Original Article

Effectiveness of School Inspection in Secondary Schools in Uganda: A Case Study of Kasese District

Wilson Mathembele[1], Dr. Imelda Kemeza, PhD[1] & Dr. Richard Twebaze, PhD[2]*

[1] Mbarara University of Science & Technology, P. O. Box 1410, Mbarara, Uganda.
[2] Bishop Stuart University P. O. Box 09, Mbarara, Uganda.
[*] Author for Correspondence ORCID ID; https://orcid.org/0009-0009-6567-5299; Email: mathembelewilson@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the efficiency of school inspections in secondary schools in Uganda, using Kasese District as a case study. A mixed-method approach was utilized, with a convergent parallel design. The study had a total population of 850 respondents drawn from 34 schools, with only 326 being investigated. Questionnaires served as the primary data collection instrument. The data were examined using simple percentages, means, and standard deviations. According to the study's findings, stakeholders such as the PTA and BOG had little engagement in inspection planning (mean: 1.63; 32.6%). It was also discovered that inspectors provided insufficient notification of the inspection exercise (mean: 1.69) (33.8%). The study also found that inspectors spent only a short amount of time inspecting (mean: 1.36; 27.2%). Furthermore, the study found that there was limited stakeholder involvement in judging educational quality (Mean: 2.69) (53.8%), as well as insufficient refresher training (Mean: 1.71) (34.2%), diminishing the overall effectiveness of the school inspection activity. The overall effectiveness of school inspection was moderate (Overall mean: 2.79) (55.8%). Based on the findings, the study recommends that school inspection authorities should provide sufficient notice before inspection visits, allocate more time for inspection exercises to enable a thorough evaluation of all key aspects and regular refresher training programs to be designed and implemented to close any gaps identified during the inspection exercise to enhance the effectiveness of inspection.

INTRODUCTION

Most education systems across the world employ school inspection or evaluation to evaluate and ensure the quality of education provision (De Grauwe, 2007; Hofer et al., 2020). School inspection has been used by nations around the world to improve oversight, monitoring, and assessment of the quality of educational standards in order to increase teaching efficacy (Ali, 1998; Education Standards Agency, 2006a; Government of the Republic of Uganda, 1992; Lugujjo, 2008; Ministry of Education and Sports (MoE & S), 2000, 2017, 2004, 2008; Hossain, 2017).

School inspection has been conducted since the early days of public education in the late 18th century when Napoleon's administration implemented it in France. Ehren and Honingh (2011) note that the Dutch Inspectorate of Education, founded in 1801, is today one of Europe's oldest Inspectorates. In the United Kingdom (UK), Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) conducted the first inspection in 1839 (Wilcox, 2000; Macbeath, 2006). According to Yin et al. (2022), education accountability aims to strengthen teachers' commitment to providing a better education for their children while also alerting parents and other taxpayers about the quality of education offered.

Over time, in Uganda, as in many other countries, School External Evaluation (SEE) in the form of school inspection has been used as a primary mechanism for monitoring educational delivery, adhering to the specified curriculum and established standards, and ensuring that schools are improving effectively (DES, 2006). School inspectors are intended to assess, monitor, and evaluate the quality of school teaching and learning, as well as the school's organization, management, and environment (Education Standards Agency, 2006).

School inspection in Uganda is a heritage of colonial government that has evolved multiple times since the 1920s. Significant social, economic, and political developments in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries shaped the nature of Uganda's educational system. Schools are now under increased public scrutiny, demanding accountability and high-quality education as a result of increased stakeholder involvement, education massification, international commitments, and employer expectations (Ministry of Education and Sports (MoE & S) 2017, National Planning Authority, 2010; Republic of Uganda, 2013; United Nations, 2015; Wilcox, 2000).

Following the recommendations of the 1989 Policy Review Report and the 1992 Government White Paper on Education, Uganda established the Education Standards Agency (ESA) in July 2001 as a semi-autonomous organization, beginning with a small staff at the headquarters and eventually replacing the central inspectorate. Ward et al., (2006) state that ESA, as a semi-autonomous organization, would be in charge of its goals, programs, and priorities. This was consistent with the finding that an independent regulatory agency is necessary for effective public service regulation (Casteel & Roebuck, 2000). Nonetheless, ESA has not operated as a semi-autonomous entity since 2004, when four regional offices were established in Gulu, Mbale, Mpigi, and Mbarara, each with 12 topic specialists. ESA's key reform initiative was the development, testing, and refinement of quality indicators that included three components: inputs (leadership and management), processes (pedagogy), and outcomes (learner achievement) (Education Standards Agency, 2006; Ministry of Education and Sports, 2012). In addition, inspection processes and instruments were created (Educational Standards Agency, 2006). Hence, investigating the effectiveness of inspection procedures, thus, pre-inspection, on-site inspection, and post inspection procedures, and proposing recommendations for a successful inspection process was therefore necessary.

The study is expected to benefit society, inspectors, teachers, researchers, policymakers, and administrators by raising awareness of available inspection services, providing a foundation for policy review, identifying areas for improvement and laying out improvement strategies, and

contributing to Uganda's limited literature on inspection procedures for improved educational quality.

Problem Statement

School inspection and supervision play an important role in Uganda by promoting quality assurance, efficacy, and access to quality education (MoE & S, 2016). The principal goals include establishing systems, articulating and overseeing standards and quality in education and sports, and monitoring the effectiveness of such standards and quality to ensure that education and sports in the country continue to improve (MoE&S, 2016). School inspection and supervision include regular institutional visits to check the progress of teaching and learning, sanitation, and data collection on teachers' and students' daily attendance. It also comprises discussions with teachers to improve teacher-learner performance and ensure policy implementation (MoE&S, 2012). Ideally, regular school inspections should not only check the efficacy of teaching and learning, but also ensure excellent education pointers.

However, despite the pivotal role played by school inspection, the effectiveness of school inspection processes in secondary schools in Uganda remains uncertain. The pre-inspection, onsite inspection and post inspection activities are critical components of the school inspection process, but there is limited evidence on how stakeholders perceive their effectiveness, especially in Kasese district given that some secondary schools are still operating below the minimum standards and students' performance has been deteriorating in the recent past. The lack of clarity of the effectiveness of school inspection processes may hinder efforts to improve educational outcomes in secondary schools in Uganda, and Kasese district in particular. It is therefore indispensable to establish stakeholders' perceptions about the effectiveness of school inspection processes so that profound recommendations can be made for improved educational quality.

Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of school inspection process in secondary schools in Uganda, using Kasese District as a case study. The study was guided by the following objectives

- To assess the overall effectiveness of the pre-inspection activities in secondary schools in Kasese District

- To examine the overall effectiveness of the on-site inspection activities in secondary schools in Kasese District

- To evaluate the overall effectiveness of the post inspection activities in secondary schools in Kasese District

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Review

This study was guided by Elton Mayo's 1930 Human Relations theory, which proposes that addressing employees' social needs increases productivity (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). In actual practice, the term 'human relation' signifies the relationship that should be cultivated and practiced by an employee or a supervisor with his/her subordinates. From the point of view of management, human relation is motivating people in organization to develop teamwork spirit in order to fulfill their needs and achieve organizational goals efficiently and economically. Employees should participate actively in decision-making (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). According to Human Relations theory, individuals who have their social needs addressed will be more self-directed and engaged to their profession. As a result, workers' desire for recognition is increasingly essential in influencing productivity (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). Teachers in education are better positioned to identify their own strengths and flaws. Thus, they should be regarded as people rather than as energy packets. Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) underline that school inspectors should work as facilitators to help teachers improve their job satisfaction. They also suggest that effective school inspection policy-making for better education quality must include teachers in the planning and evaluation process, fostering a sense of significance and contribution to school improvement.

School Inspection Procedures

Existing studies show nations possessing efficient inspection procedures have strategically established processes for conducting inspection services. Inspection procedure refers to the correct or usual way of carrying on an inspection, whereas effectiveness of school inspection is the degree to which inspections achieve their intended goal. Thus, it should be noted that secondary school inspection involves a series of interrelated activities or procedures. Many authors and inspectorates, including Wilcox (2000), OFSTED (2005), and Rono (2000), have stated that formal inspection procedures, particularly full inspection, should be carried out in three stages: pre-inspection procedures, actual inspection procedures, and post-inspection procedures. Inspectors, for example, are obliged to examine previous inspection reports before deciding which schools to inspect, as well as the type and focus of inspection (Education Standards Agency, 2006a; Pre-Primary, Primary, and Post-Primary Act (2008), Mohanty, 2000). Plans are also guided by the number of schools to be examined, as well as the frequency and duration of the inspection (Carron, De Grauwe, and Govinda, 1998).

Empirical Literature

Klerks (2012) carried out a systematic review of 14 peer reviewed studies to establish the effect of on-site inspection practices on the enhancement of the educational standards of schools, and to assess the kind of characteristics of on-site inspections that had contributed to the improvement of the educational quality. The review found that on-site inspections and their characteristics did not directly enhance the quality of education delivered by teachers. Instead, it highlighted an intricate collaboration between various aspects of school on-site inspections, the inspector, and the school community, including students, teachers, and management. Klerks revealed that research on the effect of educational regulation, for this case inspection had been scarce and called for further research on school inspection. Thus, this study aimed at extending this research further, in response to Klerks' call.

Zaare (2012) conducted a study in one Iranian Institute to determine the significance of classroom observation, an aspect of On-site inspection, on the teaching methodology of teachers. The research results revealed that teachers' performance improved as a result of self-awareness and reflective practices proceeding lesson observation. However, the researcher collected data from only one institution and moreover not in a Ugandan context. This study therefore aimed at evaluating the extent to which classroom observations have been conducted during inspection in Kasese District secondary schools.

Also, Garet et al., (2017) did a study to determine the impact of delivering performance feedback to teachers and principals following inspection. The study found that teacher performance feedback was responsible for enhancing teachers' practice. In the current study, the researcher aimed to determine the efficiency of inspection techniques for providing feedback in Ugandan secondary schools. Khan and Abdullah (2019) carried out a study to establish the effect of staff training and development as a component of post-inspection on teachers' performance in Kurdistan. They found out that there was a positive and strong relationship between continuous teacher training and development and teacher performance. The findings of the study revealed that when teachers are exposed to continuous on-job trainings and development, their job productivity and job performance increases. However, Khan and Abdullah called on future researchers to assess and review the effectiveness of trainings and their impact on teachers' performance. Thus, this study intended to investigate the effectiveness of school inspection in organizing refresher training as a key activity of post-inspection.

In analyzing the procedures of school inspection, Ehren (2016) contends that successful inspection necessitates the involvement of all stakeholders in monitoring the execution of inspection recommendations, provided that they are convinced of the recommendations' legitimacy. In line with this Tanah (2011), study of stakeholder engagement in schools in Nakuru Municipality, Kenya, discovered that participants believed stakeholder involvement

had a significant impact on school performance. The previous study, however, was performed in primary schools, whereas the current study was undertaken in secondary schools with a somewhat different management structure and analyzed the efficiency of school inspections in ensuring that suggestions resulting from the inspection exercise are implemented.

Several researchers have confirmed the importance of stakeholder involvement in the inspection process (Haris et al., 2018; Hooge, Burns, & Wilkoszewski, 2012; Manase & Habibu, 2017; Mokoena, 2011; Pradhan et al., 2012). In an investigation of related literature, for instance, Haris et al. (2018) found that good inspection fosters collaboration between schools and all stakeholders involved in efforts to improve school quality. The need of including all stakeholders in almost all school inspection procedures is emphasized by the examined literature. Therefore, determining the level of stakeholder participation in Uganda's inspection process as a component of the efficacy of school inspection is crucial.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The primary goal of this study was to determine the efficacy of school inspection methods in Ugandan secondary schools, with Kasese District as a case study. The study was conducted within the pragmatism paradigm, which holds that there are multiple realities, or ways of interpreting the world and thus understanding research (Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Hammond, 2013; Kalolo, 2015; Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017; Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2019; Shannon-Baker, 2016; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2015).

The Convergent parallel mixed research design was utilized, with both qualitative and quantitative methodologies used to gain breadth, depth of understanding, and validation of school inspection and the standards of education (Creswell, 2009; Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). This design was chosen because it is inexpensive, allows for quick data collection, and produces a comprehensive result that can be applied to a broader population (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). The study targeted a population of 01 District Education Officer, 08 inspectorate officials, 34 headteachers, 34 deputy headteachers, 34 directors of studies, and 288

teachers in all the secondary schools in Kasese District, Western Uganda. The sample for the quantitative component consisted of 326 respondents including 30 Deputy headteachers and 30 directors of studies, and 288 teachers from 30 secondary schools Kasese District of Western Uganda. Whereas the sample for the qualitative component consisted of 38 respondents composing of 30 Headteachers, 7 inspectorate officials, and 1 District Education Officer. The sample size was determined using Krejcie and Morgan's 1970 table of sample sizes. Purposive sampling was employed by the researcher to pick the District Education Officer, Inspectorate officials, head teachers, deputy head teachers, and directors of studies. The schools were selected using stratified proportionate sampling, and the teachers were chosen using simple random selection. Data were gathered using a 5 Likert Scale and interview guide.

Developing a Content Validity Index (CVI) for the instruments ensured data quality. The scale CVI values of 0.903 and 0.950 for the questionnaire and interview guide, calculated using the S-CVI/Ave technique, were all higher than the required threshold of 0.70 (Amin, 2005), indicating strong content validity. The pilot test resulted in a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.925, which was statistically significant at $p < 0.05$, showing acceptable internal consistency.

Data were summarized using frequencies, means and Standard Deviation to establish the perceptions of different stakeholders. The qualitative data was analyzed using Thematic Content Analysis (TCA), which involves systematic coding and categorizing data into themes and subthemes of text data to allow researchers to understand social reality based on the original meanings expressed by key informants (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Saldana, 2009).

RESULTS

Stakeholders' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the Pre-Inspection Activities

This subsection presents the findings on stakeholders' perceptions of the effectiveness of pre-inspection activities, focusing on their views regarding the preparation and communication processes leading up to the school inspection. Table

1 illustrates the mean and standard deviation of the stakeholders' perceptions of the effectiveness of the pre-inspection activities.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Stakeholders' Perceptions of Pre-Inspection Activities

Pre-inspection Activities	Mean	SD
At least two weeks' notice is given to this school in preparation for the inspection	1.69	.854
Teachers are involved in planning for the inspection	2.14	1.063
Headteachers are involved in planning for the inspection	2.14	1.063
Previous inspection reports are consulted in preparation for the inspection	3.29	1.048
A prior briefing is given to the headteacher and teachers	2.61	1.187
Inspectors work with teachers to develop performance-related targets	2.27	1.134
Inspectors involve PTA members in the inspection exercise	1.63	.976
Inspectors involve BOG members in the inspection exercise	1.63	.976
Sample Mean of teachers and administrators' perception of the effectiveness of pre-inspection activities	2.27	

The stakeholders' perceptions of the pre-inspection activities in Table 1 reveal that the mean score for measuring the stakeholders' perception about the effectiveness of pre-inspection activities ranges from 1.63 to 3.29. Overall, these activities are perceived as moderately effective, with room for significant improvement. The lowest-rated item was the involvement of key stakeholders in the inspection exercise, such as BOG and PTA, where the mean score was 1.63, indicating a perception that these key stakeholders like the BOG and PTA are not sufficiently engaged, which can lead to a lack of ownership and participation in the inspection process. Another weak area was the timeliness of notice with a mean score of (mean = 1.69). This reflects that respondent disagree that schools receive sufficient notice before the inspection. This suggests that preparation time is insufficient, which could hinder effective preparation for the inspection process.

However, respondents were more positive about the consultation of previous inspection reports (mean = 3.29), indicating that this practice is seen as valuable and part of a continuous improvement process. Conclusively, stakeholders feel that pre-inspection activities could be more effective if there were more involvement of the management members in the inspection exercise and provided with adequate notice.

From the qualitative interviews, headteachers accepted that indeed inspectors visit schools but expressed concern over some flaws in the inspection process. Most of them reported that;

"...inspectors just come to school without any prior notification given, appear in school and we attend to them depending on what one has come to inspect". "...there is no specific time/duration spent in school, it may range between two to four hours. In each category of the inspectorate team, only one inspector comes, they rarely come more than one". Inspectors mostly involve or incorporate the HTR, DHTR, DOS, and the Director of the school in the inspection exercise and no members from the management (PTA, BOG) are involved."

Further, interviews with the inspectorate officials revealed that

"...we plan on our side and we just go to visit schools depending on the purpose of inspection and so we rarely involve them in the planning." This narrative also suggests that inspection is mostly through surprise visits."

The inspectorate officials from the district further mentioned that;

"...we do not conduct class room observations in secondary schools, it is a preserve of DES officials who rarely come for inspection due inadequate staffing and logistical challenges. We only concentrate on files and outside observations. We do not give prior notification for most of our inspection visits."

Stakeholders' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of On-Site Inspection activities

This subsection presents the findings on stakeholders' perceptions of the effectiveness of on-site inspection activities, focusing on their views regarding the inspectors' engagement with the school environment, including interactions with staff and students, as well as the overall observation process. Table 2 illustrates the mean and standard deviation of stakeholders' perceptions of the effectiveness of the on-site inspection activities.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Stakeholders' Perceptions of Onsite-Inspection Activities

Onsite Inspection Activities	Mean	SD
Inspectors spend at least two days in this school	1.36	.771
Inspectors observe the entire period of the lesson in this school	3.30	.914
Inspectors align their activities to the school timetable	2.80	1.282
Inspectors use a variety of information-gathering methods in this school	3.56	1.118
Inspectors only observe lessons for subjects of their specialty in this school	2.06	1.044
Inspectors observe every teacher at least once every year in this school	2.11	1.001
Inspectors check learners' books during classroom observations in this school	3.09	1.238
Inspectors talk to learners during the inspection exercise	3.07	1.103
Inspectors move around to observe other school facilities	4.30	.516
Inspectors maintain a friendly atmosphere during inspections in this school	4.33	.583

On-site inspection activities illustrated in Table 2 are generally seen as effective, with a few concerns about the duration and depth of the inspections. The items "Inspectors maintain a friendly atmosphere during inspections" (mean = 4.33) and "Inspectors move around to observe other school facilities" (mean = 4.30) received high ratings, reflecting positive perceptions of the engagement and thoroughness of inspectors. These findings suggest that stakeholders appreciate the interactive nature of inspections and the attention to both classroom activities and the physical environment.

However, the item "Inspectors spend at least two days in this school" received the lowest rating (mean = 1.36), showing that stakeholders feel inspections are too brief. This perception highlights a gap in the ability of the inspection process to adequately assess school needs, especially given the limited time spent in schools. Another weak area was inspectors observe every teacher at least once a term with mean score of 2.11. This indicates that it is not common for inspectors to observe every teacher at least once a year. The mean suggests that some teachers may not be observed as frequently. The overall perception is that on-site inspections are effective but could benefit from more time to ensure a comprehensive assessment of school needs as well as observing every teacher in a year for improved teacher practice.

Thus, this study interviews with the headteachers, revealed that;

"… inspectors come to their schools at least once in a year or a term for some schools, but spend very limited time, ranging from 30minutes to 2 hours depending on the objectives of the inspection and it is rare to have a full or more than a day in school…". "… the inspectors occasionally observe the entire lesson, learners' books or find when we have other schedules and fail to observe teachers since most of their activities are not aligned with the school timetable...". The headteachers further indicate that "...indeed inspectors move around to observe school facilities but without much concentration...".

Affirming to the above, the inspectors indicated that;

"...we have tried to visit most of the schools, but due to limited resources and staff amidst overwhelming number of schools in the district, it was not possible to spend a day in one school, unless there is a special case...". "… we have tried to conduct classroom observations for a few teachers in a particular school and observe the entire lesson, but it is not possible to observe all the teachers throughout the year…".

Stakeholders' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Post-Inspection activities

Table 3 illustrates the mean and standard deviation of stakeholders' perceptions of the effectiveness of post-inspection activities.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Stakeholders' Perceptions of Post-Inspection Activities

Post Inspection Activities	Mean	SD
Inspectors hold post-observation meetings with all teachers who were observed	3.87	1.008
Inspectors provide immediate feedback to teachers following lesson observations	3.67	.795
Inspectors hold meetings to arrive at judgment about the education quality	2.69	1.300
Inspection findings are shared with stakeholders	3.01	.972
Detailed reports are issued within two weeks of Inspection in this school	2.90	1.047
The final inspection report is a fair reflection of the informal feedback received	3.69	.843
There is an improvement plan developed by all the stakeholders	3.38	1.147
All inspection recommendations are implemented in this school	3.05	.896
Inspectors make follow-up inspections at least once a year in this school	3.22	1.495
Inspectors organize refresher pieces of training to address teachers' weaknesses	1.71	.890

The findings for post-inspection activities in Table 3 suggest that stakeholders view them positively in terms of feedback and communication, but concerns remain about follow-up actions and sustaining improvements. The post-observation meetings and immediate feedback received high ratings (mean = 3.87 and 3.67, respectively), indicating that stakeholders value the feedback provided after inspections as a key element in improving teaching quality.

However, follow-up actions such as the development of an improvement plan (mean = 3.38) and implementation of recommendations (mean = 3.05) received lower ratings, indicating that while these activities are recognized, they are not consistently implemented. The lowest-rated item, "Inspectors organize refresher training to address teachers'' weaknesses" (mean = 1.71), suggests that ongoing professional development after inspections is lacking, which could undermine the long-term impact of the inspection process. In short, while post-inspection activities are generally effective, there is a clear need for improvement in follow-up and sustained support for teachers, including the implementation of recommendations and the organization of refresher training.

In agreement with the teachers' perceptions, the headteachers added that: "... after conducting inspection, inspectors rarely hold post inspection meetings involving staff, they only engage the few teachers that have been observed, sometimes they discuss observations made in the headteacher' office and leave a copy of their report...". The headteachers further added that:

"...there is little input of the teachers in regard to the quality of education since teachers are not quite often engaged in any discussions to have their views or generate the improvement plan..." "...minimal follow up is made after inspection visits by the inspectors as well as refresher trainings or seminars to close the gaps identified...". This minimizes the intended goal of school inspection to give feedback about the quality of education being provided."

The inspectorate officials reported that;

"...due to limited time, we rarely conduct post observation meetings with entire staff. We only meet with the teachers that have been observed that day. It is not possible to observe all the teachers in a school, even during the course of the year, we only sample...". Our observation report is given to the headteacher to share with the rest of the stakeholders. "...we rarely participate in the development of the school improvement plan, the headteacher does it with the other stakeholders...". The level of implementation of inspection recommendations is evaluated at our next inspection visit. Due to

limited resources and under staffing, it is not possible to organize refresher training for staff or management, though on rare occasions we try."

Comparison of Stakeholders' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Pre-Inspection, On-Site, and Post-Inspection Activities

This section presents a comparative analysis of stakeholders' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the various inspection activities focusing on the three critical phases of the inspection process: pre-inspection, on-site inspection, and post-inspection activities by examining the similarities, differences across the three phases so as to identify areas of strength and weaknesses, as well as opportunities for improvement. Table 4 presents stakeholders' perceptions of the effectiveness of pre-inspection, on-site inspection, and post-inspection activities based on the transformation of their mean scores into categorical levels. Each respondent's mean score was categorized into one of five levels: Very Ineffective (1-1.5), Ineffective (1.6-2.0), Moderately Effective (2.1-3.0), Effective (3.1-4.0), and Very Effective (4.1-5.0). This transformation helps clarify the distribution of perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the different phases of school inspection.

Table 4: Comparison of Levels of Effectiveness for Inspection Activities

Level of Effectiveness	Pre-Inspection Activities	On-Site Inspection Activities	Post-Inspection Activities
Very Ineffective (1-1.5)	Frequency: 10 (3.5%)	-	-
Ineffective (1.6-2.0)	Frequency: 8 (2.8%)	-	-
Moderate (2.1-3.0)	Frequency: 149 (51.7%)	Frequency: 57 (19.8%)	Frequency: 33 (11.5%)
Effective (3.1-4.0)	Frequency: 117 (40.6%)	Frequency: 210 (72.9%)	Frequency: 224 (77.7%)
Very Effective (4.1-5.0)	Frequency: 4 (1.4%)	Frequency: 21 (7.3%)	Frequency: 31 (10.8%)
Total	**Frequency: 288 (100.0%)**	**Frequency: 288 (100.0%)**	**Frequency: 288 (100.0%)**

For pre-inspection activities, the majority of respondents' mean scores fell into the Moderately Effective category (51.7%), with a substantial portion also rating them as Effective (40.6%). However, a small percentage of respondents' mean scores fell into the Very Ineffective (3.5%) and Ineffective (2.8%) categories, suggesting that while pre-inspection activities are generally seen as helpful, there is room for improvement, particularly in terms of providing timely notice and increasing stakeholder involvement.

In contrast, on-site inspection activities were predominantly perceived as Effective (72.9%), with a smaller portion of respondents rating them as Moderately Effective (19.8%). Very few respondents categorized these activities as Very Ineffective or Ineffective, indicating that this phase is generally regarded as the most effective among the three phases of the inspection process. This reflects a consensus that on-site inspections are valuable for assessing school needs and engaging with both staff and students.

Similarly, post-inspection activities received high ratings, with the majority of respondents' mean scores falling into the Effective category (77.7%). A smaller portion rated them as Moderately Effective (11.5%), while very few respondents considered them Very Ineffective or Ineffective. These findings suggest that while post-inspection activities, such as feedback and meetings, are seen as beneficial, there is still room for improvement, particularly in terms of follow-up actions, professional development, and the implementation of recommendations.

Overall, the findings highlight that on-site inspection activities are viewed as the most effective by stakeholders, while there is a clear need for improvement in pre-inspection and post-inspection activities. Specifically, timeliness, stakeholder engagement, and sustained support for long-term improvements are areas that need attention.

DISCUSSIONS

The study found that inspectors did not give schools notification of inspections, hence they preferred to utilize unexpected inspections without including

schools in the evaluation planning process. This conclusion supports the observation of some researchers (Aleesha, 2012; Hossain, 2017; Tanah, 2011; Wilcox, 2000) that in the majority of inspections, schools were not notified or participated in the planning of the inspection. The practice of conducting unannounced school inspections, where schools receive no prior notification of the inspector's visit has significant implications for the effectiveness of school inspection procedures. These results concur with Bagaya et al. (2020) that such surprise visits can lead to mistrust among teachers, who may perceive inspections as fault-finding missions rather than supportive evaluations. This perception fosters fear and insecurity, potentially hindering the progress of a robust quality assurance culture within schools. Moreover, the lack of preparation time may cause schools to prioritize inspection readiness over genuine pedagogical improvement, thereby diminishing the overall effectiveness of the inspection process. What remains to be determined is the appropriate time between notice and assessment that will prevent excessive strain on schools to get ready for the inspection while also giving them enough time to compile the necessary documentation for evaluation and align instructional activities with the inspection time frame.

The study further revealed that inspectors were giving inadequate time to inspection exercise as well as observing a small number of teachers. The findings are in agreement with previous researchers who found similar results. For instance, research by the Ofsted (2019), OECD, (2019), Smith, (2020) and Apple, (2018) indicates that insufficient inspection time and minimal teacher observations can lead to inadequate assessments of teacher quality, incomplete or inaccurate assessments hence undermining the accuracy and utility of evaluations. Moreover, studies conducted by Amels et al. (2020) on school effectiveness and school improvement suggest that when inspectors observe only a few teachers, the resulting evaluations may not accurately represent the overall teaching quality within a school. This selective observation can lead to skewed perceptions, potentially overlooking areas that require development or misidentifying strengths and weaknesses. Consequently, the feedback

provided may be of low quality and not always effective in fostering instructional improvement, hence undermining the effectiveness of school inspection activities. Therefore, the practice of allocating limited time for inspections and observing only a few teachers can compromise the effectiveness of school inspection procedures. Comprehensive evaluations that involve thorough classroom observations and sufficient engagement with teaching staff are essential for producing accurate assessments and fostering meaningful educational improvements.

Moreover, the study also revealed that there was inadequate follow up visits after inspection as well as partial implementation of inspection recommendation. What is potent is that the effectiveness of school inspection procedures is significantly influenced by the extent of follow-up after inspections and the degree to which schools implement the resulting recommendations. Research indicates that inadequate follow-up and poor implementation can undermine the potential benefits of inspections, and consequently crippling the effectiveness of the inspection process. For instance, in their research conducted by Hofer et al., (2020), a systematic review of 30 years of international research on school inspection effectiveness revealed that majority of inspection effects were not significant, with minimal positive outcomes. This suggests that without adequate follow-up and support for implementing recommendations, inspections may have limited impact on school improvement.

CONCLUSIONS

The evidence of this study shows that there is limited involvement of the stakeholders in the planning of inspection such as the PTA and BOG, inadequate notice for inspection, inadequate time allocated to inspection, limited involvement of the stakeholders to make judgement of the quality of education, insufficient refresher trainings, and partial implementation of the inspection recommendations which undermines the effectiveness of school inspection process and its efforts to achieve the intended impact, leaving critical issues unresolved and compromising the overall quality of education

provided. The overall effectiveness of school inspection was moderate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The school inspection authorities should provide sufficient notice before inspection visits to allow schools to prepare adequately

Also, allocate more time for inspection exercises to enable a thorough evaluation of all key aspects of school operations, including teaching quality, learning outcomes, and administrative practices

Design and implement regular refresher training programs to close the gaps identified during inspection and develop monitoring tools and frameworks to track the progress of recommendation implementation, ensuring that schools stay on course and receive timely interventions if needed.

REFERENCES

Aleesha, M. J. (2012). School Inspection System (No. 276).

Ali, M. A. (1998). Supervision for teacher development: A proposal for Pakistan. Paris: IIEP/UNESCO. Retrieved from http://ddp-ext.worldbank.org/EdStats/PAKpub98.pdf

Amels, J., Krüger, M. L., Suhre, C. J. M., & van Veen, K. (2020). The effects of distributed leadership and inquiry-based work on primary teachers' capacity to change: Testing a model. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement.* https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2020.174636 3

Apple, M. W. (2018). School inspection and teacher quality. *Journal of Educational Research*, 111(4), 439-448.

Bagaya, J., Ezati, B. A., Wafula, W. S., & Rasmussen, P. D. (2020). School inspection practices: Evidence from secondary schools in Western Uganda. *Journal of Education and Training*, 7(1), 56–76. https://doi.org/10.5296/jet.v7i1.16181

Casteel, V., & Roebuck, M. (2000). *The Education Standards Agency*: A Report to the Uganda Ministry of Education and Sports. Glasgow: Author.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). Research Methods in Education (6th ed.). New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8527.2007.00388_4.x

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (3rd Edition)*. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore: SAGE.

De Grauwe, A. 2007. School Supervision in Four African Countries. Volume 1: Challenges and Reforms. Paris: IIEP.

Education (Pre-Primary, Primary and Post-Primary) Act, 2008. Acts Supplement, 44 UPPC § (2008). Uganda.

Education Standards Agency. (2006). *A Handbook for School Inspectors. Kampala*: Education Standards Agency.

Ehren, M. C. M. (2016). *Methods and Modalities of Effective School Inspections*. (M. C. M. Ehren & K. M. Merki, Eds.). London: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31003-9

Ehren, M. C. M. (2016). Chapter 4. School Inspections and School Improvement; the Current Evidence Base. In M.C.M. Ehren (Ed), Methods and modalities of effective school inspections (pp. 69-85). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Ehren, M. C. M., & Honingh, M. E. (2011). "Risk-based school inspections in the Netherlands:

A critical reflection on intended effects and causal mechanisms". *Studies in Educational Evaluation,* 37(4), 239- 248. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.stueduc.2012.02.001

Garet, M. S., Wayne, A. J., Brown, S., Rickles, J., Song, M., & Manzeske, D. (2017). The impact of providing performance feedback to teachers and principals (NCEE 2018-4001). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20184001/

Government of the Republic of Uganda. (1992). Government White Paper on the Education Policy Review Commission Report: Education for National Integration and Development. Kampala: Government of the Republic of Uganda.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105–117). Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Hammond, M. (2013). The contribution of pragmatism to understanding educational action research: Value and consequences. *Educational Action Research,* 21(4), 603–618. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2013.832632

Haris, I., Naway, F. A., Pulukadang, W. T., Takeshita, H., & Ancho, I. V. (2018). School supervision practices in the Indonesian education system; perspectives and challenges. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 9(2), 366–387. https://doi.org/10.17499/jsser.17724

Hofer, S., Holzberger, D., & Reiss, K. (2020). Evaluating school inspection effectiveness: A systematic research synthesis on 30 years of international research. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 66, 100864. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100864

Hossain, M. (2017). *School Inspection Challenges: Evidence from Six Countries*. Paris.

Hooge, E., Burns, T., & Wilkoszewski, H. (2012). *Looking Beyond Numbers: Stakeholders and Multiple School Accountability*.

Kalolo, J. F. (2015). The Drive towards Application of Pragmatic Perspective in Educational Research: Opportunities and Challenges. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 5(1), 150–171. https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v5i1.7145

Khan, S., & Abdullah, N. N. (2019). The impact of staff training and development on teachers' productivity. Economics, Management and Sustainability, 4(1), 37-45. https://doi.org/10.14254/ jems.2019.4-1.4.

Kivunja, C., & Kuyini, A. B. (2017). Understanding and Applying Research Paradigms in Educational Contexts. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 6(5), 26–41. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n5p26

Klerks, M. (2012). *The effect of school inspections: a systematic review*. The Netherlands: Inspectorate for Youth Care. [Accessed 31 July 2018].

Lugujjo, E. (2008). *A Critique of the Post-Primary Education and Training*. Kampala: Author.

MacBeath, J. (2006). *School inspection and self-evaluation*: Working with a new relationship. New York: Routledge.

Manase, J., & Habibu, D. A. (2017). Stakeholders' Perceptions on the Adequacy of External Supervision in Secondary Schools in Chamwino District, Tanzania. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, 6(10), 157–162.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). (2000). *A Framework for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Education Sector.* Kampala: Author.

Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). (2016). *Education Abstract. Kampala*: Author.

Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). (2017). *Education Sector Strategic Plan* 2017/18 2019/20. Kampala: Ministry of Education and Sports.

Ministry of Education and Sports. (2004). *The national report on the development of education in Uganda at the beginning of the 21st century*. Kampala.

Ministry of Education and Sports. (2008). *Revised Education Sector Strategic Plan 2007-2015. Kampala:* Ministry of Education and Sports.

Ministry of Education and Sports. (2012). *How we inspect*: A Guide to External Evaluation. Kampala: Ministry of Education and Sports.

Mohanty, B. (2000). *School Administration and Supervision*. New Delhi: Deep and Deep.

Mokoena, S. (2011). Participative Decision-making: Perceptions of School Stakeholders in South Africa. *Journal of Social Sciences*, https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2011.118929 62

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W., (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement.

National Planning Authority. (2010). *National Development Plan* 2010/11-2014/15. Kampala: National Planning Authority.

OECD. (2019). Evaluating school inspections.

Ofsted. (2005). *School inspection handbook*. Ofsted. Manchester: Ofsted. https://doi.org/10.4324/97 80203416242_chapter_2

Pradhan, M., Suryadarma, D., Beatty, A., Wong, M., Alisjahbana, A., Gaduh, A., & Artha, R. P. (2012). Improving Educational Quality through Enhancing Community Participation: Results from a Randomized Field Experiment in Indonesia. Author

Republic of Uganda. (2013). Uganda Vision 2040: Accelerating Uganda's Socioeconomic Transfo rmation. Kampala: https://doi.org/10.1007/s119 47-009-0181-3 National Planning Authority.

Republic of Uganda. 1992. Government White paper on the Education policy Review Commission Report on Education for National Integration and Development. Kampala: Republic of Uganda.

Rono, D. K. (2000). *Handbook of Inspection for Educational Institutions*. Nairobi Kenya: Ministry of Education Science and Technology.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *Popular film as an instructional strategy in qualitative research methods courses.* Qualitative Inquiry, 15(1), 247–61.

Saunders, M. N., Lewis, P., Thornhill, A., & Bristow, A. (2019). *Research Methods for Business Students* (8th ed.). UK: Pearson.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2007). Supervision: A redefinition. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Shannon-Baker, P. (2016). Making Paradigms Meaningful in Mixed Methods Research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 10(4), 319–334

Smith, J. (2020). *The impact of inspection on teacher motivation*. Teaching and Teacher Education, 87, 102924.

Tanah, R. N. (2011). *Appraisal of the Inspection of Secondary Schools in the North West Region of Cameroon*. University of Nigeria, Nkukka. https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390.2011.569130

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2015). Overview of Contemporary Issues in Mixed Methods Research. In SAGE *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research* (2nd ed., pp. 1– 42). https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506 335193.n1

United Nations. (2015). *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2010*. United Nations. New York: United Nations. https://doi.org/10.1177/1757975909358250

Ward, M., Penny, A., & Read, T. (2006). Education reform in Uganda: 1997 to 2004: Reflections on policy, partnership, strategy, and implementation. Department for International Development. http://www.dfid.gov.uk

Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2005). *Research methods in education*. USA: Pearson.

Wilcox, B. (2000). *Making school inspection visits more effective*: The English experience. Paris: UNESCO.

Yin, L., Zhang, Y., & Liu, X. (2022). Teacher accountability and student achievement: A systematic review. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 114(5), 831-845.

Zaare, M. (2012*).* An investigation into the effect of classroom observation on teaching methodology. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 70(25), 605-614. doi:10.1016/j. sbspro.2013.01.099