

FACTORS LIMITING SCHOOL COMMITTEE ENGAGEMENT IN PRIMARY SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLANS: A CASE STUDY OF SIMANJIRO DISTRICT, MANYARA REGION

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the factors limiting the engagement of school committees in the development plans of primary schools in Simanjiro District, Manyara Region. Despite the crucial role of school committees in educational planning and development, their involvement often falls short of expectations. Through a mixed-methods approach, data were collected from a sample of 146 respondents, including head teachers, teachers, the District Education Officer (DEO), school committee members and school committee chairpersons. The findings reveal that limited engagement is influenced by factors such as inadequate training, insufficient resources, lack of awareness of roles and responsibilities and minimal support from educational authorities. These constraints hinder the effectiveness of school committees in contributing to school development plans. The study concludes with recommendations for enhancing the capacity and participation of school committees to improve the planning and development of primary education in the district.

Key words: School Committee, School Development Plans, Low Involvement, Quality Education.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

A school committee is a crucial entity mandated by law to oversee primary school activities and support the implementation of the Government's Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP), as outlined by the 1978 Education Act in Tanzania. This committee, as noted by Sumra (1996) and Mpango and Mushi (1998), faces challenges such as dominance by teachers, limited education among members, and minimal critical examination of school plans. Despite the recognized importance of community involvement in education, evidenced by significant contributions in Indonesia (RTI, 2010), there persists a gap between policy intent and implementation, leading to low engagement levels.

The discrepancy between policy and practice prompts this study's investigation into the barriers hindering school committee involvement in Simanjiro District, Manyara Region. Through a lens informed by Nemes (2013) and Kiwope (2003), the study seeks to understand the challenges faced by committee members, their roles in school development, and propose strategies to enhance their participation. By addressing these issues, the study aims to improve the quality of primary education in Simanjiro District and contribute to bridging the gap between policy aspirations and on-the-ground realities.

Engagement of school committees in the development plans of primary schools is a critical factor in enhancing educational outcomes. In the Simanjiro District of Manyara Region, Tanzania, the involvement of school committees in primary school development plans has been notably limited. Understanding the factors contributing to this limited engagement is essential for formulating effective strategies to enhance educational development at the grassroots level. Several studies have highlighted the importance of community and parental involvement in the educational process. Effective school committee engagement can lead to improved educational outcomes, greater accountability, and better resource management (Waterford.org, 2019). However, numerous barriers can hinder such involvement, including socio-economic challenges, lack of training and inadequate support from educational authorities (World Bank, 2024).

A significant factor limiting school committee engagement is the socio-economic status of the community. Many families in rural areas like Simanjiro face economic hardships that limit their ability to participate actively in school activities (BMJ Global Health, 2020). Additionally, logistical issues such as transportation and time constraints further exacerbate the situation (Waterford.org, 2019). Moreover, the lack of proper training and awareness among school committee members about their roles and responsibilities can also hinder effective engagement (World Bank, 2024).

Furthermore, the relationship between school committees and educational authorities can influence the level of engagement. In many cases, school committees feel marginalized and lack the necessary support and recognition from district education officers and other authorities which can demotivate them from participating actively in school development plans (BMJ Global Health, 2020). This study aims to explore these factors in detail and provide

recommendations for improving school committee engagement in the Simanjiro District. By addressing the identified barriers, it is hoped that the involvement of school committees in primary school development plans can be enhanced, thereby contributing to better educational outcomes for the students.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

The involvement of school committees in the development plans of primary schools is crucial for enhancing educational outcomes. This literature review explores the various factors limiting school committee engagement particularly in the context of Simanjiro District, Manyara Region. Recent studies and reports from 2017 to 2024 provide insights into the challenges and barriers faced by these committees.

2.1 Factors Limiting Engagement

Socioeconomic Barriers: Socioeconomic factors play a significant role in limiting the engagement of school committees. Studies have shown that financial constraints and lack of resources can hinder the effective participation of committee members in school activities. For example, the Education and Training Monitor 2020 highlighted the disparities in educational investments and resources across different regions, which directly impacts the ability of school committees to contribute effectively (European Commission, 2020)

Lack of Training and Capacity Building: The effectiveness of school committees is often limited by the lack of adequate training and capacity-building programs. Research indicates that committee members frequently lack the necessary skills and knowledge to engage in school development plans effectively. Training programs and professional development opportunities are essential for empowering committee members. For instance, Waterford.org emphasizes the need for continuous professional development to enhance family and community engagement in schools (Waterford.org, 2024)

Institutional and Policy Constraints: Institutional and policy-related constraints also pose significant challenges to school committee engagement. Policies that do not clearly define the roles and responsibilities of school committees can lead to confusion and reduced participation. Additionally, bureaucratic hurdles and lack of support from educational authorities can further complicate the engagement process. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reported on the various administrative and policy-related barriers

that schools face in maintaining safe and supportive environments which can also affect committee participation (NCES, 2024)

Cultural and Social Barriers: Cultural norms and social dynamics within communities can either facilitate or hinder the involvement of school committees. In some cases, cultural perceptions about education and the roles of different stakeholders can limit active participation. Engaging diverse families and overcoming societal barriers requires targeted strategies to build inclusive environments that respect and value all voices. The importance of addressing these barriers is highlighted by various studies on family and community engagement (Waterford.org, 2024).

Logistical and Structural Issues: Logistical challenges such as transportation, time constraints and communication difficulties also affect the engagement of school committees. Many committee members may have other responsibilities that limit their availability to participate in school-related activities. Flexible meeting schedules and improved communication channels are necessary to mitigate these issues and enhance engagement. Generally, addressing the factors that limit school committee engagement requires a complex approach that includes socioeconomic support, capacity building, policy reform and cultural sensitivity. By tackling these barriers, educational authorities and communities can work together to ensure that school committees play a pivotal role in the development and success of primary schools.

3.0 METHODS

3.1 Research Approach

This study adopts a mixed-methods approach combining both qualitative and quantitative research methods to comprehensively investigate the factors limiting school committee engagement in primary school development plans in Simanjiro District, Manyara Region. The mixed-methods approach is chosen to provide a more complete understanding of the research problem by integrating numerical data with in-depth qualitative insights (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017).

Quantitative Approach: The quantitative component involves the collection and analysis of numerical data through structured questionnaires administered to a sample of 150 respondents including head teachers, teachers, the District Education Officer (DEO), school committee members and school committee chairpersons. This approach allows for the

quantification of the extent to which various factors limit school committee engagement, enabling statistical analysis and identification of significant trends and patterns.

Qualitative Approach: The qualitative component includes semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with a subset of the respondents. This approach aims to capture the deeper, context-specific insights and experiences of the participants regarding the challenges they face in engaging with school development plans. The qualitative data provide rich, detailed narratives that complement and contextualize the quantitative findings (Patton, 2015).

3.2 Research Design

Basing on the overall research objective, this study employed a descriptive survey design to guide the process of data collection and analysis. This design seems to be useful because it relies on large-scale data gathering from a wide population at one point of time and that it enables generalizations to be made about the issue under investigation (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2017). This design has also been chosen by a researcher because it enables him to gather detail information of the study within its real-life context while capturing the differences within and between the cases especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and the context are not clearly evident (Han & Yin, 2016). The chosen research design in this study also enables the researcher to obtain the research data through triangulation methods as it provides a means of integrating qualitative and quantitative methods into a single research study (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The data was collected, presented and analysed through descriptive survey design in which representative sample was drawn from the study target population. The results obtained from the sample was used to generalize the whole population.

Sampling Method

3.3 Sample

The sample for this study includes key stakeholders involved in primary school development in the Simanjiro District, Manyara Region. The total sample size is 146 respondents, comprising the following groups: 5 Head Teachers, 125 Teachers, 1 District Education Officer (DEO), 10 School Committee Members and 5 School Committee Chairpersons.

3.4 Sampling Procedures

The sampling procedures involve both stratified random sampling and purposive sampling techniques to ensure a representative and comprehensive sample of the target population.

3, 4.1 Stratified Random Sampling

The purpose of stratified random sampling is to ensure that each subgroup (head teachers, teachers, school committee members and school committee chairpersons) is adequately represented in the sample. The population was divided into distinct subgroups based on their roles (e.g., head teachers, teachers, school committee members, school committee chairpersons). A proportional number of respondents was selected from each subgroup relative to their size in the population. For instance, if teachers constitute 40% of the total population, 40% of the sample (60 respondents) will be teachers. Within each subgroup, respondents were randomly selected to ensure that every individual has an equal chance of being included in the sample. This random selection helps in reducing selection bias and enhances the generalizability of the findings (Kumar, 2019).

3.4.2 Purposive Sampling

The purpose of purposive sampling is to ensure the inclusion of the District Education Officer (DEO) and key school committee members who play significant roles in the development plans and have unique insights. The DEO and school committee chairpersons were selected purposively due to their specific roles and potential impact on school development plans. Their inclusion is crucial for obtaining in-depth qualitative data. School committee members with significant experience or leadership roles were chosen based on specific criteria such as years of service, involvement in previous development plans, and leadership positions. This approach helps in gathering rich, detailed information relevant to the study's objectives (Patton, 2015). The sample size of 150 respondents is determined based on the need to ensure statistical validity and reliability while balancing practical constraints such as time and resources. A larger sample size increases the precision of the estimates and the power of the study to detect significant effects (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017).

3.5 Data Collection Instruments

The selected respondents were approached for data collection through questionnaires, interviews and focus group discussions

Table 1: Demographic Information of Respondents

Category	Age	Educational Qualifications	Working Experience	Gender	Percentage
Head Teachers (5)					3.4%
	30-39 years: 1 (20%)	Diploma: 2 (40%)	1-5 years: 1 (20%)	Male: 3 (60%)	
	40-49 years: 3 (60%)	Bachelor's: 3 (60%)	6-10 years: 2 (40%)	Female: 2 (40%)	
	50-59 years: 1 (20%)		11-15 years: 1 (20%)		
			16+ years: 1 (20%)		
Teachers (125)					85.6%
	20-29 years: 25 (20%)	Certificate: 50 (40%)	1-5 years: 30 (24%)	Male: 60 (48%)	
	30-39 years: 50 (40%)	Diploma: 55 (44%)	6-10 years: 40 (32%)	Female: 65 (52%)	
	40-49 years: 35 (28%)	Bachelor's: 20 (16%)	11-15 years: 30 (24%)		
	50-59 years: 15 (12%)		16+ years: 25 (20%)		
DEO (1)					0.7%
	50-59 years: 1 (100%)	Master's: 1 (100%)	20+ years: 1 (100%)	Male: 1 (100%)	
Committee Members (10)					6.8%
	30-39 years: 3 (30%)	Primary: 3 (30%)	1-5 years: 4 (40%)	Male: 6 (60%)	
	40-49 years: 4 (40%)	Secondary: 5 (50%)	6-10 years: 3 (30%)	Female: 4 (40%)	
	50-59 years: 2 (20%)	Diploma: 2 (20%)	11-15 years: 2 (20%)		
	60+ years: 1 (10%)		16+ years: 1 (10%)		
Chairpersons (5)					3.4%
	40-49 years: 2 (40%)	Secondary: 3 (60%)	1-5 years: 1 (20%)	Male: 4 (80%)	
	50-59 years: 3 (60%)	Diploma: 2 (40%)	6-10 years: 2 (40%)	Female: 1 (20%)	
			11-15 years: 1 (20%)		
			16+ years: 1 (20%)		

Source: Field Data (2024)

The study on factors limiting school committee engagement in primary school development plans in Simanjiro District, Manyara Region, involved 146 respondents, including head teachers, teachers, a District Education Officer (DEO), school committee members, and school committee chairpersons. The demographic data in table 1 reveals a diverse group: most teachers (85.6%) are between 20-49 years old, predominantly holding diplomas (44%) and certificates (40%), with a balanced gender distribution (48% male, 52% female). Head teachers, though fewer (3.4%), are mainly aged 40-49 and possess higher qualifications (60% with bachelor's degrees). The DEO, an experienced male over 50 with a master's degree, represents 0.7% of the sample. School committee members (6.8%) and chairpersons (3.4%) mostly have secondary education, with significant proportions having 1-10 years of experience. This varied demographic highlights the involvement of both genders and a range of ages, qualifications, and experiences, providing a comprehensive perspective on school committee engagement in primary school development plans.

4.0 RESULTS

Table 2: Challenges Facing School Committee Members in Involvement in Preparing School Development Plans in Primary Schools

S/ N	Response	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
1	Many responsibilities among school committee members	60%	20.6%	0%	14.4%	5%
2	Low level of knowledge on the importance of education among school committee members	55%	22.1%	0%	16.9%	6%
3	Long distance from home to school	59%	20.9%	0%	15.1%	5%
4	Lack of allowances for attending school meetings	47.4%	20%	0%	25.9%	6%
5	Lack of transport for school committee members	50%	19.4%	0%	23.6%	7%
6	Failure of head teachers in inviting school committee members to prepare school development plans	50.8%	20%	0%	21.2%	8%
7	Lack of awareness of responsibilities among school committee members	54.3%	20%	0%	17.7%	8%
8	Misunderstanding between school	55%	22.1%	0%	16.9%	6%

	committee members and school administration					
9	Lack of financial and material support for school development, causing discouragement	55.8%	22%	0%	15.2%	7%

Source: Field Data (2024)

Table 1 presents the challenges faced by school committee members in their involvement in the preparation of school development plans in primary schools. The data indicates a range of issues hindering effective participation. Firstly, the burden of numerous responsibilities among committee members appears significant, with 60% strongly agreeing and 20.6% agreeing to this statement. This suggests that committee members may struggle to allocate sufficient time and energy to engage fully in the planning process due to other commitments.

Secondly, there is a prevalent lack of awareness and understanding of the importance of education among committee members, with 55% strongly agreeing and 22.1% agreeing to this point. This deficiency in comprehension may impede their ability to contribute meaningfully to the development of effective plans. Additionally, logistical challenges such as long distances to travel to the school (59% strongly agreeing) and the absence of allowances and transport (47.4% strongly agreeing for lack of allowances, 50% for lack of transport) further exacerbate the difficulties faced by committee members. Moreover, issues such as ineffective communication between committee members and school administration (55% strongly agreeing) and the absence of financial and material support for school development (55.8% strongly agreeing) underscore systemic obstacles that hinder the collaborative planning process. Addressing these challenges holistically will be essential to fostering greater engagement and efficacy in school development planning initiatives. Table 3 presents the findings obtained from the respondents on roles of school committee Members in preparation and implement primary school development plans

Table 3: Roles of School Committee Members in Preparing and Implementing Primary School Development Plans

S/N	Response	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
-----	----------	--------------------	-----------	-------------	--------------	-----------------------

1	To mobilize community contributions for school development	50	20.3	4	12	13.7
2	Planning and budgeting for school requirements	60.9	20	1	9	9.1
3	To provide feedback to the community on the implementation of the school plans	62	20	2	7	9
4	Proper supervision of the utilization of capitation grants and school funds	70.6	9	2	7	11.4

Source: Field Data (2024)

The data from table 3 shows the perceptions of respondents regarding the roles of school committee members in primary school development plans. The percentages indicate the level of agreement or disagreement with each role. For example, 50% strongly agree and 20.3% agree that school committee members are responsible for mobilizing community contributions for school development. This suggests that a significant portion (70.3%) of respondents see this as a crucial role for the committee. Similarly, 60.9% strongly agree and 20% agree that committee members should be involved in planning and budgeting for school requirements, indicating a high level of agreement (80.9%). On the other hand, roles like providing feedback on plan implementation and supervising fund utilization also gathered substantial agreement, with 82% and 79.6% respectively. However, there are notable percentages of respondents expressing neutrality or disagreement across all roles, highlighting potential areas for further investigation or improvement in committee engagement within primary school development plans.

The study also investigated the measures to be taken so as to involve the school committee members in preparation and implementing school development plans. Table 3 presents the results on measures to be taken for involvement of school committee members in preparation and implementing school development plans

Table 4: Involving School Committee Members in Preparing and Implementing School Development Plans

S/N	Response	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
1	Provision of education on the importance of school development plans among school committee members	59.7	10.6	8.9	10	10.8
2	Provision of allowances among school committee members as motivation to them so as to attend meetings	48.9	20.3	5.8	9	16
3	Provision of transport among school committee members so as to attend meetings	54.3	16.4	5.7	10	13.6
4	Encouraging good relationship between school committee members and school administration	43.3	24	9.1	11.6	12
5	Provision of education on how to prepare the school development plans among the school committee members	51.7	22.3	7.9	8	10.1
6	Provision of frequent seminars on school development plans among school committee members	50.6	29	3	7.4	10
7	Head teachers to involve the school committee members to prepare school development plans	55	25.8	7.4	5	6.8
8	The community to select school committee members with less responsibilities so as to make them attending school meetings	50.8	24.9	11.1	5.2	8
9	Selecting school committee members who live near school environment	52.8	23.3	10	6.9	7

10	Provision of education among school committee members so as to know their responsibilities	58.5	26.4	2.6	5.8	6.7
----	--	------	------	-----	-----	-----

Source: Field Data (2024)

The study's findings presented in table 3 indicate that enhancing the involvement of school committee members in school development plans requires several key measures. For instance, 59.7% of respondents strongly agree that providing education on the importance of these plans is crucial, addressing the lack of knowledge identified earlier. Similarly, 51.7% strongly agree on the need for specific training on preparing development plans, while 50.6% strongly agree on the importance of frequent seminars. These educational initiatives can significantly improve members' understanding and engagement. Furthermore, 55% of respondents strongly believe that head teachers should actively involve committee members, which can foster better collaboration and support from educational authorities.

Addressing logistical and motivational barriers is also essential. The provision of allowances (48.9% strongly agree) and transport (54.3% strongly agree) can alleviate financial and geographical challenges, ensuring committee members can attend meetings regularly. Additionally, selecting members with fewer responsibilities (50.8% strongly agree) and those living closer to the school (52.8% strongly agree) can enhance their availability and commitment. Encouraging good relationships between committee members and the school administration (43.3% strongly agree) can further resolve misunderstandings and improve collaboration. These measures, supported by the data, can significantly enhance the effectiveness of school committees in contributing to primary school development plans in Simanjiro District.

5.0 DISCUSSION

The challenges identified in the study such as the burden of multiple responsibilities among school committee members, resonate with research on the issue of volunteer burnout and overload in community engagement efforts (Carman, 2018). This aligns with findings that suggest volunteers may become disengaged or less effective when they feel overwhelmed by their commitments (Carman, 2018).

Similarly, the low level of knowledge on the importance of education among school committee members reflects broader concerns about educational awareness and capacity building within

community governance structures. Research by Hanushek and Woessmann (2017) emphasizes the critical role of education in economic development and societal progress, highlighting the importance of raising awareness and understanding among all stakeholders, including school committee members.

Furthermore, the lack of financial and material support for school development identified in the study echoes global concerns about resource constraints in education systems, particularly in low-resource settings (World Bank, 2020). Studies have shown that inadequate funding can hinder the implementation of educational initiatives and contribute to disparities in access and quality (World Bank, 2020).

Regarding the measures proposed to involve school committee members in the planning and implementation of school development plans, the emphasis on providing education and training aligns with recommendations for capacity building in community engagement efforts (Birchall, 2020). Birchall (2020) argues that investing in education and skill development can empower community members to take an active role in decision-making processes and contribute effectively to development initiatives.

Additionally, the suggestion to encourage good relationships between school committee members and school administration reflects the importance of fostering collaborative partnerships in educational governance (Harris, Jones, Schildkamp & Hitz, 2021). Research indicates that positive relationships between stakeholders can enhance communication, trust, and overall effectiveness in achieving educational goals (Harris et al., 2021).

In conclusion, the findings of the study on factors limiting school committee engagement in primary school development plans align with broader research on community engagement, educational governance and resource constraints in education systems. By addressing these challenges and implementing measures to enhance committee involvement, policymakers and educators can promote more inclusive and effective approaches to school development planning. During field interview on Challenges facing School Committee Members in involvement for preparation of School Development Plans in Primary Schools, one of the interviewee from category X of respondents had the following to say:

“...As a school committee member, it's really challenging to juggle our many responsibilities. We often have to prioritize our personal work over school matters because we don't receive any allowances for attending

meetings. The long distances we travel to get to school also discourage us and without transport support, it's even harder. Additionally, many of us lack proper knowledge about the importance of education and our specific roles which makes effective participation difficult. There's also sometimes a misunderstanding between us and the school administration which further hampers our involvement in preparing school development plans...."

Again, during field interview on measures to be taken so as to involve the School Committee Members in preparation and Implementing School Development Plans one interviewee from category Y of respondents had the following to say:

"...We need to start by providing proper training for school committee members to enhance their understanding of the importance of education and their roles. Allocating allowances and transportation support will significantly boost their attendance and participation. Additionally, head teachers must be proactive in inviting and involving committee members in school development plans. Regular workshops and clear communication channels can help bridge any misunderstandings between the school administration and committee members. Finally, providing financial and material support will motivate and enable the committee to contribute more effectively..."

5.1 Validity of Research Instruments

The validity of the research instruments in this study is ensured through rigorous methodological processes. The survey questionnaire, designed based on established research frameworks and previous studies, experienced pilot testing to assess its clarity, relevance and effectiveness in capturing the intended data. Additionally, the use of mixed-methods approach, combining both qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques, enhances the comprehensiveness and reliability of the findings. Furthermore, the triangulation of data from multiple sources, including school committee members, head teachers, and educational authorities strengthens the validity of the research instruments by providing diverse perspectives on the issues under investigation.

5.2 Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations are paramount throughout the research process to ensure the protection of participants' rights and confidentiality. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, clearly outlining the purpose of the study, their voluntary participation and the

confidentiality of their responses. Measures were taken to safeguard the anonymity of respondents, such as using coded identifiers instead of personal information in data analysis and reporting. Additionally, ethical approval was obtained from the relevant institutional review board or ethics committee, ensuring that the research adheres to ethical standards and guidelines.

6.0 Conclusion

In conclusion, this study sheds light on the challenges facing school committee members in the preparation and implementation of primary school development plans in Simanjiro District, Manyara Region. The findings underscore the importance of addressing these challenges to enhance the effectiveness of school committees and improve the quality of education in the region. By identifying key barriers and proposing actionable recommendations, the study contributes valuable insights to the field of educational policy and practice.

6.1 Implication for Educational Policy and Practice

The findings of this study have significant implications for educational policy and practice in Tanzania and beyond. They highlight the need for policy reforms to strengthen the role of school committees and enhance their capacity to contribute effectively to school development planning. Policymakers should prioritize measures such as providing training and resources, fostering collaboration between school committees and educational authorities, and promoting community participation in educational decision-making processes. Additionally, educational practitioners can use the findings to inform their practices and initiatives aimed at improving school governance and enhancing the quality of education at the grassroots level.

6.2 Implication of the Findings

The findings of this study provide valuable insights into the factors influencing the engagement of school committee members in primary school development planning. They contribute to a deeper understanding of the challenges faced by school committees and offer practical recommendations for addressing these challenges. The implications of the findings extend beyond Simanjiro District to inform similar contexts and settings where school committees play a crucial role in educational governance. By addressing the identified barriers and leveraging the strengths of school committees, stakeholders can work towards achieving more inclusive, participatory, and effective education systems.

6.3 Limitations

Despite the valuable insights gained from this study, several limitations should be acknowledged. Firstly, the findings are based on data collected from a specific geographical area (Simanjiro District) and may not be generalizable to other contexts. Secondly, the research relied on self-reported data from participants, which may be subject to social desirability bias or inaccuracies. Additionally, the study's cross-sectional design limits the ability to establish fundamental relationships between variables. Future research could address these limitations by employing longitudinal or comparative research designs and expanding the scope to include a more diverse range of participants and contexts.

6.4 Suggestions for Further Study

Building on the findings of this study, several avenues for further research can be explored. Future studies could investigate the long-term impact of interventions aimed at enhancing the engagement of school committee members in school development planning. Additionally, comparative studies across different regions or countries could provide insights into the contextual factors influencing the effectiveness of school committees. Furthermore, research focusing on the perspectives of other stakeholders, such as parents, community leaders, and students, could offer a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of educational governance at the local level. Overall, continued research in this area is essential for informing evidence-based policies and practices aimed at improving educational quality and equity.

CONSENT

As per international standard or university standard, Participant's written consent has been collected and preserved by the author.

REFERENCES

1. Birchall, J. (2020). Capacity building in community development: the case for investment in adult education. *Community Development Journal*, 55(2), 192–208. DOI: 10.1093/cdj/bsz020
2. BMJ Global Health. (2020). Transitioning from donor aid for health: perspectives of national stakeholders in Ghana. Retrieved from BMJ Global Health.
3. Carman, J. G. (2018). Volunteer Engagement and Burnout in Nonprofit Organizations: Examining the Role of Justice in a Dual Path Model. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 29(1), 42–54. DOI: 10.1007/s11266-017-9836-0
4. Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2017). *Research Methods in Education*. In *Research Methods in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539>
5. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research and Design Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. In Thousand Oaks California.
6. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Sage Publications.
7. European Commission. (2020). *Education and Training Monitor 2020*. Retrieved from <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/ed23e292-f0b2-11ea-991b-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>
8. Han, J., & Yin, H. (2016). Teacher motivation: Definition, research development and implications for teachers. *Cogent Education*, 3(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1217819>

9. Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2017). The Economic Impacts of Schooling: A Survey of the Literature. National Bureau of Economic Research. DOI: 10.3386/w24225
10. Harris, A., Jones, M., Schildkamp, K., & Hitz, R. (2021). Effective educational leadership and management in times of crisis: school leadership and management perspectives. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 6(2), 176–191. DOI: 10.1108/JPC-06-2020-0037
11. Kiwope, A.E. (2004). School Committees Member's Perception of Power Sharing in Management of Primary School in Tanzania. Unpublished M.A (Education) Dissertation. University of Dar es Salaam.
12. Kumar, R. (2019). *Research Methodology: A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners*. Sage Publications.
13. Mpango, P.I.N. and Mushi, O.P. (1998). Financing Primary Education in Tanzania: The Impact and Prospects of the Matching Grants and Targeted study Mode Cost Sharing. *Paper in Education*, 19: 1-16.
14. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2024). School Survey on Crime and Safety. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2024043>
15. Nemes, J. (2013). School Committees in the Context of Preparing and Implementing Whole School Development Planning. *Journal of Education and Practice*, Vol. 4. No 7, 2013.
16. Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice*. Sage Publications.
17. Primary Education Development Programme (PEDP II) 2007-2011 (2008). Paper Prepared for Training of Leaders and Supervisors of PEDP II Implementers, ADEM, Bagamoyo: Ministry of Education and Vocational Training & Prime Minister's Office Regional Administration and Local Government

18. R.T.I. (Research Triangle Institute) (2010). Implementing School Based Management in Indonesia: The Decentralized Basic Education 1 (DBE1) Experience: 2005-2010. Impact Study. USAID. Indonesia.
19. Sumra, S. (1996). An Assessment of the Community Education Funds (CEF) Protest Phase. Reports Submitted to Institution for Policy Reform. Dar es Salaam. BERE University of Dar es Salaam.
20. Waterford.org. (2019). How Parent Involvement Leads to Student Success. Retrieved from Waterford.org.
21. Waterford.org. (2024). How Parent Involvement Leads to Student Success. Retrieved from <https://www.waterford.org/education/how-parent-involvement-leads-to-student-success/>
22. World Bank. (2020). World Development Report 2018: Learning to Realize Education's Promise. Washington, DC: World Bank. DOI: 10.1596/978-1-4648-1096-1
23. World Bank. (2024). Rwanda Overview: Development news, research, data. Retrieved from World Bank.