systems’. It is therefore understandable why the first task of independent government was to expand the opportunities for the African Child more so at secondary and tertiary levels. However, subsequent reviews have been necessitated by the quest to address pertinent issues of access, relevance, quality and efficiency of the education system in the country. To-day, the decentralisation of education management to the institutional level has placed tremendous demands on the management capacity of the BOGs. This project has thus focussed on those challenges.
1.2 Statement of the problem

The introduction of FPE in the 2003 led to not only a significant increase in the number of students completing primary education but also created a tremendous demand for secondary education. Besides, awareness is growing that secondary education must provide students with knowledge; skills and competence that makes them productive in economies that are increasingly knowledge driven. This has pushed the government to continuously evaluate how the secondary schools are governed, managed and held accountable. Yet with all these clear mandate and powers bestowed on the BOGs, many public schools still exhibit symptoms of poor management through; poor performance in KCSE examination, financial misappropriation, indiscipline of both staff and students, school unrest, deterioration of physical facilities and poor overall growth in terms of enrolment and physical infrastructure. Certainly, these are manifestations of management ineffectiveness.

The task force report on discipline and student unrest in secondary schools GOK (2001), listed the challenges facing BOGs as; political interferences, low education background of members and acrimony between stake holders among others. However, these were generalised findings which might not be true for all regions as each region is unique. Hence, the kinds of challenges the BOGs face in a given region are specific to the socio-economic and political landscape of the given region. As a result, the disparities in challenges and extent to which they affect the performance of BOGs would be reflected / exhibited from one region to another. The researcher therefore went out to unravel the challenges BOGs face in the management of Secondary schools in Taita District in Taita / Taveta County.
1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study thus was to investigate the critical shortcomings or challenges BOGs face in the secondary school management in Taita District. It sought to establish the causes of such challenges and also the extent of their effect on the general overall performance of the BOGs in their management capacity.

1.4 Objectives of study

The objective of the study was to investigate the effectiveness of the BOGs as the KEY players in the management of education in secondary schools. The study aimed at achieving the following objectives;

a. To find out the challenges faced by BOGs in the management of Secondary schools.

b. To investigate how the challenges have impacted on the BOG’s performance.

c. To assess the strategies used by BOGs to redress these challenges.

1.5 Research Questions

The researcher therefore aimed at answering such questions as;

1. What challenges do BOGs face in the management of secondary schools?

2. What are the causes of these challenges?

3. How do these causes influence their performance?

4. What strategies do BOGs put in place to redress the challenges?

1.6 Significance of the study

The BOGs are becoming more and more the epicentre in the running of the schools. As a matter of fact, the current trend of MOE / TSC devolving power and delegating authority to the grass root levels means that BOGs are expected to play a
very instrumental role in the effective management of secondary school. The findings of the study therefore;

1. Provides valuable information to education policy makers’ e.g. KEMI on some factors hindering BOG management of secondary schools. This will help the policy makers in terms of coming up with intervention measures such as induction courses and /or management in-service courses for BOGs, reviewing the mode / criteria of selecting the BOGs members to ensure a competent and committed body that fully represents the Ministry for effective management. The information would also help policy makers reviewing the Education Act at the National level in formulating a managerial policy that would enhance BOG management of the secondary schools.

2. The study on BOGs would immensely contribute towards solving of problems in our school as well as providing materials that are meant to highlight the need for prudent and efficient management of schools.

3. Serve as repository of knowledge for researchers and education administrators for further reference including nomination panel for BOGs.

1.7 Assumptions

1. All respondents freely provided information with honesty and truthfulness.

2. All public secondary schools had legally constituted BOGs.

1.8 Limitation

According to Kahn et al (1998), limitations are the conditions beyond the control of the researcher that may place restrictions to the conclusions of the study and their application to the situations. The following were the limitations of the study:-
• It is not possible to control the attitudes of the respondents which might affect the validity of the responses. This is because the respondent might give socially acceptable answers to please the researcher.

• For a more elaborate report, all Districts declining in performance should have been studied but owing to financial, time and other logistic constraints, this study only focussed on secondary schools in Taita District in Taita / Taveta County.

• Taita District is one out of the 265 districts in the entire country and the results of the study cannot be generalized in the whole country.

1.9 Scope of the study

The study was confined to BOGs in public secondary schools only in Taita District in Taita / Taveta County. Secondly, Head teachers were included as they are secretaries to the BOGs and are also the persons on the ground.

1.10 Theoretical framework

The study aimed at investigating the challenges faced by BOGs in public secondary schools’ management. The theoretical frame work for the study was the Role Theory. That was because it advocates for the establishment of Goals and Expectations. Role Theory posits that human behaviour is guided by expectations held both by the individual and by other people. The expectations correspond to different roles individuals perform or enact in their daily lives, such as accounts clerk, secretary and grounds man. For instance, most people hold pre-conceived notions of the role expectations of a secretary, which might include: answering phones, making and managing appointments, filing paperwork, and typing memos. These role expectations would not be expected of a professional soccer player.
Individuals generally have and manage many roles. Roles consist of a set of rules or norms that functions as plans or blueprints to guide behaviour. Roles specify what goals should be pursued, what tasks must be accomplished, and what performances are required in a given scenario or situation. Role theory holds that a substantial proportion of observable, day-to-day social behaviour entails simply persons carrying out their roles. Role theory is, in fact, predictive. It implies that if we have information about the role expectations for a specified position (e.g., cleric, fireman and watchman), a significant portion of the behaviour of the persons occupying that position can be predicted. What's more, role theory also argues that in order to change behaviour it is necessary to change roles; roles correspond to behaviours and vice versa. In addition to heavily influencing behaviour, roles influence beliefs and attitudes; individuals will change their beliefs and attitudes to correspond with their roles.

Many role theorists see role theory as one of the most compelling theories bridging individual behaviour and social structure. Roles, which are in part dictated by social structure and in part by social interactions (see the two approaches outlined below), guide the behaviour of the individual. The individual, in turn, influences the norms, expectations, and behaviours associated with roles. The understanding is reciprocal and didactic.

1.10.1 Structural-Functional Perspective:

The functionalist approach sees a role as the set of expectations that society places on an individual. By unspoken consensus, certain behaviours are deemed appropriate and others inappropriate. In the functionalist conception, role is one of the important ways in which individual activity is socially regulated: roles create regular patterns of behaviour and thus a measure of
predictability, which not only allows individuals to function effectively because they know what to expect of others, but also makes it possible for the sociologist to make generalizations about society. Collectively, a group of interlocking roles creates a social institution: the institution of law, for example, can be seen as the combination of many roles, including: police officer, judge, criminal, and victim.

Roles, in the functionalist perspective, are relatively inflexible and are more-or-less universally agreed upon. Although it is recognized that different roles interact (e.g. teacher and student), and that roles are usually defined in relation to other roles (e.g. doctor and patient), the functionalist approach has great difficulty in accounting for variability and flexibility of roles and finds it difficult to account for the vast differences in the way that individuals conceive different roles. Taken to extremes, the functionalist approach may results in role becoming a set of static, semi-global expectations laid down by a unified, amorphous society. The distinction between role and norm (or culture) thus becomes sterile.

The functionalist approach has been criticized for its static understanding of roles. Even so, it remains a fundamental concept which is still taught in most introductory courses and is still regarded as important. Interestingly, this conception has crossed over from academic discourse into popular use. It has become commonplace to speak of particular roles as if they were indeed fixed, agreed upon by all, and uncontroversial (e.g., the role of the teacher or a parent's role). This everyday usage nearly always employs role in a normative way, to imply that this is the proper behaviour for a teacher or a parent, or even for an entire institution.
Role Theory includes the following propositions:

- People spend much of their lives participating as members of groups and organizations.
- Within these groups, people occupy distinct positions each of these positions entails a role, which is a set of functions performed by the person for the group.
- Groups often formalize role expectations as norms or even codified rules, which include what rewards will result when roles are successfully performed and what punishments will result when roles are not successfully performed.
- Individuals usually carry out their roles and perform in accordance with prevailing norms; in other words, role theory assumes that people are primarily conformists who try to live up to the norms that accompany their roles.
- Group members check each individual's performance to determine whether it conforms to the norms; the anticipation that others will apply sanctions ensures role performance.

1.10.2 Extensions of the Theory

Role Theory has been a fruitful approach to understanding humans and society. As a result, various derivatives and additional concepts have developed.

a) Role Confusion.

Arises when an individual has trouble determining which role he/she should assume.

b) Role Conflict.
This results when an individual encounters tensions as the result of incompatible roles.

c) Role Strain.

It refers to the felt difficulty in fulfilling role obligations. In contrast to role conflict, where tension is felt between two competing roles, the tension in role strain comes from just one role.

d) Role Distance.

Role Distance is the effectively expressed separateness between the individual and his putative role. The individual is not denying the role but the virtual self that is implied in the role for all accepting performers.

e) Role Embracement.

Role Embracement refers to the complete adoption of a role. When a role is truly embraced, the self disappears completely into the role.

Three things seem to be involved in the earnestness with which people assume roles or the degree to which they embrace a role:

- An admitted or expressed attachment to the role.
- A demonstration of qualifications and capacities for performing it.
- An active engagement or spontaneous involvement in the role activity at hand, that is, a visible investment of attention and muscular effort.

1.11 Conceptual framework

The conceptual framework shown below explains the six tasks areas as a measure of the BOG effectiveness in the secondary school management. In other words, how the efficient and prudent management of the six task areas leads to an effective management of the secondary school. Jack (1997) says, ‘the first stage in an
institutional programme designed to increase education productivity has to do with the management of the system’. This implies that the competence of the BOG in the management of the above functions / task areas is very important.

The framework is a hypothesised model that illustrate that the school as an organisation will depend on various factors / managerial roles for attainment of the objectives. How these roles are managed will determine the overall performance of the institution and the effectiveness of the BOGs. These factors do not work independently but are interrelated. One factor influences the other leading to a common goal; the effective management of the secondary school.
Figure 1.1: Conception framework showing the roles of BOG in Secondary School
1.12 **Operational definition of terms.**

**Challenges:** Factors constraining smooth running of a secondary school.

**Board:** A group of people controlling or managing a secondary school.

**Governor:** A member of a board appointed to manage a secondary school.

**Governance:** Management of secondary school.

**Head teacher:** A person in charge of a secondary school.

**Institution:** Secondary school where learning takes place.

**Management:** A social process constituting; planning, controlling & motivating.

**Mandate:** Legal obligation or authority given to the governors of a secondary school.

**Motivation:** To inspire / make staff and student worker harder to achieve a set goal.

**Role:** These are duties / functions assigned to someone.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter examined the existing literature that was related either directly or indirectly to the study. The chapter was intended to bring to the fore, the management concepts / practices and school governance as applied to other countries and in the Kenyan schools including the challenges they encounter. The literature, both theoretical and empirical, was gleaned from books, government documents, research papers and newspapers. The literature focussed on:

a) Management concepts/practises.

b) School governance.

However, it is instructive to note that governance and management are interrelated / intertwined sets of concepts because each depends on the other. Governance refers to the machinery of government, how roles and responsibilities at different levels are aligned or coordinated and communicated to avoid overlaps or gaps in responsibility and maximise coherence. Management on the hand refers to the processes and practises by which members of board and PTA employ to fulfil their roles and responsibilities as laid out in the policy and legislation. Hence, if governance structure is vague, it is very difficult for management to function well. Likewise, if managers are not competent or trained, do not understand their roles, no matter how well defined the governance structure is, it cannot function as intended- Allan Dyson et al (2006).

2.2 Management Concepts
Henry Fayol (1949) gave a classic definition of management as; to fore cast and plan, to organise, to command, to coordinate and control. This was further alluded
by Okumbe (2001), who gave the definition of management by Koontz and O’Donnell as an operational process initially best dissected by analysing the managerial functions of planning, organising, staffing, directing, leading and controlling.

The concept wringing out of these definitions is that to manage requires;

1. Planning, both short term and long term.
   I. Delegation of tasks/duties which is the staffing/organising.
   II. Monitoring of the tasks/duties to ensure they are being done to the standard i.e. the commanding and directing function.
   III. Evaluation to check if set targets are being realised; the coordination or leading aspects.
   IV. Feedback mechanism to see areas which requires improvement i.e. the controlling function.

Suffice it therefore to say, planning is looking forth, controlling is looking back.

Chabari (2007) gives Wild description of management as the art of getting the best out of the available resources: human, physical and financial. He argues that decisiveness in decision making is vital in management. So that a well-knit team is a vital part of any manager’s job as it will utilise these (available) resources prudently leading to improved output, efficiency and utilisation. Cole (1986) gives a holistic view of management by viewing it as a process operational within a basic organisational structure. He identifies the following fundamental principles of management structure: -Defining the responsibilities of the management supervisory and specialist staff, determining how these responsibilities must be delegated-devolution of power, coordinating the execution of the responsibilities and maintaining high morale. However, Smelter et al (1989) hold the opinion that
functions are intertwined and therefore not possible for a manager to neglect any one of them as that would lead to ineffective performance.

In as much as the above were classical management principles practised in the business organisations / sector, they very much influence education management of schools. This is well captured in the hand book on effective management in school (2008) which says: “Management of school involves; planning, directing, organising, coordinating, controlling and monitoring the education process”. The book further says that it involves focus (read planning) on education resources i.e. the finances, materials, time and human resources for optimum utility.

Chabari (2007) borrowing from Hale alludes to the above by indicating that ;” management subsumes fives distinct intertwined elements: Planning what is to be done ; allocating the time and effort to what is to be done ; motivating and generating the effort to do it; coordinating and combining effort and controlling what is done to ensure it conforms with what was intended”. Mumo (2004) lists six sets of behaviour or principles that explain more than fifty percent (50%) of a manager’s effectiveness as identified by Robinson et al (2007). They include;

- Controlling the organisation’s environment and its resource.
- Organising and controlling.
- Handling information (i.e. policies).
- Providing for growth and development.
- Motivating employees and handling conflicts.
- Strategic problem solving.

In our Kenyan setting, the task of managing school is bestowed on the BOGs as managers. In a review of school management by MOE in 1994, the following were outlined as indicators of effectiveness of these managers.
- Board’s guidance and management especially in leadership.
- Board’s ability to plan and assess its own performance.
- Quality of members derived from member’s recruiting and selection competence.
- Quality of support services BOGs receives from the other stakeholders in the management of secondary school -a measure of commitment.
- Quality of BOGs meeting.

The above points to the competence and commitment of the managers which is given more credence by Sessional Paper No 6 (1988), which recommended that members of BOGs and School committees be appointed from persons who are committed, competent and experienced so as to enhance management and development of education institutions. The GOK report (1988) too, in acknowledging the crucial role played by BOG in management of education institution, further suggested that Boards be appointed on time and the members be carefully selected to ensure Boards have committed members to enhance management of high standards of education and high training.

2.3 School governance

School governance thus is the management of the school and it is becoming an increasingly important issue as educators begin to realise how crucial it is to empower the participants in educational process. In most Sub Saharan countries in Africa, World Bank paper No 127 (2008) reports, governance structures extend from MOE through decentralised education offices to secondary schools; the point of confluence of governance structures and public. According to the report, secondary education is an amorphous zone that lies between basic education and higher
education. It is a step for pupils to broaden their knowledge and experience from basic level and prepare for work or higher education lines.

In Kenya, the school governance is entrusted to the BOGs who are the MOE agents on the ground. The BOGs, in conjunction with other education (field) officers e.g. the DEOs are in charge of the overall school management. The broad objective of the secondary school education in Kenya is to prepare students to make a positive contribution to the development of the society and acquire attitudes of national patriotism, self-respect, self-reliance, cooperation, adaptability and a sense of purpose and self-discipline. Indeed, the school as the most local education unit has become a locus of demand for accountability. School BOGs as managers of their schools are charged with making their school perform. This has called for a radical review of school governance. Nevertheless, some conditions are critical for effective governance such as;

Selection or election (recruitment) of staff based on demonstrated competence and training for specific job responsibility to enable them make informed decisions which they are accountable for;

Clear assignment of responsibility and authority to avoid overlaps and gaps.

2.3.1 Recruitment of governors

The BOGs importance in school management cannot be gained said as Kenya Times (1986) reports; “School boards are must ...boards are important for proper management of School”. Waweru (2005) concurs, he says; BOGs critical role is to determine the intellectual health of our nation through their personal management styles, provision of effective leadership, prudent management and utilisation of the resources at their disposal. The need for efficient management of schools has placed
much more emphasis on the nature and role of BOGs as the managers and its effective use of resources such the human, financial and material. They are the centre piece of the various stake holders of a given institution. GOK (1988), in recognition of these tasks and expectation placed on the BOGs hence recommended that; ‘‘BOGs and school committees be appointed from persons with qualities of commitment, competences and experience’’

Some Governing Boards (GBs) have no difficulties getting persons with appropriate skills and knowledge. However, there instances where some schools find it hard to identify persons willing to serve as governors and have to fill vacancies with governors who feel ill equipped to make a full contribution. This may leave a small ‘core of governors’ carrying the most burdens while the others play a marginal role. Besides, some governors recruited may not necessarily reflect the characteristics of the local communities. Also, unlike in London where the school governing bodies comprise professionals who are elected and show a lot of zeal, in Kenya, situation arises where the professionals who are selected are sometimes so busy and therefore fail to attend BOG meetings. Their nominations have to be revoked and replaced by locals who may NOT be well learned (exposed). In other cases, professionals are not even willing to be associated with schools that do NOT perform well in the exams - Waweru (2005). This leaves the board with semi-illiterate persons who bring in little or no innovation and keep conflicting with the principal as Daily Nation (1987) observes; “Schools with best facilities in Kakamega District were doing poorly because of disagreement between the board Members.” Besides, they are no set criteria enumerating the skills a person should posses to qualify for appointment to a board which negatively impact the government effort in provision of quality education. The service in the board is not well remunerated and consequently most
professionals opt to stay away from it. The result is that most public schools are managed by old and unenergetic retirees, semi-literate business people or the semi-skilled non professionals who are more often than not, erudite in elementary law and cannot readily grasp the provisions of the education Act or the basic concepts in management of public finance, human resource management and organisational management. Daily Nation (1988) avers and points out: “Incompetent Boards in Secondary schools ---contributed to poor education standard in Bungoma District”. Mumo (2004) further identifies a gap existing in the education Act as it does NOT limit re-appointment of ordinary members hence continuing being ineffective.

It is therefore important for the government, parents, school managers and educationists to review the current system of managing public institutions to attract more professionals and allow full and equitable participation by all the stakeholders. For instance, unlike in Britain, Senegal and S A, in Kenya, students are NOT represented in the BOGs. However, the inclusion of the parent in BOG was meant to increase participation in the running of the schools hence minimise conflict between the schools, BOGs and PTA and encourage team work & collective responsibility where all members abide by decisions reached at board meeting, adds Waweru (2005). Apart from appointing the representative to board, religious organisations which sponsored or founded most public schools in Kenya still play a peripheral role in managing the schools. They should instead get more involved since they can play a complimentary role in guiding and counselling adolescent students. Religious leaders exercise both temporal and spiritual authority and can exert moral pressure on delinquent students to infuse behavioural change - Stevens (1995). Allan (2006) too alludes, he quips;

“Much research has demonstrated that the quality of education
depends primarily on the way schools are managed more than on the abundance of available resources and that the capacity of schools to improve is strongly influenced by the quality of leadership provided.”

2.3.2 Role of BOG in secondary school management

Management and administration.

To begin with, it is rather important to briefly discern between management and administration. There’s a thin margin between management and administration. Management in an organisation involves planning, designing, initiating actions, monitoring activities and demanding results on the basis of allocated resources. It is policy making, policy control and monitoring. Administration on other hand involves implementation of the policies, procedures, rules and regulations as set up by management. Brooks Adams states that:

‘Administration is the capacity to coordinate many and often conflicting social energies in a single organization so adroitly that they shall operate as a unity.’

Mbiti (1974) considered a school as a formal organization and emphasized that ‘where there is an organization a need for management and administration must arise’. He saw a school as a social system within a large society that requires formal management system in order to provide conditions and services which would enable children to learn.

In the Kenya setting, the major responsibility of the management of secondary schools was placed under the BOG after independence. Board of Governors were established in the section 10 and 12 under the legal notice 17 of 1971. The decisions of BOG must pass through chain of bureaucracies before reaching the permanent
secretary for approval. Mumo (2004), states that board of governors is a legal entity with specific powers underlying its establishment and operation Education Act (1968) & revised (1980). The members of BOGs are appointed by the ministry of Education and functions in accordance with the provisions of the Act, the TSC Act and any rules and regulations made there under and a code of management approved by the minister. The Kenya Education Commission (1971) report part 1 saw the management of secondary schools by BOGs as a means of decentralization of day-to-day management of schools. The education Act Cap 211 (1968) revised in 1980 outlines the responsibilities of BOG in school management as including:-

i. Management of the schools according to the stipulation of the Teachers Service Commission Act.

ii. Ensures the effective and accountable use of resources in the provision of public or private education.

iii. To ensure that the school is conducted to provide educational services in accordance with the provision of the relevant educational laws and regulations that may be in existence or may come into existence from time to time.

iv. The maintenance of high moral tone in schools and the maintenance of the religious traditions of the schools in the Republic of Kenya.

v. To ensure safe custody of schools funds, and endorse any money withdrawn for the development of the school.

vi. Drawing school policy and articulating the government’s policy on education in schools.

vii. Discipline of teachers and students.
The GOK Report (1976) addressed the issue of management of education and training and suggested an increased degree of delegation within the BOGs running secondary schools in order to enhance effective management. The Kamunge Report (1988) also proposed careful selection of members of BOGs so as to ensure committed members are appointed to the Board. The report enlisted BOG roles as encompassing:-

a. Development of educational institutions.

b. Adequate management of the institution’s finances.

c. Disciplining both students and teachers.

d. Hiring and firing the subordinate staff.

Mbiti (1974:28) further stated that as the legal managers, the BOG must realize that their major task is to make the school purpose clear to everyone, to see that the necessary equipment and monetary resources are available for the school use, and to motivate their staff, students and the parents and to produce a lively school spirit and excellence in work performance.

Mbaabu (1983) observed that, as managers of the schools, the BOGs are the administrative agent closest to the teacher, pupils, and the school community. This follows that they can make use of their position to the best advantage of their school. They could influence the three groups to contribute positively and effectively to help achieve the purposes and aims of the school. Mbiti (1974:111) stated that the success of every school to a larger extent depends on a sound school administration. He argued that there are various aspects of educational administration such as personnel, sound equipment and administrative structure that assist educational managers in maintaining a sound school administration. For an effective and efficient school administration, he argued, school employees must possess the right attitude and competent skills to enable them get the work done. Equipment and supplies should be
adequate and delivered in school on time; there should be adequate financing of school functions, effective personnel supervision, and good human relations in school; appropriate administrative methods to motivate the employees and sound planning to fit changing situations. In reference to this, Ozigi (1977) also argued that if we turn to administration in educational organizations, we find that all the activities are directed towards the attainment of the goals of teaching and learning, and all people working in the institution will have to contribute towards the accomplishment of these goals. Teachers and other professional staff are involved; as are parents, lay members of the community; also involved are members of school board, local education authorities, inspectors and ministries of education among others. Ozigi (1977:4) further argued that the institutional managers have to establish their goals, coordinate, plan and implement the school program and policies and manage whatever resources are available to them to ensure the success of the educational programmes. Ochieng (1984:29) observed that the secondary school managers are the instrument through which the school as a social system fulfills its functions. O’Connor (1985) argued that, whatever roles board members performs, it is primarily their job to see that the staff develop pupils who are mature, alive and instilled with the spirit of service towards mankind spiritually, intellectually, morally, physically and socially. On the other hand, Campbell (1974), Elsbree at al. (1967) and Nwagwu (1978) agreed that the administrative tasks or operational areas of school administration fall under the following areas:

1. Curriculum and Instruction
2. Finance and Business Management
3. Physical Facilities
4. School Community Relations
5. Pupil Personnel

6. Staff Personnel

It is by coordinating these operational task areas that an environment conducive to learning and teaching would be created. Gakeri (1978) observed that these tasks supplement one another and hence the independence seen is only arbitrary. Odali (1984) saw these activities/tasks as the major roles that board members have to play and classifies them as:

1. Managerial leadership – duties which requires organization and administration.

2. Instructional leadership – duties necessary to ensure that teaching and learning are effectively carried out in the school.

Thus, the effective coordination of these operational task areas would create an environment conducive for learning/teaching. And as Bell (1976; 20) sums up; ‘The weight of many decisions that daily touch the lives of the child and his/her education lies on the school board. So their effectiveness or lack of it will determine how the school performs.

However, these roles of the BOGs are not discharged effectively due to various bottlenecks experienced by the members- Gituma (2004). The study on BOGs in Meru Central District revealed that all BOG members were not inducted after appointment and were performing most their duties through trial and error approach, he adds.

For the purposes of this study therefore, a brief look at challenges faced in performing some of the tasks was essential.

2.3.3 Roles and Challenges Faced By BOGs in Carrying Out the Administrative Tasks.

Mbaabu (1983) argued that it is would be very naïve to imagine that board members would be able to carry out all the duties like providing instructional leadership, business, and custodial functions and among others carry out the role of
school organization and management without experiencing some constraints. In support of the variation of problems in various institutions, she further pointed out that, the problems experienced by board members in general varied depending on the school environment, the school tradition, the characteristics of the learners and the head teacher’s personality, his competence, his efficiency and effectiveness. In support of what was pointed out by Mbaabu (1983), and according to a paper presented by Mohammed II et al (November 2005), there were many challenges facing education in Africa today: lack of learning materials, few qualified teachers, and financial constraints are just but a few of the challenges. The AIDS epidemic and famine have placed further limitations on what governments can spend on education. Wanga (1984) identified three categories of problems:

1. Personal or human problems related to age, sex, physical strength and stamina among others – these include; board member’s personality, competence, efficiency and effectiveness, staff personality and characteristics of students.

2. Intra-organizational problems – these include; the school environment, the physical facilities in the school, time available for performing the school tasks, communication patterns within the school and the nature of staff and students within the school.

3. Extra – organizational problems – these include; political, religious and economic constraints.

All the above problems affect the board members in carrying out their administrative duties in the various operational areas as follows;
2.3.3.1 Role and Challenges in Curriculum and Instruction- Policy implementation

This entails drawing and articulating the government policies on education in the school including curriculum & instruction. But as Allan (2006) observes; what influence do governing bodies have? i.e. how far do they shape strategic policy and detailed decision policy making in schools given the degree of autonomy enjoyed by head teachers and the externally imposed constraints such as lack of experience in engaging in such formal decision – making settings?. Magiri (2005) avers, he says; BOGs were not effective in articulating / implementing policies due to low academic qualifications among some members and manipulations by Head teachers due to ignorance and personal interests. Further, members had not read the legal document to know the mandate and only thought their role was to ensure school produced God-fearing students and loyalists to the political system of the day, he quips. He further adds, policy formulation and implementation posed a challenge to the BOGs. This is partly because policies are either school based or MOE formulated and required to be articulated correctly if goals and objectives of education are to be achieved. Board members also lamented that some head teachers do not guide them well on school policies. Others policies are made by MOE without a proper induction process in place- write Magiri (2005).

Mwiria (Daily Nation July 28th, 2004) attributed poor management to unqualified BOGs where majority were illiterate and do not have the capacity to plan and implement policies in their schools. Political interferences pose another challenge. It has been observed that there cases of self- interest and group interest that are political in nature in school organisations. Some BOG members are elected as members of a political party or appointed by the party in power. In such situations, the members form camps and lay plans that conform to their political affiliation. They
also vote as a block on issues. Each group or camp tries to control issues that are to be decided upon by the BOGs, he adds. Noll (1991) says that the control of education has wide range of political influences, the domain in which struggle for power and control belongs. Kenya Times (2001) avers and reports;

“The BOGs and school committee should be elected from personality who have foresight and are committed to their duty of advising PTA. They should NOT think of sitting allowance but be motivated by school academic progress, discipline and general infrastructure. “

Daily Nation (1999) also adds

“Many people have being blaming pupils and teachers for poor results in national examination in their areas. They accuse pupils of not working hard, teachers for not preparing the pupils well and themselves of not providing enough facilities in schools. However, the same people especially parents have failed to recognise the role played by BOGs and PTA in their schools. These are the people formulating and implementing policies in school”.

Sponsor interference is another challenge facing BOGs management in schools. Mwiria (Daily Nation July 28th 2004), says problems in management are exacerbated by PTA, BOGs and sponsors who continue to support unqualified persons to head schools and protect them even where there is evidence of misappropriations of school resources. The Kenya Episcopal Conference Report (1982) conveys sentiments of the Catholic Church that its influence in many of its sponsored schools has been grossly eroded and become little more than symbolic. The church demands increased representation in BOG appointment and claims that its rights and roles as the sponsor has been ignored. Kogan et.al. (1984) identifies the challenge of autocratic principals
who he argues influence the BOGs to the extent that the board may just be content to be kept informed of current policies and make occasional suggestions. The study pointed out that the principal may have a closer relationship with the board chairmen than with the majority of the governing body. This was found to demotivate and discourage the BOGs from active role participation in decision making. As such the study pinpoints autocracy, as being challenge to effective BOG functioning. Manipulation by head teachers due to their ignorance, and individual members’ personal interest and demotivation among members are other factors behind dismal performance, Wangai (2001).

Magiri (2005) asserts that members were not fully conversant with their roles as they were only explained to them by the education officials during the inauguration meeting. Moreover, they have not read legal documents to assist them. He further observed that DEO’s office had lean staff, making them delay the responses, and also failure to attend meetings for guidance and advice. This leads to members resolving some issues through trial and error methods, an aspect that has put the schools in constant collision with teachers, parents, students and trade unions. Some officers were also accused of corruption and lack of knowledge on some policies and guidelines. Heads of schools are still not transparent on some issues especially finances and students admission and usually give BOG members blackout, until when a problem arises like students unrests. This poses a bigger problem because there is mistrust between the administration and managers who should be working in harmony – Chabari (2007) adds.
2.3.3.2 Role and Challenges in Finance and Business management

The BOGs are mandated by the Education Act to audit and regulate expenditure by the school to ensure that all the income received by the school is applied for the promotion of the objects of the school. These statutes presume that members of the board are knowledgeable in law, human resource management, supply chain management, accounting and project management. Unfortunately these skills are not present in the managers and that is where the main problem in the management of public school lays- Stevens (1995).

In education, the financial management is concerned with the cost of education, sources of income to meet the education costs and the spending of the income in an objective manner in order to achieve the educational objectives - Okumbe (2001). He further said that areas covered under this task are:

1. Budget making
2. Securing revenue and

Rono (1990) and Mbaabu (1983), among other researchers observed that, it is generally agreed that the administrative activities in finance and business management are instrumental to the achievement of the major purposes of the school. This emphasized what Ozigi (1977:78) stated when he pointed out that;

‘No organization can survive or carry out its functions effectively without adequate financial resources at its disposal. Money is needed to pay staff, maintain the plant, and keep services going. In a school situation this is especially true, and in Nigeria particularly, education is a very expensive business… expenditure on education continues to rise as a
result of the rapid expansion of the system at all levels.’

In support of the foregoing, Mbiti (1974:114) stated that money is an obvious and important element for the success of any venture. In this connection, curriculum programs cannot be launched without the necessary funds to support them. This was further noted by Ochoro (1987) when he emphasized that the corner stone of any enterprise is the finance without which no program, however well planned can take off. It is therefore important, for any earmarked program to be properly budgeted for, ways and means sought for receiving funds for running the program.

It is thus a common understanding that curriculum programs cannot be launched without the necessary funds to support them. Rono (1990) observed that any expansion in school creates a need for more money. Consequently funds are always limited and therefore this becomes a challenge to the school boards. As was further observed by Mbaabu (1983), finance is always a serious problem especially with the 8:4:4 system of education which is practical oriented and which requires that science laboratories, home science block and workshops be built and equipped. Hence lack of money to construct and equip the existing laboratories poses a great challenge in dealing with school finances.

Most researchers have cited parental socio-economic status as a great challenge since most students from poor social economic backgrounds are unable to raise the required fees. As was noted in a paper on Improving School Effectiveness (1998), in schools where there were higher proportions of economically disadvantaged pupils, results for all pupils tended to be depressed / dismal. This was further supported by the Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (IPAR) (2003), where it was observed that the combined effect of poverty at the household level and the high cost of education coupled with reduced government expenditure on
secondary education, had resulted in inadequate provision of teaching and learning resources contributing further to deterioration of performance. As was pointed out by Prof. Saitoti during his speech in Accra Ghana (April 2007);

‘Secondary education is on a cost sharing basis between the
Government and parents, and poses affordability problems
since 56% of the population in Kenya live below poverty line.’

This poses a great threat and challenge to the institutional managers because as many researchers have emphasized, the cornerstone of any enterprise is the finance without which no program however, well planned can take off. In Kenya, Public Secondary Schools get funds from; governments grants (the free day secondary education fund) CDF / MOE bursaries, development partners e.g. NGO, CBO, Well wishers, Sponsors and the parents. However, bursaries allocated to schools cannot meet even meet a quarter of the existing school expenses - Mumo (2004) reports. Actually as observed by IPAR (Vol. 9.Issue 3, 2003) in its current form, the Ministry of Education Bursary Fund has not had the desired effect of enhancing; access to, retention and participation in secondary school education and thus the issue of finances remains a big challenge yet to be addressed in relation to dealing with provision of finances in schools -Mumo (2004) adds. Magiri (2005) pointed out that BOGs experienced problems in financial management due to the inability of the BOG members to manage financial matters properly. Most of the members lacked innovative skills to solicit for schools funds. Mwagiru (1988) states that; ‘many BOG members have their eyes on tenders’. He observes that chaos in schools have to a large extent been attributed to BOGs. He emphasized this point adding that in too many cases board members are incapable of making any useful contribution to the improvement of their institutions. Some BOG members use the board for personal gains. Many of the members lack sufficient
educational experience as far as academic, administration and financial matters are concerned – he adds. This argument is also supported by World Bank paper (2008) which observed; the BOGs are required to oversee the school management in general and school financial management in particular. The report further adds, PTA, created by the presidential directive in 1980, raises funds for school developmental activities / programmes but they have no legal authority and are basic volunteers who access quality education through various unorthodox means. They also lack access to vital document hence undercutting its ability to hold schools accountable.

School management therefore becomes complex due to the multiple sources of financing which creates multiple senses of ownership. The existence of governance structure does NOT guarantee effective operations; report the World Bank (WB) paper (2008). Instead the paper recommends;

(i) Clearly defined lines of authority, responsibilities and reporting requirements among all parts of the structure.

(ii) Clearly designated avenues to carry public voice to decision making authority.

In Kenya, PTA must rely on BOGs to convey their messages to Ministerial ladder. But BOGs, being politically appointed, may feel NOT compelled to take up the PTA calls. Yet if PTA are given great ability to make their voice heard, its members may be encouraged to participate with renewed energy – the WB report adds.

Chabari (2007) concurs, he says; Role conflicts between BOG and PTA poses a managerial challenge to secondary school boards of governors. Ministry of Education (1988) in the Report of the Education Administration Conference, held at JKUAT (21-25, April 1987) indicated that the overlaps in the roles and functions of PTA and BOG in secondary school management led to
managerial problems. The report further observes that the PTA has emerged as a main player in secondary school management and a competitor of BOGs in policy formulation and decision making. Over the years, PTAs have continued to compete for dominance and have gone as far as demanding school records and accounts and daringly adjusting school fees and development fee that have been set by BOGs. The conflict was mainly on the use of collected funds and especially where development priorities of the two bodies clashed. The Education Administration Conference report (1988) cited areas of operational conflicts as project formulation, design implementation, funding and interpretation of school policy and policy implementation. The report further notes that the conflict exists in that, whereas PTAs have no legal standing in school management BOGs have. Such competition and interference inhibit BOGs managerial functions in secondary schools - he quips.

(iii) Governing board members being selected on basis of their competence and commitment rather solely for political reasons.

Wangai (2001) avers, she observes that most of the board members do not measure for this task; they lack the financial prowess and others have vested interests in the procurement of supplies. This means they can be comprised and it exposes them to manipulation. Magiri (2005) too indicates that some Head teachers are not transparent in finances hence causing friction. A point also alluded to by Daily Nation (2004) which reported;

“Marsabit DC ordered some school BOG disbandment as they ran schools without bank accounts and flaunted accounting procedures. Most of them were illiterate and had being appointed for political reasons which made it easy for head teachers to manipulate many of them.”
2.3.3.3 Role and Challenges in Physical Facilities and Material Resources

Physical facilities refer to resources such as the classrooms, laboratories, workshops, special rooms (tuition areas), dormitories, dining hall and the grounds. While material resources refer to text books, equipment, stationary and all the essential teaching learning materials. In a school situation, the required facilities must never be taken for granted Mumo (2004) observes. Mbiti (1980:9) asserted that:

‘The question of equipment requirements demand that the organization possess not only what is necessary but also what is modern and up-to-date if good quality work is to be done.’

The emphasis according to Rono (1990) was the fact that any school aiming at high academic achievement must have not only well qualified teachers but also adequate facilities. On results of delaying essential facilities, Mbiti (1980:9) observed that:

‘When school equipment supplies are delayed, teachers cannot be expected to do their work properly. Poor teaching will lead to poor performance by the pupils in public examinations.’

He continued to assert that: ‘Poor administrative procedures in supplying equipment would result in poor quality work’. The BOGs therefore shoulders the burden of ensuring that the school is well equipped with the necessary materials for the well being of the program of their instructions.

It is sad to note that the provision of physical facilities in secondary schools remains far below the expected level. As pointed out by Prof. Saitoti (2007) demand for secondary education places continues to increase and lack of adequate classrooms is a major constraint. He further cited an overwhelming demand for more learning facilities especially in arid and semi-arid areas and in urban slums. Several studies have revealed that lack of adequate material and physical facilities like text books,
classrooms, laboratories, libraries and workshops pose the greatest challenge to the managers in achieving institutional goals and objectives. Further, Eshiwani in the Daily Nation of August (1987) in an answer to his own question ‘What makes a winner?’ cited regional disparity and lack of text books as some of factors contributing to poor performance in some schools. Mumo (2004) also reports; most institutional heads interviewed by Themanie (2006), Gichuri (2003), Wachira (1998), and Rono (1990), among others agreed that it had been quite difficult not only to procure essential facilities but also to maintain and repair existing ones. Lack of adequate funds was cited as the cause for this deficiency- Mumo (2004) wrote in his findings.

In Kenya, head teachers play an important role in the process of providing educational facilities in schools. The weekly Review (February 22nd 1991:3) indicated that the process of providing physical facilities in Kenyan schools had not been easy more so especially with the introduction of the 8:4:4 education system which has many demands in case of the required physical facilities. In relation to the demands raised by this system, the Standard Newspaper of October, 8th 1991, cited criticisms voiced by many people who had argued that the 8:4:4 curriculum had posed a great financial burden to parents and had made some schools, both primary and secondary not to teach certain areas of the curriculum due to lack of facilities. Njihia (1987:38) observed that head teachers experienced acute administrative problems as a result of limited physical facilities in their school, which adversely affected the effectiveness of instructional programs in the school. This was further supported by Kipkulei (1991) the then permanent secretary of the Ministry of Education, who pointed out that;

‘The schools with adequate physical and material resources
performed better in national examinations than those which lacked them. Hence school managers should ensure that they offer adequate facilities.’

Studies done on performance reflect that among the factors that led to poor performance in schools, lack of facilities ranked high. It is quite imperative that if a school is to perform as expected, sufficient classrooms, laboratories, text books and all the essential stationery should be available.

The persistent hunger for education after independence led to the increase in demand for secondary education places. The government thus resolved that the development of facilities and boarding cost will be the responsibility of local communities and parents ROK (1984: 151). The government realised that if this trend continues unabated, it will pose a management constraint to the ex chequer and hence a crisis to the BOGs in their management endeavour. It therefore introduced cost sharing which shifted the cost of education to parents as alluded in the GOK report (1988) which states;

“The growing demand for expansion of education and training at all levels and the corresponding higher costs have made it difficult for the government to finance education entirely from the budgetary provision without adversely affecting other areas of development. For this reason and in order to maintain the development and expansion of education and training there will be need to sustain and enhance existing partnership between the government, communities, parents, individuals and organisation in financing education and training” (G.O.K, 1988:15)

As Waweru (2005) observes, both the government and communities pursued the expansion of secondary school education aggressively. The government however, burdened by other concerns, delegated the management and development of
secondary schools to community through BOGs. But due to economic melt-down, communities rarely came-up with new schools. Rather, they inherited classes from the existing primary schools, and then forced the government to provide teachers and appoint BOGs to manage them. The problem is; the academic, professional and management skills of the BOGs were not emphasised. This has raised concern to the management capabilities of the BOGs members – he adds.

2.3.3.4 Role and Challenges in Staff Personnel Management

Managing the human resources available as a school is one of the most important tasks of school managers. Indeed the success of any school programme depends on how efficiently the school managers deploy these important resources for the best use of the school. In a secondary school, staff personnel consist of the teaching and non-teaching staff. The manager’s role under this operational area was summarized by Campbell (1971:162) as including:

- Developing personnel, securing personnel needed to man programs of instruction and pupil services; providing appropriate stimulation and encouragement to staff members as they work at their jobs; and appraising the performance of staff members in terms of their assigned responsibilities in the school system, policy formulation related to staff personnel, supervision and evaluation of personnel.

Appraisal of the teachers according to Campbell (1971:180) should be based on the work or performance of the teacher. He further argued that both the class teacher and the head teacher comprehend the teaching / learning process.
On the crucial role played by staff in the day to day running of the school, Campbell (1971:154) noted that:

To implement any of the programs… under curriculum development or pupil personnel, appropriate staff must be provided.

Among the challenges faced in this area, low morale amongst different staff was quoted as a major problem in most schools. This was revealed by studies carried out by Wachira (1996), and Gichuri (2003) among others – Mumo (2004) reports. BOGs are thus posed with a great challenge to motivate and develop staff so as to increase their morale. In a paper on Performance Management during a TSC Heads Seminar (2004), Mr. Makosi stated that, the provision of an enabling environment whereby employees were motivated to achieving a high level of productivity by focusing on tasks entailed in the job, provided for increased achievement, advancement, and a sense of personal work. He further observed that if the work itself was not a source of pride, the employees would never be motivated.

The school boards therefore have a challenge to provide this enabling environment to all workers in the school. They are therefore charged with the difficult role of creating harmony, promoting good staff morale and a climate conducive to good teaching and learning process within the school. They should be able to develop the staff fully so as to realize their maximum potential – Mumo (2004). As Okumbe (2001), put it,

‘Human resource development in education is the process by which educational managers identify, develop and effectively release the maximum potentials of employees for the benefit of both the educational organization and individual worker’.

As Bradley (1996) also observes;
“All schools want to be successful. However, what is success or what is effectiveness?. Even if a school is considered successful or not at a given time, conditions are constantly changing. ”

This is a challenge to BOG to continually review their human / personnel needs in order to keep a breast with changing circumstances if they are to realise any success. The current trend is for BOGs to carry out a ‘Staff Needs Assessment’-SNA-identify their UNIQUE needs and then mounts their own school based training programmes to redress such shortfall. The other duty expected of the BOGs is recruitment and disciplining of staff. Cases abound of irregularities in the recruitment process due to not only interference from outside but also incompetence on the part of the BOGs as Daily Nation (1999) writes;

“BOGs would prefer that teachers in their schools
be from their own area going to an extent where
language of communication is the local dialect.”

On this, Njathi.S.N (2005) proposes that BOGs be inducted on the selection procedures of teachers and be forced to follow this criteria (set by TSC) to overcome the above problem. Further, Head teachers as secretary to the BOGs be made to work outside their home area to reduce nepotism. Another major problem cited in many studies as posing a great challenge to school boards is inadequate staff. In relation to this, Odali (1984) noted that whenever a school was understaffed, the school managers would be faced with a big problem because some classes would stay without teachers and the available teachers would be overloaded and in the end they become ineffective. This would lead to poor performance amongst students and even indiscipline may arise because of idleness. Waweru (2005) too observes; the government provision of trained staff is slow which has further complicated the role
of BOGs in managing schools. The problem is further compounded by the TSC posting of problematic teachers to schools and then asks BOG to deal with them yet they have no formal induction on TSC Act, TSC code of ethics and TSC-COR.

In Kenya, securing and maintaining staff personnel has caused a great challenge to school boards, especially in Arid and Semi Arid (ASAL) regions, Mumo (2004) quips. In other regions some studies have revealed that boards may be faced with all sorts of problems. For instance, there may be a general shortage of staff in a community and all the BOG’s efforts to get the employer to give them suitable staff or even any staff at all may prove futile. On the other hand, there may be local pressures and politics, which discourage able staff and even force them to leave. Such problems pose a great challenge to school heads. As the World Bank paper (2008) reports; the governance structure and managerial processes entailed in requesting for a teacher (in shortfall) or in disciplining a teacher, limit the effectiveness of Kenyan school head (read board) to manage their teachers. Low staff motivation due to low remuneration and conditions of service also affect performance of BOGs in effective management of schools. The situation is further complicated by teachers union.

2.3.3.5 Role and Challenges in Students Personnel Management

Students are the key stakeholders within the school. They are the DIRECT consumers of the programmes in the schools and are therefore the performance indicator of the school and the Nation. This is well nested in the Government National Development Plan (NDP 1966-69) which declared;

“Education and NDP are so closely related in developing the country that it is almost impossible to speak of one without the other. Schools and colleges are developing human resources that will shape the pattern
of future national life” (ROK 1966; 305).

Education is therefore being seen as an economic vessel through which BOGs can formulate policies that will propel the student to work hard and wring out their optimum potential and latent talents. School, as a microcosm of the society i.e. a society in miniature should design pillars of value system – the school culture- that will nurture a holistic student who can meet the challenges of the macro society in strides and be beneficial to the community. The sum total of the entire processes in a school setting thus determines greatly the outcome of the inputs i.e. goods (and services) as depicted in the pictogram below.

Figure 2.1: - Input-Output Processes

This calls for a leadership which is focused for the good results to be achieved. Bradley (1996) agrees and points out that;

“The processes employed through management style, organization and leadership principles to foster school improvement can influence results.”
Managing the students effectively is therefore vital in the overall management of a school. As emphasized by Gakeri (1987), the pupil is the reason for the school’s existence. It should be borne in mind that whatever duties, tasks or roles that board members are charged with, the main concern and the immediate beneficiaries are the pupils. It is for this reason Mbiti (1980:53) asserted that:

‘The head master (School Board) is charged with the great responsibility of fostering the right atmosphere for the child’s growth and development. This is so especially if we recall that pupils in the school are assisted in growth and development not only intellectually but also as individuals in a holistic sense.’

The foregoing was further supported by Gakeri (1987) when she pointed out that all the operational areas of the school boards revolved around this holistic approach. In order then for the above vital task to be approached in the right direction, Okumbe (2001) stated that the head teacher (as board secretary) has the following subtasks to perform:

1. Guidance and counseling.
2. Discipline of students.
3. Scheme of discipline.
4. Student’s welfare and special services.
5. Students inventory, files and attendance.
6. Enrolment and participation, and
7. Appointment of students’ leadership system.

As revealed in many studies, major problems existing in this area relates to students’ deviant behavior manifesting itself in general indiscipline seen through mob actions, truancy and drug and substance abuse. In a Head Teachers’ Conference
(2003), Mr. Rono, the then Inspector of Schools said that: ‘Everything else minus discipline is zero.’ Discipline is therefore necessary for the success of any institutional programme. On the issue of discipline, Themanie (2006) noted that school boards had encountered many challenges trying to shape students who were already shaped by the society and contemporary issues. Such students did not want to listen to advice and many of them reacted against the discipline being enforced – Mumo (2004) quips.

Other problems in dealing with students personnel are related to family problems affecting pupils such as poverty among parents, lack of parental concern, single parenthood, divorce, orphanage as a result of AIDS epidemic and separation among others. The BOG is thus posed with a great challenge to ascertain that proper guidance and counselling is taking place.

Besides, while parents are quick to blame the school administration when things go wrong, they however shy away from practical involvement in the management of institutions, being contented to play the perfunctory role of paying school fees, electing PTA representatives and attending annual general meetings. Parent should instead get more involved and support the school administration in matters of enforcing discipline - Chabari (2007).

Stevens (1995) observes that incompetent boards are major source of discontent among students and parents. He therefore suggests that religious organisations which founded and continue to sponsor most public schools in Kenya get more involved by playing a complimentary role of guiding and counselling the adolescent students. Religious leaders exercise both temporal and spiritual authority and exert significant moral pressure on delinquent students to infuse behavioural
change. Presently they play a peripheral role in managing the schools that of appointing representatives to the school boards – he adds.

A number of challenges still come along the way as schools endeavour to promote good behaviour on the students. For instance, the enactment of the children Act has made education a basic human right. Within the Act, the learners are not supposed to be subjected to any form of stressful punishment or even expelled from school when their conduct is unbecoming. This compounded with bloated number of students in secondary schools as a result of FPE and FDSE has posed a management crisis to the schools. Magiri (2005) therefore suggests that to streamline management of the school, BOGs be mandated to deal with some issues with finality in consultation with DEB, e.g. students’ discipline such as in the case of arson, felony by fellow students, infamous conduct like lesbianism, homosexualism etc.

In Aug - 2011, the MOE also adopted and the Child Friend School (CFS) approach to provision of quality education in Kenya. The MOE advocacy for the CFS concept is pegged on the fact that it has as its core point of reference, the current and future best interests of the learning child and also provides a reasonably accessible language and set of dimensions for all who are responsible for children’s learning; from family to national policy makers to talk about what that means and how to do it. It aims at effectively pulling together the various dimensions of quality to make schools functional, the report adds. The CFS has FIVE components, namely: an inclusive child friendly school; a safe and protective school; an equity and equality promoting school; a health and nutrition promoting school and enhancing school community linkages and partnerships.
2.3.3.6 Role and Challenges in Promoting School Community Relation

This entails enhancing school community linkage and partnership i.e. the good general conduct of the school. The school being a social system is expected to interact well with the community and the environment around it. BOGs therefore act as a link between the school and the community. It is thus their prerogative to articulate the societal interests and expectations from the school as well as read the school to the community by way of elucidating the goals, motto, vision and mission statement of the school during open day, education day & chiefs barazas. In other words communicate the school to the society as alluded by Nyongesa (2007) who says;

“Communication is the art of giving and receiving information.

It is the art of telling someone something you want him to know”.

But as Allan (2006) puts it; whose interests do the Governing Bodies represent? Also given the today’s diversity, whose voices are heard most strongly? How committed are the BOGs in marshalling the interests of the community they serve? How is their attitude towards the school and the community? What is the relationship between actions of the BOGs and the quality of service rendered or provided by the school? i.e. how is quality defined by different stake holders? What sort of stances and actions by BOGs enhances quality? He adds.

It is important to address these concerns because as Allan (2006) portends; governors are conceptualized as occupying a bridging role between three the different ideals, namely;

i) Perform managerial, monitoring and evaluation role to maintain standards.

ii) Acts to transform national policy into relevant and appropriate local change.

iii) Democratically represent the local people and what they want done for their school.
2.3.4 Role confusion

Obat (2007), quoting from Kogan and Huston’s detailed study on the operations of Governing Boards in 4 local education boards in Britain, found out that role confusion was rampant among members of the GBs who displayed widely varying purposes in behavior and performance. This emanated from uncertainties of purposes, legitimacy power and professional – lay relationship. Because of the above uncertainties, they concluded that GBs lacked identity and a sense of their own mission. Allan (2006) concurs and reports that; despite the relatively cosy impression which the governing bodies may present, all is not well as the following problems emerge, viz;

- The balance between challenges and support.
  In principle, the GBs should hold Head teachers accountable in ways that help to improve performance of the schools but in practise this is NOT always the case. Most commonly, the governors feel ill equipped to challenge the professional judgement of Head teachers and hence prefer to see themselves as supporters, he quips.

- The balance between strategy and management.
  In principle, GBs are responsible for the strategic over sight of the school, leaving the day to day management of the school to Head teachers. In practise they feel unable to chart a strategic direction without the detailed professional knowledge of Head teacher, wrote Allan.

Gitura (2007) avers and reports that several factors still inhibit the effective performance of the BOGs in Abogeta Division in Meru as depicted by the poor performance in KCSE exams, staff and students indiscipline, run down facilities etc. The factorial causes include; parents not supporting the BOGs by introducing local politics, low exposure of board members who may have been selected through other
reasons other than merit hence posing problem of incompetence and low educational standards thus hampering BOG effectiveness. According to Danzberger-Obat (2007) wrote- Board members in USA also received little training for their role and that 2/3 of them had no established process of evaluating or monitoring the board’s role.

Following this revelation, it is clear that BOGs require preparation and training for the enormous work ahead of them in school’s management. It would be pathetic to learn that some members sit on school boards without making any significant contribution due to lack of knowledge about legal procedures and policies that guide management - Obat adds. Allan (2006) too alludes to this, he quips;

“Much research has demonstrated that the quality of education depend primarily on the way schools are managed more than on the abundance of available resources and that the capacity of schools to improve is strongly influenced by the quality of leadership provided”

The WB (2006) paper reports; in recognising the need for an effective leadership, a number of countries have organised leadership training programmes to equip the school governors with vital leadership skills. In England and Wales, the training is sponsored by National Governors Association and Governors Wales respectively, while in SA, the South African Department of Education have designed leadership training programme for secondary school heads and governors in recognition of their importance in improving education quality and are accredited courses for this purpose. In Senegal, the School Improvement Plans (SIP) created in 1996, encourage entrepreneurial skills for Head teacher’s and governors to help find funding for school projects that enhance educational quality training on academic and administrative leadership.
In Kenya, secondary school heads and governors also need to be trained for they lack the “analytical skills” to know how to interpret the data they collect and transmit to the DEO – WB paper adds. The MOE continues to employ archaic techniques in the administration of educational institutions. The tools for management and evaluation of public institutions have remained static for a long time despite the rapid technological, socio-cultural and economic changes in the country. In response to this, the MOE (Daily Nation, Aug 25th, 2011: 37) through KESI, launched a free Diploma in Education Management course for Head teachers to equip them with requisite skills that will help them manage schools properly on behalf of the board. The Minister for Education stated that the Diploma program will equip school heads with knowledge and skills vital for improved service delivery at schools and consequently contribute to better resource management and child friendly schools. The director KEMI added that; the diploma in education management will help school heads implement management policies, procedures and reforms in the education sector properly and also utilise modern management tools e.g. ICT in their schools. They will also develop the necessary leadership skills required in the contemporary education sector. TSC- Secretary also observed that; effective and efficient management of schools is of great concern to the commission and the public as it inevitably affects the level of education standards. Further, managers are entrusted by the government with devolved funds for FPE and FDSE as well as many challenges facing operational environment in our schools – he added. Indeed, as DN (Nov, 16th 2011: 13) observed, the successful integration of technology and the push to make education more relevant in the 21st century requires teachers with the right competencies, values and attitudes.
2.4 Summary of the Related Literature

In the first part of this, chapter the researcher reviewed related literature on: Management concepts and their relevance / application in managing education; School governance focusing attention on recruitment of board members, role of BOG in managing schools as well as challenges encountered. From the foregoing, it is evident that secondary school management by school boards faces a host of challenges across the countries, developed or developing. These challenges range from political interference, role confusion, lack of power to implement their decisions, poor administration orientation to cases of self interest vis-à-vis group interests. These challenges stem from the complicated nature and the strategic position of secondary schools in society.

The report of “The Task Force on Discipline and Student unrest in secondary school in Kenya” (2001) summed up the challenges facing BOGs in the country and categorically indicated that some of the problems of management emanated from the role the BOGs play. The report summed up the challenges as unnecessary political interference, lack of responsibility / commitment to the job, low education background, vested interest, some members serving in several boards, some head teachers sidelining some BOG members as well as BOG / PTA funds conflict. The task force report further observed that the appointment of unqualified, incompetent, and non-committed members compromised quality management and academic standards in the majority of secondary schools in the country. However, the education Act (1968) that created BOGs is silent on the calibre of the members. Also, there exist different legislation provisions that govern management of educational institutions. Such scattered and uncoordinated pieces of legislation fail to provide for the effective management of the country’s educational institutions.
Although several studies have been done on BOG’s management of secondary schools, none has been carried out in these operational task areas as managers in public secondary schools in Taita District. Also no study known to the researcher has been carried to determine the extent to which the co-opted PTA members impact on the BOG’s effectiveness. Besides, the study seeks to unravel if learners and teachers inclusion into the Board is feasible in Kenyan situation. Also the mode of nominating the board members and giving the sponsor the privilege to nominate the chair could be hindering effectiveness. Is it not time other approaches are adopted e.g. election of Board?

This study was thus carried out to fill these gaps that have been left by many researchers.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter comprises the methodology and research procedures that were used in obtaining data. The chapter covers the study design, locale and population, sampling design, data collection and analysis.

3.2 Study design

The study used a descriptive survey of the challenges BOG members face in their managerial roles of secondary schools in Taita District. The study employed this research design because in descriptive surveys, no variables are manipulated and the researcher just reports the state of affair as they are in the field. Besides, it is also used in preliminary and exploratory studies to allow the researcher to gather information, summarize, present and interpret information for purpose of clarification. In other words, this kind of design is concerned with gathering facts and obtaining pertinent precise information concerning the current status of phenomenon and whereas possible making conclusions from facts discovered or generalization of statistics that results when data is abstracted from a number of individual cases.

3.3 Study locale

The research was conducted in Public Secondary Schools in Taita District, Taita / Taveta County. The District boarders: Taveta to the West, Mwatate to South and Voi to the East. The following reasons informed the choice of the District for the study:
i. Accessibility and peculiar problems related to the study. The study was intended to establish the administrative challenges facing BOGs in the management of secondary schools.

ii. Financial and Time constraints. The District is home to the researcher so accommodation was guaranteed at no cost.

iii. No such study had been conducted in the District hence the need to fill the gap.

3.4 Target population

The study targeted all BOGs and Head teachers of the 15 public secondary schools in the District. The District has: 2 Provincial Boys and 1 Provincial Girls School Full Boarding; 1 Provincial Mixed Day & Boarding Secondary School; 2 Districts Mixed Day and Boarding Secondary School; 9 Districts Mixed Day Secondary Schools.

The following were therefore included in the survey:

a) BOGs; a total of 195 (i.e. 13x15) BOGs.

b) Head teachers; a total of 15 Head teachers were captured in the survey.

3.5 Sampling design and Procedure

Sampling is a process of selecting a subset of cases from a larger population in order to draw conclusions about the entire set. In practise, a minimum of 10% for a large population and 20% for a small population in survey research is considered a good representation.

3.5.1 Sampling procedure

In this study; stratified sampling was used to stratify /classify schools as provincial or district schools, purposive sampling was then used in each classification
to ensure unbiased distribution within the District, and then random sampling was finally employed to select the 5 BOGs members out of the 13 BOGs in each selected school.

3.5.2 Secondary Schools:
8 public secondary schools; 1 pure provincial boys’ school, 1 pure provincial girls’ school, 1 mixed provincial school and 1 mixed district boarding day and 4 mixed district day secondary schools.

3.5.3 Respondents:
5 BOGs members out of the 13 BOGs in each of the 8 selected schools were involved; giving a total of 40 BOGs which translated to 20.51% (40/195x100) of the total BOG’s population.
8 Head teachers; providing over 50% of secondary schools head teachers which is well above the percentage proposed above in the study.

3.6 Research Instruments

Questionnaires were used as the only instrument in this study because of limited time and financial implication. Abagi (1995) quips, questionnaire is the most common instrument for a survey research; it is straight forward and less time consuming for the respondents. Questionnaires are also preferred because they are said to give comparative information as they are uniformly framed- Borg and Gall (1989). In addition, the respondent remains anonymous to the researcher and has more time to think over the questions which may result in a more honest and meaningful answers. The researchers used two types of questionnaires:-

- Questionnaire for Head teachers.
- Questionnaire for BOG members.
3.6.1 Questionnaire for Head teachers

This questionnaire was broken into three subsections, namely:

- The demographic part which entailed the head teacher’s general information.
- Management part which addressed pertinent issues regarding school management.
- Challenges head teachers face as secretary to the BOGs.

3.6.2 Questionnaire for BOG members

The BOG’s questionnaire was also subdivided into three sub units, i.e.:

- The first part on general information regarding a board member.
- The second part was on pertinent issues concerning the board.
- Lastly, administrative challenges faced by the board.

3.6.3 Validity of the instruments

Borg et al (1989) stated that validity is the degree by which the sample of the test items represents the content the test is designed to measure. This study employed content validity, which was a measure of the degree to which the data collected using a particular instrument, represented a specific domain of the indicators or content of the particular field.

Besides, the validity of the research instruments was also established by seeking suggestions / opinions of the experts in the field of study especially the researcher’s supervisors in the Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), the usual procedure in accessing content validity of a measure is to use a professional or expert in the particular field.
3.6.4 Reliability of the instruments

Reliability is the degree to which a test consistently measures whatever it is supposed to measure, Gay (1992). The more reliable a test is, the more confidence we can have that the scores from administering the test are essentially the same scores that would be obtained if the test were re-administered. A test re-test method was used in this study to estimate the degree to which the results obtained after a repeat were a measure of the accuracy of the same concept in order to determine the reliability of the instrument. The responses of the two tests were very similar / close.

3.6.5 Piloting

Pre-testing of the instruments was conducted on a selected sample similar to the actual samples used in the study to validate the instrument. The practise of pre-testing the questionnaire is important because of the unclear directions, insufficient space to write the responses, wrong phrasing of the questions or inconsistencies which needs to be reviewed after piloting. One head teacher and 5 (five) BOG members were picked from one of the remaining schools and were used in piloting the two set of the questionnaires. The paper and basket method were used to randomly select the piloting school not included in the study sample.

3.7 Data collection procedure

The researcher obtained an introduction letter from the Chairman, Department of Education. He then sought a research permit from the Permanent Secretary – MOE - for authority to carry out the research. Finally he got the DEO’s introductory
authority letter to schools. He personally sent and collected the questionnaires from the selected schools.

3.8 Data analysis

The data was then analysed using the descriptive and inferential statistics in the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). The package was preferred because of its efficiency and ability to handle large amounts of data. It entailed; description of data according to responses; data analysis / processing of the data by calculating;

i. Measures of central tendency such as mean.

ii. Measures of variability such as range.

Different items that answered a given research question were grouped together and discussed together. The next step was; displaying or presentation of the analysed data using frequencies tables and percentages to establish the number of respondents falling within a certain item. According to Gay (1992), descriptive survey is commonly represented by use of frequency tables, graphs, pie-charts, means, calculation of percentages and tabulating them appropriately. Lastly was a brief discussion of the findings.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of the study was to investigate the challenges facing the BOGs in School Management in Public Secondary Schools, a case of TaitaTaveta. A total of 8 schools were used in the study; mainly 1 boy’s, 1 girl’s, 1 mixed day / boarding school, (all provincials); 1 mixed boarding / day and 4 mixed day secondary schools. The schools were selected using stratified random sampling technique. The Instrument used by the Researcher was Questionnaire; namely two type of questionnaires. Questionnaire ‘A’ was for Head teachers while questionnaire ‘B’ was for the BOGs.

The objective of the study was to investigate the effectiveness of the BOGs as the KEY players in the management of education in secondary schools. The study therefore aimed at achieving the following objectives;

1. To find out the challenges faced by BOGs in the management of Secondary schools.
2. To investigate how the challenges had impacted on the BOG’s performance.
3. To assess the strategies used by BOGs to redress these challenges.

The study thus covered the following areas: the demographic profile of the Schools and the BOGs, the challenges faced by BOGs in the six management task areas, the impact on the performance and strategies employed. The return rate was; all the Head teachers (100%) returned their questionnaires while out of the total of 40 questionnaires given to the Board members, 38 (95%) were returned. Lastly, the data analysed presents the items according to the manner in which they had appeared in the
questionnaires to avoid adulterating the contents and also according to research objectives.

4.2 Demographic Profile of Schools and BOGs / Head Teachers

The first concern of the study was to establish the schools situation and the personal profile of BOGs / Head teachers in terms of gender, age, academic qualification, experience and placement in the Board.

4.2.1 School Type

The category of the schools is presented on the Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of school</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Mixed Day</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Mixed/Boarding/Day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Girls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Boys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Mixed Boarding / Day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Category of Schools

The Table 4.1 shows that 50% of the schools were District Mixed Day while 12.5% of them were District Mixed Boarding and Day with only 25% being pure Provincial schools. That translates to a total of 62.5% of the schools being District Schools. In essence, that implied majority of the learners did not have access to the provincial schools which presumably had better facilities. This concurred with Waweru (2005) report which observed that both the government and communities pursued the
expansion of secondary school education aggressively. The government however, burdened by other concerns, delegated the management and development of secondary schools to community through BOGs. But due to the economic melt-down, communities rarely came-up with new schools. Rather, they inherited classes from the existing primary schools and then forced the government to provide teachers and appoint BOGs to manage them. Indeed this fact explains why the majority of schools were District schools in this study. (The problem was; the academic, professional and management skills of the BOGs were not emphasised which has raised concern to the management capabilities of the BOGs members).

On school founding bodies; the head teachers indicated that 50% were ACK sponsored while the rest were Catholic sponsored. That implied the schools had Christian foundation which was very ideal in inculcating Christian values to the students. O’Connor (1985) also alluded that, whatever roles board members perform, it is primarily their job to see that the staff developed pupils who are mature, alive and instilled with the spirit of service towards mankind spiritually, intellectually, morally, physically and socially.

Out of the schools surveyed, 12.5% of them had been in existence for between 16 to 20 years, 25% of them for between 21 to 25 years and 62.5% for over 25 years of age some running to almost 50 years. That partly could be the reason why some of the head teachers’/staff houses are dilapidated as reported in these findings.

On Head teachers’ houses; 50% (i.e. 4 head teachers) reported they were not housed while the other 50% were. Out of the 4 head teachers who were housed, 25% observed that the houses were below standard, 25% average and 50% rated theirs as good. For those who lived out of the school, they commuted to school either by walking; using ‘bodaboda’ means or by motor vehicles. Certainly that poses a great
challenge in the board management of the schools considering that the head teachers were the epicentre in the administrative execution of BOGs decisions at school. Of great concern would be the custody of the schools’ property when the head teachers left in the evening.

4.2.2 Demographic profile of BOGs / Head teachers

The initial intent of the researcher was to establish the composition of BOG’s in Secondary school in terms of gender, academic qualification, age and experience, placement in the board, schools served and professional qualifications. The data collected is presented in Table 4.2 to Table 4.9.

a) Gender composition of Board members

The gender composition of the BOGs including head teachers was as summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>BOG</th>
<th>Head teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>23.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Gender Composition of BOGs / Head teachers

About 76% of the board members were male while about 24% were female. A similar figure for the head teachers was also reported in which 75% of them were male and rest female. That was fairly below the Ministerial policy guidelines requirement that not less than one third of any composition of persons be from one gender. However, regarding marital status, all board members were married, while for the head teachers
87.5% of them were married and the rest single. That augured well with their position considering that as managers they needed to be good role models or managers right from their homesteads. Besides, as family persons, it also puts them in a better place to understand the dynamics of the students and human beings in general.

b) Age of BOG members and Head teachers.

The Table 4.3 shows the spread of the ages of the board members including head teachers.

| Age in years | BOGs | | Head Teachers |
|--------------|------|------------------------------------------------|
| f            | %    | f           | %     |
| 31 – 35      | 1    | 2.63        | 0     |
| 36 – 40      | 2    | 2.63        | 2     | 25 |
| 41 – 45      | 2    | 5.26        | 2     | 25 |
| 46 – 50      | 7    | 18.42       | 1     | 12.5 |
| 51 – 55      | 5    | 39.47       | 3     | 37.5 |
| 56 – 60      | 8    | 21.05       | 0     | 0 |
| 61 – 65      | 4    | 10.54       | 0     | 0 |
| Total        | 38   | 100         | 8     | 100 |

**Table 4.3: Age of BOG members**

From the data, only 5.26% of the board members were below 40 years of age while 71% of them were in the age bracket of 51 – 65 years of age. That could pose a problem of ‘generation gap’ between the managers and the students with regard to students’ likes and dislikes. For the head teachers, 50% were below 46 years of age meaning they were still youthful and could therefore relate well with these likes and dislikes of the young generation. Nevertheless, the spread still showed the board members including the head teachers were mature enough to handle issues in their institutions.
c) Academic Qualifications of BOG members

The researcher obtained the following data from the academic qualifications of the board members (and the head teachers) who responded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic qualifications</th>
<th>BOGs</th>
<th></th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O level</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Academic Qualification of BOG members

Of the 38 BOGs who took part in the study; 36.84% had O level certificate, 47.37% were Diploma holders and 15.79% had university degrees. The data also showed that 87.5% of the head teachers had university degrees. That meant all the board members were reasonably qualified to handle and articulate any issues in their institutions. They could act as role model to the learners.

d) Years of Experience in the Current School.

The years of service of the BOGs in their current stations were tabulated in Table 4.5. Out of the BOGs surveyed, 10.52% had served for about one year, about 21% were in their first term, 42.12% in their second term and a 26.32% were doing their third term. However, contrary to what Mumo (2004) had established in her study, none of the members in this study reported to be doing their fourth term. All in all, those in their third term could be approaching intellectual bankruptcy and could be a hindrance to new ideas from the newly appointed board members.
Table 4.5: BOGs Years of Experience

For the head teachers, the experience was spread through the respondents as shown in the Table 4.6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: BOGs Years of Experience

From the data, 62.5% of the heads had been in these positions for over 10 years with 12.5% of them having been in those positions for over 20 years. However, 25% of the head teachers had headed their schools for less than 6 years. The import of that was these heads had no enough exposure to make them master the art of the game.

Regarding the Job groups, all head teachers were Job group M and above which was in tandem with the ministerial requirement that all head teachers be above Job group M. The spread was 37.5% job group M, 50% job group N and 12.5% P. That also
indicated that their motivation from the employer was also reasonable and therefore they should be sufficiently motivated to work.

**e) Placement In The board**

The Table 4.7 shows how the various categories of the BOGs were involved in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in BOG</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary member</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Board Members Position in the BOG

The spread of the data shows each facet of the board members had participated in this study and therefore the views of each cadre of group were represented. The large representation in this study by ordinary BOG members (63.16%) was expected because in practise that was the group that is on the ground. Most chairpersons were professionals engaged elsewhere and in principle appeared mostly during full BOG meeting. In other cases, professionals were not even willing to be associated with schools that do not perform well in the exams. That left the board with semi-illiterate persons who brought in little or no innovation, Waweru (2005) reported, and thus kept conflicting with the principal as Daily Nation (1987) observed; “Schools with best facilities in Kakamega District were doing poorly because of disagreement between the board Members.” Besides, there were no set criteria enumerating the skills a person should posses to qualify for appointment to a board which negatively impact the government effort in provision of quality education. The service in the
board was also not well remunerated and consequently most professionals opted to stay away from it. The result was that most public schools were managed by old and unenergetic retirees or business people or the semi-skilled non professionals who were more often than not, erudite in elementary law and could not readily grasp the provisions of the education Act or the basic concepts in management of public finance, human resource management and organisational management.

f) BOGs Composition According to Interests represented in the Board.

The Table 4.8 captures BOGs awareness of the interest they represented in the boards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special interest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA nominee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Composition of BOGs members according to interests in the Board

Table 4.8 shows that the BOGs awareness of the groups they represented in the Boards was well spread. Only 10.52% of the members were not conversant with the composition of the BOGs. As it was in practise, the sponsor had the highest share of the board members (36.84%). However, as Stevens (1995) observed, apart from appointing the representative to board, religious organisations which sponsored or founded most public schools in Kenya still played a peripheral role in managing the schools. They should instead get more involved since they could play a complimentary role in guiding and counselling adolescent students. Religious leaders exercised both temporal and spiritual authority and could exert moral pressure on
delinquent students to infuse behavioural change – the report added. This is true especially today with the withdrawal of corporal punishment.

On qualities considered in the choice of PTA nominees; 36.84% reported interest in educational matters, 42.11% position in the PTA committee and in the community and 21.05% had No idea. That indicates some BOGs were not quite versed with criterion of nominating PTAs.

On number of meetings per year; 78.95% said thrice and only 21.05% said when need arose. Most schools thus endeavoured to hold the BOG meetings at least thrice annually as enumerated in the education Act. Regarding the number of days of notice of the meeting; 26.32% of the BOGs noted 1 week. However, 63.16% reported 2 weeks and 10.52% said 3 weeks. Majority of the board members were therefore notified within the stipulated period of 2 weeks which meant they had sufficient time to prepare for the meetings. On quorum, 63.16% reported they were able to raise the minimum numbers required to conduct business.

**g) Induction Courses of the BOG**

In majority of schools, BOGs had not attended induction courses on appointment. Only 28.95% male and 7.90% female had. However, all the Head teachers (100%) reported to have been in-serviced on some educational management courses. Some of the areas they had been trained are shown in Table 4.9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster preparedness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance &amp; Counselling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource mgnt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior admin management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety in schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: Educational Management courses for Head Teachers

The Table 4.9 shows some of the areas head teachers had been trained included; Financial management (62.5%), Curriculum management (50%), Guidance & Counselling (37.5%), Conflict resolution (37.5%), Disaster preparedness (25%), Stress management (37.5%), Safety in school (25%), Human resource management (25%), Senior management course (37.5%) and ICT (25%). The head teacher however, reported the following areas as requiring further training; Guidance & Counselling, Project proposal writing, Project management, ICT and Monitoring & Evaluation. All in all that implied head teachers had been adequately ‘capacity build’ to manage issues at school.

When BOGs were asked about in service training on BOG management roles: only 18.42% of them stated they had attended. While on BOGs knowledge of the legal documents they ought to have read; only 13.16% said they had read these
documents and rest, 86.84% indicated they had not with some who were not even aware. On BOGs role explanation during inauguration; 63.15% of the respondents reported not very well.

The greatest challenges that arose from the lack of knowledge of these legal documents were; BOGs ended up making improper decisions and even managed the school by crisis (hunch). They also had difficulty in articulating the legal implications of some of their resolutions and thus were prone to manipulation by some unscrupulous head teachers. Indeed some BOGs complained of their recommendations not being honoured by the DEOs / MOE. This is a potential management problem and could be an impediment to quality education. Daily Nation (1988) averred and pointed out that: “Incompetent Boards in Secondary schools --- contributed to poor education standard in Bungoma District”. Further, Obat (2007) added, it was pathetic to learn that some members sat on school boards without making any significant contribution due to lack of knowledge about the legal procedures and policies that guide management.

However, the relationship rating between Head teachers and BOG was rated as good by 87.5% of the respondents and 12.5% rated fair. The arguments by head teachers were: BOGs supported school programme, offered constructive criticism and positive contributions, were very cooperative and some offered innovative ideas. But as Allan (2006) quipped and rightly so, the GBs should hold Head teachers accountable in ways that helped to improve the performance of the schools but in practise that was NOT always the case. Most commonly, the governors felt ill equipped to challenge the professional judgement of Head teachers and hence preferred to see themselves as supporters rather than challengers. He further added, GBs were persons responsible for the strategic over sight of the school, leaving only
the day to day management of the school to Head teachers. In practise however, they felt unable to chart a strategic direction without the detailed professional knowledge of Head teachers. That poses a problem of a balance between ‘challenge’ and ‘support’ on the part of the BOGs.

**h) BOG Nomination and Appointment**

All schools under this study had an operating BOG which was well constituted. Also, all (100%) head teachers followed the laid down requirements on nomination of BOGs. Regarding the interests represented, all (100%) head teachers reported the three areas; Community, Special interest and Sponsor which meant the head teachers were well versed with their work. The head teachers also gave the following qualities to be considered in the choice of the nominees. Majority (62.5%) of the panel members placed emphasis on education, 50% integrity and interest in education while 25% professionalism. Professionalism was not very attractive as most of these professionals hardly picked up these appointments and those who did, seldom attended leading to lack of quorum. That fact was also attested by head teacher’s comment on BOGs taking up the appointment. The outcome was 50% responded YES and the rest NO. The response was these professionals were very busy and some spent most of their time out of the country hence failed to take up the appointments or show up for the BOG meetings.

**4.3 Challenges Faced By BOGS in Secondary School Management**

Mbaabu (1983) argued that it would be very naïve to imagine that board members would be able to carry out all the duties like providing instructional leadership, business, and custodial functions and among others carry out the role of school organization and management without experiencing some constraints. In
support of the variation of problems in various institutions, she further pointed out that, the problems experienced by board members in general varied depending on the school environment, the school tradition, the characteristics of the learners and the head teacher’s personality, his competence, his efficiency and effectiveness.

The researcher thus sought to establish the school’s situation from head teachers in order to identify the challenges faced by the BOGs in managing the schools. The researcher collected data from the Head teachers’ on the adequacy and condition of various resources, facilities and personnel. These were classified into:

- Curriculum and Instruction
- Staff personnel
- Physical and Material Resources
- Finance
- Student personnel
- Parent/Local community

The situation of each of these areas is as presented in this analysis.

4.3.1 Challenges in Curriculum and Instruction

The researcher was interested in establishing the extent to which the BOGs were involved in the curriculum issues i.e. policy implementation in the schools in such areas as setting schools objectives, provision of instructional materials and supervision of the curriculum. The findings have been summarised below.

a) BOG self-assessment on setting school educational objectives.

All the board members (100%) said they were involved in setting the schools educational objectives, 89.5% reported they did that at the beginning of the year while 10.5% did it at the end of the year. That response was also supported by all head
teachers (100%) who reported that they had been doing so at the beginning of the year. The meant the work plan for the year was well set as the year began.

b) Providing instructional materials and maintenance.

BOGs indicated that they equipped their schools with the requisite instruction materials for teaching / learning. However, that was not reflected in the performance as the student’s performance (average Mean Grade of Schools) taken over a period of 5 (five) years shows in Table 4.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean grade</th>
<th>Quality grades</th>
<th>Mean grade</th>
<th>Low grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10: Student’s performance (Mean Grade of Schools) for 5 Years

None of the schools in the study posted a mean grade of A (plain) to B (plain) over the last five years. Majority (62.5%) of the schools had at D+ (plus). Only 12.5% had a B-. That is worrying trend considering that the national examination (KNEC) qualifying grade is C+ (plus). That implied that only 12.5% would qualify under the grading system.

The BOGs stated the following for the dismal performance: Parents were not paying fees promptly and the disbursement of the government FDSE funds to school
was always late and also inadequate. That led to insufficient funds to supplement the scarce material resources and equally delayed the acquisition of those instructional materials. The other reasons were; loss of books by students and the difficulty in recovering them especially for the leavers and those who dropped out of school. Surcharging them became even a problem because most of the learners were unable to pay fees. The point wringing out from these responses was; the instructional materials provided were not only inadequate but were also availed late. That would certainly affect the learning process as these instructional materials might not be at hand when the teachers needed them for planning, and the learners for reference and revision purposes. That situation if not properly checked could actually cause the students not to perform well. Mbiti (1980:9) concurred and quipped that:

‘When school equipment supplies are not provided, teachers cannot be expected to do their work properly. Poor teaching will lead to poor performance by the pupils in public examinations.’

The head teachers too added the following responses on the dismal performance in schools in the District: 50% of them reported indiscipline among students, 25%; inadequate support from parents; 25%; unhealthy Boy / Girl relationships; 50%; lack of enough textbooks, 50%; generally weak students; 12.5%; lack of remedial teaching; 37.5%; lack of work motivation; 25% lack of syllabus coverage and 37.5% absenteeism due to school fees.

c) Ensuring actual teaching takes place.

BOGs gave the following responses: they lacked proper monitoring devices / mechanism as they were not experts in the area of teaching hence not able to understand everything; had difficulty in arranging meetings with teachers to confirm the extent of the actual teaching that took place thus relied on head teachers report. A
checklist of the curriculum supervision by the head teachers revealed the data shown on Table 4.11. From the data obtained, all head teachers (100%) made an effort to check teacher’s schemes of work (S.O.W). On lesson notes, 62.5% had NOT been checking these documents. The head teachers might therefore not be sure of what teachers delivered to the learners in class. The situation was further compounded by lack of head teachers to; do class observation (50%) and even checking the text book materials used by teachers (37.5%). In summary, supervision of curriculum and instruction was not adequate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th></th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
<th></th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers S.O.W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers lesson notes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing classroom teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion after Assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking textbooks used by teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help from QASO in terms of instructional supervision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11: Curriculum supervision of Professional Documents by Head Teachers

On supervision of actual teaching, head teachers gave the following reasons; Lack of adequate time as 87.5% for the Head teachers reported they were also teachers; while 25% of the head teachers complained of not having deputies; 37.5% stated HODs had big workloads while others 62.5% observed that the HODs were
BOG appointed hence lacked authority to supervise others and 37.5% reported teachers resistant to change.

d) Ensuring syllabus is covered on time.

On syllabus coverage by teachers, 84.2% of board members indicated that their teachers do cover the syllabus on time and rest 15.8% do not finish the syllabus (on time). BOGs reported the following as reason for teachers not covering the syllabus: Late reporting back of students from holidays which consumed programmed time more so in day schools; Low entry behaviour of students making it hard for the learners to be taught fast; Transfers of teachers because of promotion which created understaffing; frequent staff turnover of the BOG teachers which caused staff shortages; numerous absenteeism of the students which distracted learning and poor time management by teachers.

Those who covered the syllabus employed the following strategies: Team teaching; created extra classes in the morning, afternoon, evening (preps where possible) and Saturdays; used remedial classes and Holiday sessions and proper time management. On Syllabus coverage from the head teachers 75% reported they do and only 25% do not finish the syllabus. Head teachers observed the following for lack of syllabus coverage: late enrolment in form I (one), inadequate programmed time (by KIE) and poor time management by teachers; teachers illness and teachers attending workshops / clinics – reported by 37.5% and another 62.5% felt the slow learners made it difficult for teachers to move fast and hence dragged others behind. Still 25% observed that the indiscipline cases of students took quality time resolving them.
e): Categorization of Instructional Leadership Style.

The head teacher made the following observations regarding their leadership style; Democratic, Authoritative and Laizzesfairre each 12.5%, a blend of all the three 50%, Open door policy 12.5%. The reasons they advanced for these choices were: It created a balance for all and allowed employees to report freely to the Head teacher. The challenges they faced in these instructional leadership style included; 37.5% complained that follow ups were a problem due to lack of time in the laizzes fairre style; 25% said the leadership style called for frequent meetings which consumed time in the democratic type and another 25% met resistance by teachers /staff especially the authoritative one.

The head teachers further observed that most BOG members were laypeople on school management practises so they could not give good / sound advice on this issue. Moreover, a majority of the BOG members were not fully conversant with their roles as they were only explained to them by the education officials during the inauguration meeting. That coupled with the fact that they had not read the legal documents to assist them could pose a serious problem in their management of this task area. Magiri (2005) averred and observed that; BOGs were not effective in articulating / implementing policies due to low academic qualifications among some members and were manipulated by Head teachers due to ignorance and personal interests. Further, BOG members had not read the legal document to assist them.

4.3.2 Challenges in Human Resource (Staff) Personnel

Managing the human resources available at school is one of the most important tasks of school managers. Indeed the success of any school programme depended on how efficiently the school managers deployed these important resources
for the best use of the school. In a secondary school, staff personnel consist of the
teaching and non-teaching staff.
The manager’s role under this operational area was summarized by Campbell
(1971:162) as including:

   Developing personnel, securing personnel needed to man
   programs of instruction and pupil services; providing
   appropriate stimulation and encouragement to staff members
   as they work at their jobs; and appraising the performance of
   staff members in terms of their assigned responsibilities in the
   school system, policy formulation related to staff personnel,
   supervision and evaluation of personnel.

The staff situation in schools, their motivation and challenges were areas of concern
to the researcher in this study and have been captured below.

a) Staff Situation in Schools.

   All the BOGs (100%) reported they had shortages in their schools with some
schools having a shortage of as much 8 (eight) teachers in their schools. That is a big
shortfall considering that a shortage of 8 (eight) teachers was almost the population of
teachers in single stream which stands at nine as per the curriculum based
establishment (CBEs). The affected schools thus had to employ BOG teachers with
their meagre revenues. Besides, what that meant was syllabus coverage was not done
altogether or was done haphazardly as most of these BOG teachers had high turnover
since majority of them were waiting for posting elsewhere or to go to colleges. The
most affected thus were the learners as they had to make do with the prevailing
circumstances. Certainly that also greatly affected how they performed. Indeed, on the
crucial role played by staff in the day to day running of the school, Campbell
(1971:154) noted that: ‘To implement any of the programs... under curriculum development or pupil personnel, appropriate staff must be provided’.

In relation to that, Odali (1984) also observed that whenever a school was understaffed, the school managers would be faced with a big problem because some classes would stay without teachers and the available teachers would be overloaded and in the end they become ineffective. This would lead to poor performance amongst students and even indiscipline may arise because of idleness. Waweru (2005) too observes; the government provision of trained staff was slow which had further complicated the role of BOGs in managing schools. However, worthy noting, majority of schools in this study also had more male teachers (60%) than female. That could impact negatively on the girl child as most of the role models were male teachers.

(b) Staff Shortage in Subject Areas

The head teachers were asked to indicate subject areas which had teachers’ shortage and the responses were shown in Table 4.12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English / Kiswahili</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths / Phys / Biol / Chem.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE / History /Geography</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; B/Studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12: Staff shortages in Subject Areas

The worst hit subjects were the ‘applied’ (i.e. Agriculture / B/studies) with a short fall of 30%, followed by the Humanities and Maths & Sciences at 25% and languages, 20%. The shortages especially in the applied subjects negate one of the
fundamental principles of the current system of education mainly to equip learners with the lifelong skills. The learners therefore exited the school system having been not well equipped with these essential survival skills. In totality, all the subject groupings had shortages which affected the teaching / learning process and consequently performance.

(c) Staff houses situation.

On staff houses situation; 25% of the board members reported that they had only a house for head teacher, 37.5% said the houses were not enough for all staff teachers and thus teachers had to reside out of the school and another 37.5% stated that the schools had no houses at all. The biggest effect of that was the unavailability of teachers to students since the teachers stayed out of the school compound and some lived very far. That denied the students enough contact time with the teachers as the teachers left early to cover the long distances. This has contributed to wastage of useful time resulting to inadequate / lack of syllabus coverage. Regarding the rating of these houses where they were available, 66.67% of the BOGs reported they were not up to standard and probable then not attractive to the teachers.

(d) Staff motivation

Head teachers (62.5%) reported that their staff were fairly motivated while the rest 37.5% stated their teachers were well motivated. The staff fair motivation was due to the dismal students’ performance and the not so good working conditions e.g. lack of staff houses and staff shortages hence big workloads the head teachers reported.

Asked if the boards had conducted School’s Needs Assessment –SNA- at school level to establish their staff needs, only 50% of the heads reported YES and gave these reasons; to determine the terms of service of the BOG employees, to
recommend the staff for seminars / workshops and for upgrading and motivational purposes. That was also supported by all board members who reported that they encouraged their staff to attend seminars / workshops. In addition, 86.84% of the BOGs stated they recommended their staff for promotions. That should inspire the staff to work hard with zeal.

On remuneration and termination of service of the non-teaching staff, 78.95% of the Board members indicated it was done by the government and only 21.05% reported it was done by the BOGs. That showed that only about a fifth were aware of the right procedures posing a big management problem as it exposed the members to manipulation by unscrupulous heads. On monetary motivation, BOGs reported they did not do that because of inadequate funds and also they had no approved vote head for such motivation. That could easily demoralise the teachers out to give their best especially under those stringent conditions of shortages of staff. That posed another challenge to the board.

e) Recruitment of staff

The composition of the recruiting panel as reported by the board is as shown in Table 4.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy principal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA chairman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13: Recruiting panel
In this study, 97.36% of the BOGs indicated they were involved in the recruitment of the staff (teachers and non-teachers) and only 2.64% reported they were not. The data also shows that the spread of the BOGs awareness about the persons involved in the recruitment exercise was quite good. On fairness of the exercise, the BOGs gave the following steps that were under taken to achieve it: advertisement, application, short listing, interviewing, recruitment and employment. None of the board members reported any interference from politicians or sponsors. This is contrary to similar findings by Njathi (2005), in which the selection panel was so skewed to a point where the board members practised nepotism to a level that they would even want to recruit a staff from their own ethnicity.

f) Discipline:

All BOGs stated they were involved in the discipline of staff and students. Their involvement included; discussing such discipline problems in meetings and recommending the type of punishment to be administered mainly; Suspension, Interdiction and Recommendation for expulsion (though outlawed).Some of the difficulties they encountered were: Parents sided with their children and interference from members’ unions.

In general the following challenges were encountered in staff management: maintenance of the high motivation / expectation of teachers with the prevailing financial constraints, meeting the pay rise and payment of salaries for non-teaching staff, inadequate personnel for various departments, lack of their (staff) capacity to perform well and negative work attitude. The head teachers reported this; negative attitude of the students to education, low morale of staff caused by the dismal performance of the students, over enrolled classes and big workloads of the teachers;
poverty of the community that led to poor payments of fees, lack of skills / competence of some managers and the general lackadaisical attitude of staff.

4.3.3 Challenges in Physical and Material Resources

The situation of the school’s resources as indicated in Table 4.14. With the introduction of cost sharing by government GOK (1988), the burden of equipping the schools with physical facilities and material resources was then transferred to the parents / communities. However, it has had challenges with regard to acquisition, repairs and maintenance of the resources as was attested by the head teachers who gave the situation of the school’s resources as shown in Table 4.14 above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of resources</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Lacking</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet/Latrine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean water</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School playground</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Aids</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14: Resources in Schools
Most facilities were generally not available e.g. 55.56% of the BOGs reported their schools had no library, 28.57% had no staffrooms, 87.5% had no ICT and 55.56% had no adequate classroom text books. That, coupled with the large numbers of students in the schools (class rooms) presented a challenge in the content delivery or teaching / learning process and might explain why the performance was not good. Indeed, the head teachers stated that the effect of these shortages of facilities to the teaching / learning process was inexplicable as the available facilities were overstretched which affected the smooth learning. That had a net negative effect on the curriculum delivery/implementation process too, head teachers reported. BOGs further noted the shortages of the following facilities: Lab, Dining hall / kitchen, Hostels, Staff houses, Classrooms and Offices (HODs) and ICT lab. On materials resources, the BOGs named mainly; Revision books and Classroom textbooks.

Improvisation approaches that the board had employed included: Use of makeshift Jiko / kitchens to prepare meals for the learners, especially lunch programmes for day schools, asked parents to make more contribution to supplement the material resources not availed by the school and use of other special rooms e.g. science rooms and book rooms for learning.

Because of the overuse of the limited resources, BOGs faced the following challenges in management of physical and material resources in schools; rapid tear and wear of these resources because of the overstretching them, parents overburdened financially owing to the additional levies to supplement the resources; Overcrowding in classes due to the bloated classes, frequent losses of books by students and the difficulty in replacing the lost books because of inadequate funds. All these posed enormous challenges to BOG school management because as Mumo (2004) observed,
in a school situation, the required facilities must never be taken for granted. Mbiti (1980:9) further asserted that:

‘The question of equipment requirements demand that the organization possess not only what is necessary but also what is modern and up-to-date if good quality work is to be done.’

4.3.4 Challenges in Finances

With the introduction of free day secondary education (FDSE), the main source of funds in school is the government. However, due to the rising demand for funds in schools, BOGs had devised other means of sourcing for funds as follows: levied school fees from parents; advised parents to apply for CDF / MOE Bursaries and also assistance from other well-wishers e.g. NGO. Nevertheless, this came with its own unique challenges as reported thus; majority of the BOGs (60.53%) had No idea about financial management and hence could not offer any sound advice to the institutions; some BOGs (55.26%) even thought schools finances were NOT the issues of the BOGs but rather they were a preserve of the school administration (read head teachers). For that matter, schools were to manage their finances independent of the boards they reported. Other challenges were: inadequate funds from the government and problem of the school fees defaulters that led to huge debts from parents. In fact all schools (100%) reported they suffered losses due to fee defaulting adding that it affected their payment to; creditors, BOG teachers and support staff as well as procurement of materials.

The head teachers were asked to indicate the proportion of parents who were able to pay (DEB approved levies) fees on time and responded as follows; only 25% of parents paid fees promptly. The remaining 37.5% paid after some time with a lot of coercion and the rest, 37.5% absconded. The proportion of those who absconded over
the years led to the huge fees debts to the schools. The challenge with that was the school ended up with a large number of creditors.

The reasons advanced for the defaulting were: 62.5% of the head teachers stated poverty and 37.5% reported poor priority to education i.e. the parents were not giving education a lot of priority. So it mattered not whether the students were in school or not, a fact that could explain the students’ absenteeism from school.

Board members were also asked to comment on any Income Generating Activities (IGA) in their schools and responded as follows; 65.79% of the BOG members reported they had NONE while 34.21% had. Those who had, named these projects as; Dairy farming and Green house farming and that the maintenance was done by schools through the Agriculture students. They said the income gotten was used in boarding equipment and stores (BES).

With funds from the government being not adequate and the parents defaulting in their fees payments, the head teachers were really faced with the daunting task of managing their schools with all those financial constraints. The effects of that as reported by head teachers were: 87.5%, it affected quality teaching and learning due to student’s absenteeism; 67.5% stated it created school creditors; 67.5%, stalled infrastructure development and 50%, slowed delivery of services. This was further emphasized by Ozigi (1977:78) who pointed out that;

‘No organization can survive or carry out its functions effectively without adequate financial resources at its disposal.

Money is needed to pay staff, maintain the plant, and keep services going. This is especially true in a school situation.
4.3.5 Challenges in Student Personnel

The student’s population was an average of 48 students per class in most schools. However, some classes had over 50 students especially the single streams. That is way above the bench mark of 45 students as stipulated by the Ministry. This certainly posed a big challenge in the management of the students in terms of behaviour, monitoring their attendance and equitable distribution of the meagre resources in schools. It was therefore understandable why the head teachers complained of bloated number of students and over stretching of the available facilities. The factors influencing enrolment were given as; limited availability of boarding facilities for those parents who sought boarding schools and the proximity of the day schools for parents who could not afford to take their children to boarding schools.

Some of the approaches head teachers used to mitigate the over enrolment included; Use of laboratory or dining hall for teaching; cramming many students in class or the use of computer laboratory. To go round the problem of student’s absenteeism, all (100%) head teachers used class registers to keep track of the absentees, 25% employed the use of subject attendance records while 12.5% used gate passes / leave outs. Regarding the proper keeping of student progress records; 75% used mark sheets / spread sheets, filing and report books and only 25% used ICT. That meant this ICT technology has yet to pick up in most of the schools possible due to financial constraints bedevilling the schools. To tame students’ behaviour and discipline, approaches used were; Guidance and counselling, use of peer counsellors and use of reward both positive and negative, Okumbe (2001). The other challenges experienced in students’ management were listed as follows: students were not ready to pick up leadership roles, limited contact time between teachers and students especially for day schools, problem of drug abuse, lack of being focussed,
absenteeism due to fees, peer influences especially for day schools, boy-girl relationships, indifferent attitude to learning and girl’s pregnancies.

The BOGs gave the following reasons for student’s unrest and moral decadence; Lack of being focused due to few role models in the community to inspire the learners, parental negligence, peer influence, negative media publicity / influence, lack or poor communication between students and administration, societal moral decay in which BOGs complained of some community selling drugs to learners, drug abuse among students and student’s laxity that led to students’ having an indifferent attitude to education. Other reasons advanced were; too many subjects being taught to students, lack of syllabus coverage in time to allow room for adequate revision, absenteeism of the learners due to poverty, lack or no serious participation of stakeholders in the school administration and teachers style of teaching (i.e. lack of preparedness) all of which demoralised the learners. The learners would then engage in these school unrests to vent out their frustrations. These arguments agreed with head teachers observations who reported; parents were not investing heavily in education of their learners (75%) while 62.5% of the head teachers also complained of poor parental guidance (assertiveness) / parent neglecting their learners, 50% reported inadequate teachers input, 75% poor student attitude towards education, 75% students not being focussed / had no goals and 62.5% of heads low supervision by QASOs. Others were lack of role models, general societal moral decadence, poverty in the community and students felt low self-esteem.

4.3.6 Challenges of School - Local Community relation

All the BOGs (100%) indicated that their school - community relation was very good. That was because the schools were founded on community basis (100%) through harambee spirit or church funding. However, the researcher was equally
interested in finding out the extent of the social vices e.g. bhang / cigarette and alcohol taking in the community and the pilferage if any. The BOGs were thus asked to rate the level of social vices around their schools and reported as on Table 4.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.15: Social Vices**

On these social vices, 63.15% of the respondents reported a rating of average and above average which is quite worrying. Asked to state the impact of the social environment on the student’s, the report was: it was infiltrating into schools and had increased cases of indiscipline in schools as well as caused students’ dropout. This should be a cause for concern given that schools are located within the communities. Besides, students being juveniles were bound to be attracted to these vices within their proximities and might be a pointer to the increasing student’s unrest and falling moral standards within the student’s fraternity. In deed BOGs noted that some community members were selling drugs to learners.

BOGs challenges in school –parent / community relation was; some parents had a negative attitude towards the schools. This was actually supported by report of the respondents on attendance of parents to school meetings in which 62.5% of the BOGs claimed schools had to impose fine for attendance while 12.5% said attendance was generally poor. Only 25% of the respondents said their meetings were usually well attended. Regarding the support from parents in the BOGs efforts to enforce
discipline among the students, the responses were: 44.74% of the parents were fairly supportive while 21.05% were not supportive at all. Only 34.21% reported parents were quite supportive. The head teachers also gave similar responses as follows; 50% of head teachers reported parents were fairly supportive while 25% reported parents took sides with their students. The remaining 25% said parents were quite supportive. This trend of support from parents is not very good as it might encourage students to misbehave in schools knowing that there is an 87.5% probability of getting a fair support or parents taking sides with them.

4.4 Impact of These Challenges on BOGs Performance

The various challenges faced by the BOGs in the Public Secondary schools management had also affected / influenced the way they governed the schools. For instance, BOGs lamented that they do not know their roles fully as they were not trained in school and financial management; besides, they had no of knowledge of the legal documents they (BOGs) were expected to have been versed with. For that matter, BOGs reported that; they ended up making improper decision or employed management by crisis and had difficulty in articulating the legal implications of some of their resolutions. The result was some of their recommendations were not honoured / revoked by the DEOs / MOE offices. Still on DEOs / MOE office, the BOGs complained of No regular inspection from these offices. The board members were thus forced to go by the assessment report from head teachers as they (BOGs) were not expert in these fields of assessment. Considering that head teachers were also overburdened with responsibilities, the assessment was left to the HODs most of whom were internally appointed and hence not confident enough to execute it efficiently. That meant that this key component of curriculum management was not
done effectively, indeed as was attested by Table 4.11 which puts BOGs performance / effectiveness to question.

The head teachers too listed the following impacts: 37.5%; delay in appointing new boards and 25%; delayed response to correspondence or delivery of information from MOE, 75%; inadequate supervision and assessment from education offices, 75%; TSC not providing enough teachers, delay in replacing transferred teachers and frequent transfers of teachers. Still 25%; of the head teachers complained of some BOGs were not being fully attentive in the meetings, 12.5%; sponsor giving no financial support to the schools under them instead sponsor ever asking schools to contribute to the diocesan / church kit.

Also arising from that lack of knowledge of the requisite documents, some BOGs engaged in conflict of interest in School Management. In this study, 37.5% of head teachers reported that BOGs had shown conflicting interest in the management of the school by wanting to meddle with the tendering of supply of foodstuffs and in the awarding of labour contract at school but the schools objected because that was against the law. On nepotism / patronage in BOG deliberations; 87.5% reported no while 12.5% said those cases were there.

The BOGs also put the following across as affecting their effective performance: Shortages of physical and material resources e.g. Lab, Library, Lack of support/good will from government office namely DEOs / MOE with respect to Staff shortages; Delayed remittance of the FDSE fund, Insufficient funds to run the schools; Inability to pay creditors due to the financial constraints bedevilling the schools and lack of income generating activities / projects. The end result was; schools were forced to survive on credit due to high cost of goods, inflation and
fluctuation of prices of most essential commodities making it harder to implement school plans.

Others were; Low academic performances of the learners making it difficult for teachers to complete the syllabus effectively; tedious procedures of disciplining TSC teachers; disciplined cases forwarded to education offices being sometimes revoked thus frustrating the efforts board members. Besides, some board members were busy and thus NOT available at times, hence the ones most available BOGs were retirees / or locals, intellectually bankrupt and with a lot conflict of interest. BOGs also reported that poor visionary leadership of the BOG members; Non-participation of key stake holders e.g. students, teachers, alumni of the schools, in decision making; Head teachers who are non-performers; Political interferences; Fees defaulting by parents and BOGs having no experience on institutional matters were hindrance to effective school management by BOGs. These challenges coupled with the BOG’s inadequate managerial skills, had made them manage schools in hunch or huff-huff manner i.e. trial and error approach.

Asked to comment on the effect of these challenges on their performance, the BOGs stated; it demoralized the members resulting to poor performance; BOGs members ended up failing in their roles; BOGs committee were divided especially by political interference; BOGs being: not able to provide the necessary materials for teaching / learning which led to poor results; not able to implement programs due to lack of funds; Leading to the stalled project hence shunning / tarnishing the name of BOGs;.
4.5 Strategies Used By BOGs to Mitigate The Challenges

4.5.1 Strategy to the Challenges in Curriculum & Instruction

The head teachers came up with the following suggestions to mitigate these challenges. For the syllabus coverage; teachers organized for more additional time such as creating remedial classes for such group like the slow learners and also sacrificed their personal time to give individualised attention to the learners. BOGs also exhorted parents to pay for the employment of the BOG / PTA teachers to fill in those who had left through natural attrition or transfers and had not been replaced.

Concerning curriculum supervision; BOGs sponsored the HODs for workshops /seminars for capacity building. However, TSC should confirm them to give them authority, head teachers added.

4.5.2 Strategies BOGs Employed to Manage the Material Resources

To meet the ever rising demand for places for secondary schools, schools had to resort to using make shifts rooms such as dining hall, labs, computer rooms and prefabricated class rooms for teaching and learning. Apart from that, BOGs have had to marshal parents to pay fees due to them to enable board members supplement some of these material resources needed. Prudent use of the available resources was also applied.

The head teachers proposed the following suggestions; 87.5% requested MOE/CDF to offer more infrastructure grants to school for expansion to accommodate the surging numbers of students seeking admission, 62.5% suggested Government increase the FDSE fund to enable schools purchase of more instruction materials, 50% wanted the PTA development levy to be increased and extended to cover maintenance and improvement, 37.5% said there was need to improve physical
facilities by sourcing funds from donors and lastly 25% suggested organising for harambees.

4.5.3 **Strategy to the Challenges of Staff management**

The head teachers gave the following as some remedies to the above: encouraged teachers to concentrate with the few students who were ready to perform; gave ‘group’ assignment to overcome the problem of ‘big’ class numbers and workloads; marked students work in piece meal to minimise delay in returning the assignments; Capacity build teachers to equip them with the requisite skills by seconding them to organised seminars and workshops; Applied TSC Code of Regulation & Ethics and BOG –Employment Handbook manual in dealing with discipline of staff and students and encouraged more persons to train in those areas with shortage of subject teachers.

4.5.4 **Strategy to the financial challenges.**

BOGs had the following strategies that they employed to go round the financial challenges: Sent students home for fees periodically; advised parents to pay the fees in instalments; prudent use of the available funds and organized for harambees / fund raising to raise funds for the schools’ projects. For head teachers, 50% of them advised getting bursaries from CDF, MOE, NGO’s and well-wishers, 87.5% proposed outstanding amounts being cleared before students accessed their certificates and 37.5% suggested breaking down the payment of the fees in instalment as per agreement with parents.

Other future suggestions were, schools initiate some income generating projects e.g. green house, crop and dairy farming; hire out of facilities such as sports field, school hall / bus to increase revenue; getting the right leaders with vision and marshalling for funds from well-wishers, parents etc.
4.5.5: Strategies to These Challenges on student’s management.

Head teachers reported the following; invited resource persons’ e.g. motivational speakers and professionals to speak to students; were more vigilant to the student’s behaviour, strengthened the Guidance and Counselling department, empowering the disciplinary committee and invited parents of concerned student(s) for (moral) counselling. Continuously counselled students on attitude change;

4.5.6: Strategies Used To Solve Challenges of School/Community Relation

BOGs encouraged parents / community to embrace their schools; talked to parents during AGM regarding being positive about their schools but also sought provincial administration help where social vices such as drugs taking / peddling were involved.

**BOGs further suggestions on possible solutions / strategies;**

BOGs recommended that visionary people in board who could solicit for funds from different sources should be identified. They also wanted parents to be committed to pay fees in statutory instalments per term. In addition, the board wanted the government to increase the FDSE fund to enable it meet demand for more physical facilities and material resources. On their part, the BOGs proposed that they should be trained / inducted on managerial skills to make them manage the schools more effectively. The head teachers’ too concurred and reported that; BOGs should be inducted /trained when appointed and taken for refresher workshops regularly to refine their management skills .i.e. capacity build them. Another suggestion from the head teacher’s was appointment of BOGs be made from competent people with requisite professional skills, academic qualifications and knowledge of some school management issues as was proposed by GOK (1988).
However, the BOGs wanted to be more empowered to discipline teachers at school level i.e. handle some discipline issues with finality and that politics should also be delinked from BOGs duties, they further proposed.

On BOGs suggestions on persons to be included in the board; they named the following; 68.16% proposed students, 18.42% businessmen, 28.95% NGOs, 50% Alumni of the schools, 65.79%; Teachers and 13.15% Nonteaching staff. That almost tallies with the situation in Britain, South Africa and Senegal who had co-opted teachers, students as well as non-teaching staff in their governing bodies. Asked to comment on the inclusion of teachers and students as board members, BOGs gave the following remarks: 86.84% reported it was a brilliant idea, because they were core persons / executer in the education system. Students on the other hand would also have room to positively criticize the school management and also proffer their suggestions. From the head teachers, the remark was equally impressive as 75% of them reported it was a very good idea in that it created ownership and facilitated / enhanced implementation of policies at school. They were actually the key stake holders in the school, the grouped added. However, 25% said it should be not recommended. On head teacher’s opinion on the co-option of PTA members: The response was; it was also a very good idea since they represented parent’s interest in school management. In addition, parents contributed heavily to the development of infrastructure and academic progress of the school, the head teachers added. If that comes to happen, it will be in realise the government report-GOK (1976) which had also recommended the involvement of sponsors, parents, teachers and various governing bodies in secondary schools management and was viewed as a move towards improving efficiency of educational institutions. The government intention was to enhance efficiency of education management by increasing the capacity,
responsibility and accountability of secondary school boards for funding arrangement and management. The secondary school boards therefore have a crucial role to play in the school management.

The head teachers’ response on the sponsor’s privilege of picking the chairperson of the BOGs was; 75% claimed that mode reduced the chances of a better person being elected. They thus wanted the BOGs to have the free will to elect their own. However, 12.5% felt it was alright while the rest (12.5%) were non-committal. Asked to comment on the election of BOGs as opposed to selection by a panel; 62.5% of head teachers highly opposed it saying it would lead to election of sycophants and hecklers who wielded a lot of powers while 50% reported it was not effective because popularity was not leadership. Regarding who else should be included 37.5% of head teachers responded the inclusion of youthful person to the board and the 25% inclusion of a parent.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the findings of the study on challenges faced by BOGs in public secondary school management. It also provides discussions and conclusions drawn together with the proposed recommendations of the study based on the following research objectives.

a) To find out the challenges faced by BOGs in the management of Secondary schools.

b) To investigate how the challenges have impacted on the BOG’s performance.

c) To assess the strategies used by BOGs to redress these challenges.

5.2 Summary

The purpose of the study was to investigate the challenges facing the BOGs in School Management in Public Secondary Schools a case of Taita Taveta. A total of 8 schools were used in the study; mainly 1 boy’s, 1 girl’s, 1 mixed day / boarding school, (provincials); 1 mixed boarding / day district and 4 mixed day district secondary schools. The schools were selected using stratified random sampling technique. The instruments used were questionnaires: for Head teachers and for the BOGs. The data that was obtained through the research questionnaires was then analysed through simple descriptive statistics; mainly frequency tables and percentages. The study covered the following areas: the Demographic profile of the Schools and BOGs (including head teachers) and the challenges faced by BOGs in the management task areas.
5.2.1 Summary of Research Findings

The analyses of the data enabled the researcher to come up with the following findings based on the following themes;

a) Demographic profile of the BOGs / head teachers.

i) Gender composition, academic qualifications and years of experience.

The research findings indicated that majority of the BOGs were male which contravened the ministerial guidelines that required at least one third to be from a given gender. All were however, married with the level of education being ‘O’ level and above such that some were diploma holders and others graduates. That reflected the presence of learned persons in the boards conforming to the ministerial policy guidelines which required board members to have a minimum of form four level of education.

Majority of the secondary head teachers too in this study were male. On marital status, majority of them were also married and all were above 35 years of age. Out of those who responded, majority had university degrees and the rest diplomas but all were trained professional teachers. Most of them had been head teachers for more 10 years with some of them being very senior head teachers at job group P. All the head teachers have had some training on education management. Besides, all the schools in this study were church sponsored having been in existences for more than 15 years and with fully operational Board of Governors.

Majority of the BOGs were aged over 40 years with some of them being over 56 years, possible retirees. Out of that a good proportion of them had been in the schools for a period ranging 4 to 9 years. That implied the BOGs were doing their second and some their third term in the same station. The danger was a person might become
intellectually ‘senile’ of new ideas and even become a barrier to change. The problem however, lied with Education Act with is silent on the number of times a member is to be reappointed to the same board and certainly that ceiling needs to be defined. To compound the problem, some of the board members serve as BOG members in other schools. The Task Force Report on the students’ indiscipline and unrest in schools (2001) observed that the practise made Board members ineffective.

ii. BOG Nomination and attendance.

The nomination exercise of the Board members was fully attended by the DEO, area MP, Chief, Councillor and the Sponsor. Some of the qualities considered during the nomination exercise were; education level, interest in education, integrity, personality and professionalism. To make the board be more inclusive however, both head teachers and BOGs agreed overwhelmingly that there was need to rope in the students and teachers as board members considering they were the key consumers of the resolutions of the Board. The BOG went even further to suggest the inclusion of also the alumni’s of the schools, NGOs to create ownership as well parents who should be brought to board through nomination and not co-option as they were the main financiers. If that came to happen, then it would compare with that of Senegal and Britain who have incorporated the students’ teachers and the parents in their governing boards. However, none of the BOGs proposed the exclusion of the politicians in the board though they complained of political interference in their deliberations. This might be some work to be studied on later.

A good number of the BOGs indicated they hold three meetings every year. Only a small fraction said they do so when need arose. A good number of the BOGs stated that they got notification within 2 weeks, some within 1 week and even others
reported to be informed within 3 weeks. In all that was sufficient time to prepare for
the meeting. On quorum, most of the BOGs reported to raise the number required to
hold a meeting. On some BOGs not taking up their appointment the reason given
were; they were so busy and some spent part of their time out of the country. A
worrying trend was, a large percentage of the BOGs in this study had not read the
legal document on which their power and mandate were hinged on. They reported that
they had learnt about these roles during inauguration and in some few cases in BOG
meetings. That could explain the reason some BOGs lamented about the DEOs office
overturning there recommendations.

b) Challenges BOGs Face in the Management of Secondary Schools.

Research findings in chapter four indicated that BOG members experienced the
following challenges in their management task areas:

i) Curriculum Implementation.
Curriculum implementation was not effectively done due to lack of a streamlined
mechanism to monitor its delivery and implementation the BOG reported. Besides,
some schools did not finish the syllabus or coverage was done haphazardly due to
teacher’s shortage and the high turnover of the BOG teachers. Moreover, most
schools also experienced shortages in almost all the subjects with the highest shortfall
being in maths and sciences, humanities and applied subjects. This could greatly lead
to poor performance in national examinations.

ii) Staff and Student management.
The challenges were shortage of teachers occasioned by the stringent measures being
taken in employing new teachers. Schools have had to employ BOG teachers to fill
this gap. However, the unforeseen challenge was the high turnover of these teachers
who sought for greener pasture elsewhere possible due to insufficient funds to pay them.

On students, the challenge was managing the big numbers in schools against the limited resources available and their negative (indifferent) attitude to education. The others were; Low academic performances of the learners which demoralised the teachers, instances of students’ unrest and the tedious procedure of disciplining both students’ and TSC teachers. Besides, some of the discipline cases forwarded to the education offices were sometimes revoked thus frustrating the members.

All the BOGs did not mount school based needs assessment (SNA) to come up with ‘home grown’ problems and solutions pertaining to their own schools. The SNA propagates the need for schools to address their own problems domestically. It therefore differs from the organised external workshops / seminars which would address collective issues of the district.

iii) Financial constraints.

Majority of the schools in this study reported poor rate of schools fees payment. Apart from that only a negligible number of schools had income generating projects. That coupled with payment of BOG teachers has resulted in draining the meagre resources within the school thus making it hard for schools to afford sufficient teaching and learning materials.

The insufficient funds to run the schools had resulted to inability to pay school creditors. The schools thus survived on credit due to the high cost, inflation and fluctuation of prices of most essential commodities. That poses a big challenge to the school managers.
iv) **Physical and Material resources.**

Most schools lacked facilities such as Lab, Library and Classrooms which affected performance. Also the shortage of staff houses had equally led to reduced student-teacher contact time as most teachers lived far from school. The situation got worse during rainy season as some teachers got late to school (and even tired) which greatly affected output. That coupled with the over population in schools posed a great challenges to the ill-trained managers. The additional burden of paying the BOG teachers’ salaries had also slowed down the schools’ physical and infrastructural development.

The other problem was the over enrolment that led to over stretching of the scarce facilities to their maximum.

v) **School- Community Relation.**

The challenges had been to sensitise community to help curb the pilferation of the social vices e.g. khat, tobacco, kuberi and cigarettes into school as they contributed to student indiscipline.

c) **Impact of these Challenges on the BOGs performance.**

BOGs do not know their roles fully because they were not trained in school management and financial management i.e. BOGs had inadequate managerial skills, hence managed schools in hunch / huff- huff manner i.e. trial and error approach; The bit of induction they were exposed to was what they received during inauguration and sometimes the ‘up dates’ given to them by education officers during the board meetings. To complicate matters, majority of the BOGs had never read the legal documents.

The BOGs thus stated the following: BOGs members ended up failing in their roles because of making irrational decision owing to lack of knowledge of these documents.
which demoralized them resulting to poor performance. Besides, they were unable to offer sound advice to their institutions on pertinent issues afflicting the school e.g. on student and staff discipline.

BOGs being not able to provide the necessary materials for teaching / learning; not being able to implement programs because of insufficient funds, leading to stalled project hence shunning / tarnishing the name of BOGs. All that led to poor performance of the BOGs.

Division in BOGs committees occasioned especially by political interference affected deliberations;

d) Strategies BOGs Use to redress the challenges.

BOGs gave the following suggestions: Solicited funds from different sources e.g. CDF, LATF, MOE NGOs & harambees; Committed parents to pay fees in statutory instalments per term and used prudently the available resources. In addition, advised their schools to create more extra classes / remedial classes, employed BOG teachers and urged parents to supplement instructional materials provided by schools. Other strategies were; employed some members of the community in the school in the lower echelon jobs to boost ownership and accountability to the community and hired some of facilities to the community e.g. school hall, sports ground, to enhance rapport.

e) BOGs Suggestions on Persons to be Included in BOGs;

They named the following: 68.16% Students, 18.42% Businessmen, 28.95% NGOs; 50% Alumni of the schools; 65.79% Teachers and 13.15% Non-teaching staff and visionary leaders.

In view of the gap that the researcher sought to fill, the findings were as follows; on inclusion of students and teachers an overwhelming percentage of both BOGs
and Head teachers (75%) voted for the proposal. BOGs gave the following remarks: it was a brilliant idea, because they were core persons in the system. It would enable teachers to push for implementation of some of the agreed policies. On the other hand, students would also have room to positively criticize the school management and also air their suggestions, the board members added. If the idea materialised, Kenya will join the ranks of Senegal, South Africa and Britain who have included these persons in their governing boards.

On impact of the PTA on BOG, all (100%) said they had a big impact because they represented parents who were chief / major financers of schools.

On sponsor picking the chairperson, majority (62.5%) of head teachers felt it stifled the chances of a better competent person being chosen. However, majority (75%) of head teachers were united in opposing BOGs being directly elected. They posited that it would bring in hecklers who were popular but had no vision.

A suggestion of including Businessmen, NGOs, Alumni’s of the schools and Non-teaching staff as board members came from the BOGs responses. That is something worth exploring in future. Already in South Africa non-teaching staff are part of their board members. In Kenya, the GOK (1976) had also recommended the involvement of sponsors, parents, teachers and various stake holders into the school BOGs to enhance ownership.

5.3 Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that:

-Majority of the BOGs had not undergone training on financial and school management. They thus involved themselves in school management in ways than those stipulated in the education Act e.g. conflict of interest in schools management.
-BOGs faced challenges in secondary school management which included; inadequate facilities, insufficient funds and generally inability to manage the schools due to lack of clear cut roles. These challenges in secondary school management were manifested by way of registering poor performance, students’ indiscipline and stalled infrastructure development.

-Lack of staff houses in schools also had a negative impact on the schools overall performance as it reduced the student – teacher contact time / hours.

-The shortage of teachers’ too had an adverse effect especially on the schools with staff shortages as the schools were forced to spend the meagre funds to pay the BOGs teachers.

-The study concludes that it is imperative for the government to revise the education Act so as to put a cap on the reappointment on board members to enhance efficiency and effectiveness.

-The communities around the schools had a lot of influence on the institutions. This was reflected in the general discipline of the students and overall growth / development of a school.

-The MOE should also increase the FDSE funding / grant to schools to supplement the BOGs effort in providing facilities and materials to schools.

5.4 Recommendations

In view of the findings, the researcher proposes the following recommendations; The academic qualifications of BOGs be strictly considered. Preferably, appointment to the BOG should be pegged at the level of good education of at least the Diploma level considering there were many educated persons around today. Graduates should be given the highest priority. Besides, people engaged in busy offices should be exempted from such appointment as they ended up giving lip services to the
institutions to which they were appointed. Rather, priority should be given to alumni’s and local qualified persons as well persons who were professionals in education.

BOG members should be inducted or professionally trained in financial and school management. This would ensure Board members know their Role, Mandate and Privileges (if any) and therefore cushion themselves against making decision in an irrational manner. It will also fore stall such cases where their uninformed decisions were later quashed by DEO’s office leading to frustrations and demoralization. In addition, it would help them in foreseeing instances of any financial mismanagement be it embezzlement or misappropriation of school funds beforehand.

There is also need to place a limit on ‘recycling’ of BOGs. The legal mandate of the BOG should be reviewed so as to put a ceiling to the number of times a board member could be reappointed to the same board. This would make the board more efficient and effective. The researcher proposes a maximum of two terms, which translates to six years. Alongside with that should be the multiple appointments of BOGs to different institutions which should also be curbed. This is because the engagement of the BOGs in numerous boards means little time to think through the myriads of issues / challenges bedeviling their various schools. This could partly explain the cry for visionary leadership.

The Education Act should also be reviewed so to as to incorporate other stakeholders namely the representatives of the students, teachers, parents, (who are the core consumers of the BOGs deliberations), CBOs as well as NGOs, (who play vital role in supporting the schools financially). The inclusion of such persons especially the students,’ teachers and parents in the board would create ownership of the decisions resolved by the board. It would further bring on board all the
representatives of the school’s stake holders in the management as proposed by GOK (1976) and hence partnership. Apart from that, BOGs should be delocalised so that local community captures the entire catchment area of a school and not members within the vicinity of the school. That would bring in a cross breed of ideas as opposed to the homogeneity of thought bred in by scouting for members from the same locality. This could also be the source of the poor / lack of visionary leadership.

To make the BOG be felt in the schools, there is need to increase their mandate by giving them more power to resolve certain issues with finality. Such cases might include expulsion of students like those involved in arson cases, interdiction of teachers such as those implicated in infamous conduct e.g. carnal knowledge, inciting students to cause unrest etc.

The government should also consider increasing number of field officers in the districts if quality of education especially in public secondary school is to be realised. This would put to rest cases of teachers accused of unpreparedness when going to class. Besides, it would boost the assessment and supervision of the actual curriculum implementation which was grossly lacking in majority of the schools (see Table 4.11 pg 62). In deed this request should be expeditiously pursued if the country is to be industrialised by the year 2030. However, the government also needs to employ more teachers to offset the perennial teachers’ shortage in public secondary schools which was occasioned by the freezing of teacher’s employment some years back. This shortage has been accused of contributing to the lack of syllabus coverage in schools and the numerous turnovers of the BOG teachers. Thus, if that was done it would put these problems to rest.

To alleviate the problem of inadequate funding from the government, schools should be encouraged to start income generating activities (IGAs), such as farming
namely; dairy, poultry, crop and even bakery. The government can partner with agricultural field officers to help identify the kind of IGAs for schools. Parents should be encouraged to supplement text books and revision materials.

The BOGs also need to establish channels in which the students could ventilate the issues afflicting them e.g. by creating students’ baraza forum. Strengthening guidance and counselling too would certainly help in redressing students’ myriads of problems. School should also devise rewarding systems to appreciate performance. That would encourage a healthy competition and hence improve performance.

5.5 Areas for Further Research

This study was only confined to Taita District in Taita / Taveta County. For that matter, similar studies should be done in other districts in the country to come up with more general findings.
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APPENDIX 1

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO RESPONDENTS

MKONGO P DOUGLAS

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

P.O BOX 43844,

NAIROBI.

Dear Respondent(s),

RE: DATA COLLECTION FOR M.ED RESEARCH PROJECT

I am a post graduate student at Kenyatta University currently on a research project on the “challenges faced by BOGs in secondary schools management; a case of Taita / Taveta”.

You have been identified as an ideal research person and therefore kindly requested to respond to the questionnaire items as honestly as possible and to the best of your knowledge.

The questionnaire is designed for this research purpose only. Therefore the responses shall be absolutely confidential and anonymous. NO NAME SHALL BE REQUIRED FROM ANY RESPONDENT OR INSTITUTION.

Thank you, for agreeing to participate in the study.

Yours faithfully,

Mkongo P Douglas.

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR: Head Teachers

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to investigate the challenges Head teachers face in Public Secondary School Management in Taita District. The researcher wishes to state that your opinion / responses shall be handled with utmost confidentiality. In this regard, PLEASE DO NOT INDICATE your name on the questionnaire.

INSTRUCTION

Kindly ensure you answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge. Please tick or provide information as required.

Section A: General information:

(1) Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ].
(2) Marital: Married [ ] Single [ ].
(3) Age (Tick where appropriate)
   - 25-30 [ ] 31-35 [ ] 36-40 [ ].
   - 41-45 [ ] 46-50 [ ] 51-55 [ ].
(4) Highest academic / professional qualification__________________________-
(5) Please indicate the duration you have served as a head teacher__________________
(6) Please indicate your current Job Group_________________________________________
(7) Do you live within the school premises? Yes [ ] No [ ].
   (a) If yes, what is your rating of the school house?
      Explain______________________________________________________________
   (b) If No, how far away from school do you live and how do you get to your place of work?
      Explain______________________________________________________________

8. Have ever received any in service training in:
   i Educational Management? YES [ ] NO [ ]
ii Which areas were you included in the in service training if yes?

iii Was the in-service adequate? YES [ ] NO [ ]

9. How many years have been to this school been a secondary school?

   a) 1 – 5 [ ]
   b) 6 – 10 [ ]
   c) 11 - 15 [ ]
   d) 16 - 20 [ ]
   e) 21 – 25 [ ]
   f) Over 26 years

   (c) (i) Nature of school; Boys [ ] Girls [ ] Mixed [ ]

   School Sponsor:

10. School type: Boarding [ ] Day [ ] Day / Boarding [ ]

11. The school is? Mixed [ ] Girls [ ] Boys only [ ]

12. School Sponsor:

SECTION B: CHALLENGES FACING HEADTEACHERS IN SECONDARY SCHOOL MANAGEMENT.

(i) CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

13. Do you set educational objectives for your school annually? Yes [ ] No [ ]

14. At what time of the year do you set them?

   Beginning of the year [ ] End of the year [ ]

15. a) Do you provide your teachers with textbooks and other materials they require in order to ensure curriculum delivery? Yes [ ] No [ ]

b) What problems do you encounter in the process of providing these materials resources and their maintenance?
16. Indicate how often you carry out the following evaluation exercises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Exercise</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers' schemes of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers' lesson plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers' lesson notes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing teachers while teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing the teacher(s) before you see him/her in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing the lesson together with the teacher after assessing him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking the text book and other written literature used by teachers in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you get help in terms of supervision of instruction from QASOs in charge of the division?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. What was your school’s mean grade / score in KCSE examination in the last 5 (five) years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) What were the main reasons for the attainment of the above grades? (You can tick more than once).

(a) Generally weak pupils [ ]
(b) Lack of syllabus coverage [ ]
(c) Lack of enough textbooks [ ]
(d) Indiscipline among pupils [ ]
(e) Lack of qualified teachers [ ]
(f) Change of administration [ ]
(g) Lack of motivation to work hard [ ]

Any other (state)________________________________________________________
c) Any other comment:  
____________________________________________________________________

18. Do your teachers manage to cover the syllabus effectively before student sit for their KCSE?

YES [ ] NO [ ]

If yes, what strategies have you employed?

Explain____________________________________________________________________

If no, please explain factors that lead to the poor syllabus coverage___________________________

19. What type of instructional leadership style do you use?

Briefly your choice of the (a) above?____________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

20. What challenges do you face in the following areas?

a) Provision of the instructional materials and maintenance___________________

____________________________________________________________________

b) Ensuring actual teaching takes place in the classes__________________________

____________________________________________________________________

c) Ensuring the syllabus is covered on time__________________________

____________________________________________________________________

d) Applying the instructional leadership mentioned above___________________

____________________________________________________________________

21. What other challenges do you face in the management of curriculum and instruction in your school?______________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

22. How do you overcome the challenges mentioned above?____________________

____________________________________________________________________
(ii) PHYSICAL AND MATERIAL RESOURCES

23. How many teachers in your school are TSC APPOINTED (per gender)? M [   ]
   F [   ]

24. In which subject areas do you have shortage of TSC teachers?

25.(i). How would you rate the teacher’s staff houses in your school?
   Explain_____________________________________________________

   (ii) Does the issue of staff houses affect the availability of teachers to students?
   Briefly explain______________________________________________

26. Generally, how would you describe your teachers in terms of motivation?
   Briefly explain______________________________________________

27. Do you encourage your staff to attend in-service courses, seminars and
   workshops?
   YES [   ] NO [   ]

28. Do you encourage or recommend teachers for promotion? YES [   ] NO [   ]

29. (a) What other challenges do you face in the management of staff personnel
   (including non teaching) in your school?_________________________

   (b) What are some of the possible cause of the challenges you face in (a)
   above________________________________________________________

   (c) How do you overcome the challenges mentioned above?______________
(iii) PHYSICAL AND MATERIALS RESOURCES.

30. (a) Indicate the status of physical facilities in your school by ticking (✓) appropriately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of resources</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Lacking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets/ Latrines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School play ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching aids(e.g wall charts, maps etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Any other(s) please specify
_________________________________________________  

31. (a) How is your instructional leadership affected by shortage of facilities in your school?
_________________________________________________

(b) In your opinion what are the measures that can be taken to improve and maintain the facilities at school?
_________________________________________________

(iv) FINANCES

32. What proportion of parents pays (school) fees in time?

Explain________________________________________

33. (a) Does the school have any income generating projects?______________________

(b) (i) If yes, about how much money do you raise from the project(s) per year?
_________________________________________________

_________________________________________________
(ii) How do you utilize this money from b (i) above?

________________________________________________________________________

34. (i) How has the issue of fees defaulters affected your school?

Explain________________________________________________________________________

(ii) How are you overcoming it? _______________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(v) STUDENT

35. What is your total student enrolment at present (per gender)?

Boys [ ] Girls [ ]

36. Indicate the number of streams and the number of students per class / form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class / form</th>
<th>No of streams</th>
<th>No of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. What major factors influence enrolment of students in your school?

________________________________________________________________________

38. What mechanism have you put in place to manage?

(a) Daily student attendance____________________________________________________

(b) Proper keeping of student record___________________________________________

(c) Students’ behaviour________________________________________________________

(d) Student’ discipline_________________________________________________________

39. (a) What other challenges do you face in the management of students’ personnel in your school?

________________________________________________________________________
(b) What might be the probable cause of the challenges you face in (a) above

(c) How do you overcome the challenges mentioned above?

(vi) PARENT / LOCAL COMMUNITY

40.(a) How was your school started?

Explain

(b) How is the relationship between the local community / founders and the school?

41. How is the attendance of the general PTA meetings in your school? (Tick appropriately)

a) Meetings usually well attended: [ ]
   b) The school imposes a fine to enforce good attendance: [ ]
   c) Attendance to meetings is generally poor: [ ]
   d) Any other (explain)

42. How would you rate the level of social vices (drugs, excessive drinking and insecurity) around the school?
   a) High [ ]  Average [ ]  Low [ ]  None [ ]

Explain

b) What is the impact of the social environment around the school on your student’s discipline?

43. To what extent do the parents in your school support you in enforcing discipline in student?

   They are quite supportive [ ]
   They are fairly supportive [ ]
   They tend to take sides with their children [ ]
   Others (explain)
SECTION C: PERTINENT MANAGEMENT ISSUES.

44. (a) Does your school have an operative BOG? ________________________

(b) If yes, who composed the nomination panel?

(c) What interests are represented in the BOG? ________________________

(d) What qualities were considered in the choice of the nominees to represent the above (43a)?

45. (a) Did all the appointed members take up their appointment?  Yes [ ]  No [ ]

(b) If Not, how many declined and why?

46. Who else do you feel should be appointed to the BOG and to represent whose/which interest (Specify)?

47. (a) Do you experience difficulties in raising quorum during BOG meetings?

   Explain______________________________________________________________

(b) How often are the BOG meetings held in a year?

   Once [ ]  Twice [ ]  Thrice [ ]  when need arises [ ]

48. How many BOG members are university graduates?

   (i) Male [ ]  (ii) Female [ ]

49. (a) Have any BOG members in your school undergone any training in school management or leadership?  Yes [ ]  No [ ]

   (b) If yes, how many?  Male _______  Female________

50. How would you rate your relationship with the BOG members?

   (i) Excellent [ ]  Good [ ]  Fair [ ]  Poor [ ]

   (ii) Briefly explain_____________________________________________________

51. Has any BOG member in your school shown interest to supply goods and services to the school directly or indirectly?  Yes [ ]  No [ ]

   If Yes, briefly explain__________________________________________________
52. (i) Would you say patronage / nepotism ever influence BOG deliberations in your school?
   a) No [ ]  b) Sometime [ ]  c) Quite often [ ]
   d) Other (explain)

   (ii) If your choice is (b) or (c) give examples

53. (a) What challenges have you encountered in your effort to work with the following offices as secretary to the BOG
   MOE
   DEO
   TSC
   BOG
   SPONSOR

   (b) Suggest what should be done to make BOG’s more effective in its management duties.

54. What do you think are the REASONS for?
   a) LOW ACADEMIC standards in the District?

   b) Students UNREST in the District?

   c) Moral decadence in students?

55. As a SECRETARY to the BOGs and BOG Nomination Panel, please COMMENT on the EFFECTIVENESS of the following:
   a) The Cooption of PTA members into the board:

   b) The inclusion of TEACHERS and STUDENTS in the BOGs:
c) Sponsors being given the privilege of nominating the chairperson:________________________
d) BOG members being ELECTED rather than selected by a panel:________________________
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APPENDIX 3
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BOGS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to investigate the challenges BOGs face in Public Secondary School Management in Taita District. The researcher wishes to state that your opinion / responses shall be handled with utmost confidentiality. In this regard, PLEASE DO NOT INDICATE your name on the questionnaire.

INSTRUCTION

Kindly ensure you answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge. Please tick or provide information as required.

Section A: General information

1. Gender: [ ] Male [ ] Female

2. Marital status: [ ] Married [ ] Single [ ] Other

3. Academic / qualifications attained:
   - Primary [ ]
   - Secondary [ ]
   - College [ ]
   - University [ ]

4. Professional qualifications: ____________________________ ____________________________

5. Age bracket
   - 25-30 [ ] 31-35 [ ] 36-40 [ ]
   - 41-45 [ ] 46-50 [ ] 51-55 [ ]
   - 56-60 [ ] 61-65 [ ] 66 and above [ ]

6. (i) What is your position in the BOG? ____________________________

(ii) How long have you served as a governor in your school? ____________________________
(iii) Are you a board member of any other school? Yes [ ] No [ ].

(iii) If yes how many other schools?

______________________________

(iv) Which category do you represent in the BOG?

Sponsor [ ] Community [ ]

Special [ ] PTA Nominee [ ]

SECTION B: CHALLENGES FACING BOGs IN SECONDARY SCHOOL MANAGEMENT.

(i) CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

7. (a) Are you involved setting educational objectives for your school annually?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

(b) If yes, at what time of year do you set them?

Beginning of the year [ ] End of the year [ ]

8. Do you teachers manage to cover the syllabus effectively before students sit for their KCSE?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

(a) If yes, what strategies have you employed?

Explain______________________________________________________________

(b) If No, please explain factors that lead to poor syllabus coverage.

______________________________________________________________

9. What type of management leadership style do the BOGs use /

employ?____________________________________________________________
b) Briefly explain the choice of (a) above?

______________________________________________

10. What challenges do the BOGs face in the following areas?

(a) Provision of the instructional materials and maintenance

______________________________________________

(b) Ensuring actual teaching takes place in the classes_____________________

(c) Ensuring the syllabus is covered on time.

______________________________________________

(d) Applying the management style mentioned above_____________________

11. What other challenges do the BOG face in the management of curriculum and instruction in your school?

______________________________________________

12. How do to overcome the challenges in mentioned above?

______________________________________________

(ii) STAFF AND STUDENT PERSONNEL

13. How is the situation of the teacher’s shortage in your school?

Explain______________________________________________

14. (i). How is the situation of teacher’s staff houses in your school?

Explain______________________________________________

(ii). How would you rate the staff houses if any?

Explain______________________________________________

(iii). Does the issue of staff houses affect the availability of teachers to students?

Briefly Explain______________________________________________
15. Recruitment.
(a) What major factors influence enrolment of students in your school?

(b) Does the BOG recruit?
   Teaching staff: Yes [ ] No [ ]
   Non teaching: Yes [ ] No [ ]

(c) If yes, please list down the composition of the recruiting panel

(d) How is the recruitment process carried out to ensure the right candidate is selected?

16. (i) Who determines the nonteaching staff remuneration?
(ii) Who terminates the services of BOG employees?

17. Has BOG ever carried out a needs assessment for its staff? Yes [ ] No [ ]
   If answer is Yes, please specify;

18. Generally, how would you describe your staff and students in terms of motivation?
   Briefly explain

19. Do you encourage your staff to attend in-service courses, seminars and workshop?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

20. Do you encourage or recommend teachers for promotion? Yes [ ] No [ ]

21. Discipline.
   (a) Are BOG members involved in controlling discipline of students?
      Yes [ ] No [ ]
   (b) If yes, explain how?
   (c) Does BOG face any difficulties while dealing with discipline of?
      (a) Teachers? Please explain
22. (a) Are your recommendations honoured by MOE especially on discipline of students?  
   Yes [    ]  No [    ]  
(b) How long does it take to get responses?  
______________________________

(c) Does TSC always accept your recommendation on:  
   (i) Recruitment: Yes [    ]  No [    ]  
   (ii) Promotion: Yes [    ]  No [    ]  
   (iii) Disciplinary: Yes [    ]  No [    ]

23. (a) What are the main challenges the BOGs face?  
   (i) During the recruitment process;
______________________________
   (ii) In motivating staff and students:
______________________________
   (ii) Student motivation;
______________________________
   (iii) In the management of the staff (including non teaching) and students in your school?
______________________________

(b) What are some of the possible causes of the above challenges?  
24. How do you overcome these challenges?  
______________________________

______________________________

(ii) PHYSICAL AND MATERIAL RESOURCES

25. Does the school any shortages of:  
   (a) Physical facilities? Please specify
______________________________
(b) Material e.g. textbooks? Please specify;
______________________________

26. What other means do you use to supplement the above resources?
____________________________

27. What challenges do you face in management of the above resources?
____________________________

(b) What strategies do you use to overcome these challenges?
____________________________

iv) **FINANCES.**

28 (i). What are the main sources of School Finances?
______________________________

(ii) Who else is involved in soliciting school Finances?
______________________________

(iii) Does the School have any income generating projects?
______________________________

If yes:
(a) Specify the project(s)
______________________________

(b) How are the projects maintained?
______________________________

(iv) What are the main challenges that BOG’s face in the financial management in your school?
______________________________
What does the school do to overcome these challenges? Please explain
_____________________________________________________________________

(v) PARENT / LOCAL COMMUNITY.

29. (a) How was your school started?
Explain______________________________________________________________

(b) How is the relationship between the local community / founders and the school?
_____________________________________________________________________

30. (a) How would you rate the level of social vices (drugs, excessive drinking and insecurity) around the school?
   a) High [ ]   Average [ ]   Low [ ]   None [ ]
Explain______________________________________________________________

   b) What is the impact of the social environment around the school on your student’s discipline?
_____________________________________________________________________

31. To what extent do the parents in your school support you in enforcing discipline in student?
   They are quite supportive [ ]
   They are fairly supportive [ ]
   They tend to take sides with their children [ ]
   Others (explain)
32. What challenges do you experience in regard to school community relation?

__________________________________________________________________________________________

(b) How do you overcome the challenges?

__________________________________________________________________________________________

SECTION C: PERTINENT MANAGEMENT ISSUES.

33. (a) Composition of BOG’s

(i) How many members are representing the following groups in the BOG?

Representing sponsor [ ]
Special interests [ ]
Community [ ]
P.T.A.Nominee [ ]

(ii) What interests are being represented by the special interests group in the BOG?

__________________________________________________________________________________________

(iii) What qualities were considered in the choice of the PTA nominees to the BOG?

__________________________________________________________________________________________

34 a) Are you aware of the interests and wishes of the category you represent?

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

b) If yes, comment on / state the expectations of the group you represent in the performance of the BOG managerial role / duties;

i)__________________________________________________________________________________________
ii)____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

c) What are some of the factors that make some BOG members not perform their duties as expected?

____________________________________________________________________

35. To what extent were your Roles as a member of the BOG explained to you during the inauguration meeting?

Very well [ ] Fairly [ ] Well [ ] Poorly [ ]

36. How often does the MOE official in your meeting update you on your Role as a School manager?

Always [ ] Occasionally [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

(b) School management

37. How often are the BOG meetings held in a year?

Once [ ] Twice [ ] Thrice [ ] When need arises [ ]

38. (a) How many days are you given as a notice of the meeting_________________

(b) (i) Do all members attend the meeting? Yes [ ] No [ ]

(ii) If No, give reasons as to why some members are unable to attend

____________________________________________________________________

39. When are the agendas of the meeting circulated to you?

____________________________________________________________________

40. How many BOG members have undergone training in BOG Management Roles and Leadership? Male [ ] Female [ ]
41. (a) What are the main challenges / problems are faced by BOG members in school management?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

(b) Suggest ways of overcoming these challenges______________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

(e) Legal status.

42. State whether you have read the following documents since you become a governor.

(i) Education Act: Yes [    ]   No [    ]
(ii) BOG code of management: Yes [    ]   No [    ]
(iii) TSC C.O.R: Yes [    ]   No [    ]
(iv) The workman Compensation Act: Yes [    ]   No [    ]
(v) Any other Act; Explain: _____________________________________________

43. (a) Name any other BOG Functions and Roles which are not covered in the education Act?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

(b) What are the main challenges that arise from lack of knowledge on the legal documents?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
44. What challenges do you face in your effort to work with the following?

MOE

_______________________________________

TSC

______________________________________

DEO

______________________________________

Head Teacher

________________________________________________________________

45. Suggest what should be done to make BOGs more effective in its management duties?

________________________________________________________________

46. What do you think are the REASON for?

(a) Low academic standards of education in the District?

____________________________________________________________

(b) Student unrest in the District?

____________________________________________________________

(c) Moral decadence / Decay in morals in students?

____________________________________________________________

47. In your opinion;

(a) What would you consider as the causes of the challenges faced by the BOGs in school Management?

________________________________________________________________

(b) How do the challenges affect the performance of the BOGs in secondary schools?

________________________________________________________________

(c) Suggest possible solutions to these challenges

________________________________________________________________
48. Who else do you feel should be appointed in the BOG and what interest should the person(s) represent? (Specify)

____________________________________________________________________________________

49. Please comment on the impact of including the TEACHERS and STUDENTS as board members.

____________________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION
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