

Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN)

Impact of support to School Based Management Committees: stakeholders' views of change

Report of qualitative research in five states of Nigeria

Report Number: ESSPIN 423

**Duncan Little
Ingrid Lewis**

April 2012

esspin
Education Sector
Support Programme
in Nigeria



UKaid
from the Department for
International Development

www.esspin.org

Report Distribution and Revision Sheet

Project Name: Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria

Code: 244333TA02

Report No.: ESSPIN 423

Report Title: Impact of support to School Based Management Committees:
stakeholders' views of change: Report of qualitative research in
five states of Nigeria

Rev No	Date of issue	Originator	Checker	Approver	Scope of checking
1	April 2012	Duncan Little Ingrid Lewis	Fatima Aboki	Ron Tuck	Formatting/ Checking

Scope of Checking

This report has been discussed with the originator and checked in the light of the requirements of the terms of reference. In addition the report has been checked to ensure editorial consistencies.

Distribution List

Name	Position
DFID	
Sarah White	Human Development Team Leader, DFID
Barbara Payne	Senior Education Adviser, DFID
Roseline Onyemachi	Education Project Officer, DFID
ESSPIN	
Ron Tuck	National Programme Manager
Kayode Sanni	Deputy Programme Manager
Gboyega Ilusanya	State Team Leader Lagos
Emma Williams	State Team Leader Kwara
Steve Bradley	State Team Leader Kaduna
Pius Elumeze	State Team Leader Enugu
Mustapha Ahmad	State Team Leader Jigawa
Pius Elumeze	State Team Leader Enugu
Jake Ross	State Team Leader Kano
Richard Hanson	Lead Specialist, Information Management
John Kay	Lead Specialist, Education Quality
Fatima Aboki	Lead Specialist, Community Demand & Accountability
Nguyan Feese	Lead Specialist, Institutional Development
Musa Hadejia	Access and Equity Specialist, Jigawa
Hadiza Umar	Access and Equity Specialist, Kaduna

Nura Usman	Access and Equity Specialist, Kano
Olufunke Bolaji	Access and Equity Specialist, Kwara
Abiodun Fowomola	Access and Equity Specialist, Lagos
Abass Kabiru	Gender and Equity Specialist, Abuja

Disclaimer

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties.

Note on Documentary Series

A series of documents has been produced by Cambridge Education Consultants in support of their contract with the Department for International Development for the Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria. All ESSPIN reports are accessible from the ESSPIN website <http://www.esspin.org/resources/reports>

The documentary series is arranged as follows:

- ESSPIN 0-- Programme Reports and Documents
- ESSPIN 1-- Support for Federal Level Governance (Reports and Documents for Output 1)
- ESSPIN 2-- Support for State Level Governance (Reports and Documents for Output 2)
- ESSPIN 3-- Support for Schools and Education Quality Improvement (Reports and Documents for Output 3)
- ESSPIN 4-- Support for Communities (Reports and Documents for Output 4)
- ESSPIN 5-- Information Management Reports and Documents

Reports and Documents produced for individual ESSPIN focal states follow the same number sequence but are prefixed:

- JG Jigawa
- KD Kaduna
- KN Kano
- KW Kwara
- LG Lagos
- EN Enugu

Contents

Report Distribution and Revision Sheet	i
Disclaimer	ii
Note on Documentary Series	ii
Acronyms and Abbreviations	v
Acknowledgements	v
Abstract	1
Executive Summary	1
Background.....	2
Findings and next steps.....	3
Introduction.....	5
Purpose of the research	6
Methodology and main activities.....	7
Overview	7
Research stages	9
Research questions.....	11
Field research methods	12
Research participants	14
Findings	16
Summary of major findings	17
Mobilising and managing resources for school improvement according to community concerns	19
Mobilising financial and practical support within the community	21
Mobilising and controlling human resources for the school.....	23
The government's role.....	25
Improvements made and resource gaps remaining	27
Bringing more children from excluded groups into school	30
General enrolment and attendance issues	30
Minority ethnic groups	32
Working children	34
Children with disabilities	36
Girls and gender issues.....	38
Role of parents.....	40
Child-to-child activities	41
Language issues	43
Contributing to community empowerment and participation in education	43
Community ownership of school management	45
Teachers' relationships with communities.....	46
Engagement in the education process by children and parents.....	47
Women's involvement and women's committees.....	49
Children's involvement and children's committees	52
Holding duty-bearers to account regarding improving schools and education for children	56
Holding parents to account	60
Holding government to account.....	61

Improving the capacity of civil society and government to stimulate demand, support and monitor SBMC development	63
SBMC coalitions	66
The future and sustainability after ESSPIN	67
Conclusions.....	68
Summary of findings and implications.....	70
Annex 1: Examples of key findings from stakeholders	76
Mobilising and managing resources for school improvement according to community concerns	76
Contributing to community empowerment and participation in education	84
Enabling women, children and other excluded groups to have a voice	87
Holding duty-bearers to account regarding improving schools and education for children	89
Improving the capacity of civil society and government to stimulate demand, support and monitor SBMC development	93
Annex 2: Postscript -update on SBMC replication	97
Annex 4: Guide questions used in phase 1 and phase 2 field research.....	101
Annex 5: Research participants.....	117

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CBO	Community-based organisation
CSO	Civil society organisation
CGP	Civil society and government partners
DO	Desk officer
EFA	Education For All
EO	Enlightenment Officer
ES	Education Secretary
ESSPIN	Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria
LGA	Local Government Authority
LGEA	Local Government Education Authorities
PTA	Parent-Teacher Association
SBMC	School-based Management Committee
SMO	School Mobilisation Officer
SSO	School Support Officer
SUBEB	State Universal Basic Education Board
TES	Turaki Education Service
UBEC	Universal Basic Education Commission

Acknowledgements

This report was written by Duncan Little and Ingrid Lewis of EENET CIC (Enabling Education Network Community Interest Consultants), based on analysis of field research conducted in five states of Nigeria in 2011 by Duncan Little. Editing and additional analysis were provided by Helen Pinnock; Appendix 2 was written by Sandra Graham with overall coordination by Fatima Aboki, ESSPIN Lead Specialist; Community Engagement and Learner Participation.

Grateful thanks are due to Fatima Aboki, Sandra Graham, Hadiza Umar, Seyi Ola, Funke Bolaji, Abubakar Nashabaru, Musa Hadeija, Nura Usman and Abiodun Fowomola for support in providing access to research participants, arranging logistics and helping to shape the final report. The research was funded by ESSPIN and Save the Children.

Abstract

1. This report highlights stakeholder's views of change as a result of a partnership of government and civil society in activating, training and mentoring School Based Management Committees in 5 states of Nigeria. It provides analysis and makes recommendations towards strengthening community voice in school improvement and education for all children.

Executive Summary

2. This report presents research conducted by consulting agency EENET CIC into experiences of school based management committee (SBMC) development within the Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN). Over 1100 school management committees have been activated and trained by ESSPIN.
3. Two rounds of independent qualitative research, involving approximately 1180 participants, were conducted to capture how newly activated and trained SBMCs were performing in their communities. Interviews and focus group discussions were held in 53 schools or school clusters.
4. The key research questions, refined during the research, were as follows:
 - What role have SBMCs activated with ESSPIN support played in mobilising and managing/governing resources for school improvement according to community concerns?
 - What role have SBMCs activated with ESSPIN support played in bringing more children from excluded groups into school?
 - To what extent are SBMCs activated under the ESSPIN model contributing to processes of community empowerment and participation in education?
 - To what extent have women/children and other excluded groups been enabled to have a voice?
 - To what extent have SBMCs activated with ESSPIN support been able to hold duty-bearers to account on improvement of schools and education for children?
 - How has the ESSPIN model of SBMC activation contributed to the capacity of civil society and government to stimulate demand, support and monitor the process of SBMC development?
5. The research took a qualitative and participatory approach to capture the views of parents, community members, teachers, SBMC members, CSOs and government staff on the quality, effectiveness and sustainability of their SBMCs. These SBMCs had been activated, trained and supported by ESSPIN to improve children's experiences of education in five states of Nigeria. This research primarily involved participatory, qualitative approaches to

information collection, supplemented by a rapid desk review of existing project reports. The research design did not include a quantitative element, as the key focus was on capturing in-depth learning from stakeholders' perceptions of processes around SBMC activation and development.

Background

6. The Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN) is a six year programme of education development assistance supported by the UK's Department for International Development (DFID). It is a part of a suite of programmes aimed at improvements in governance and the delivery of basic services. ESSPIN operates at four levels: federal, state, community, and school, and is focused on six states: Enugu, Jigawa, Kaduna, Kano, Kwara and Lagos.
7. ESSPIN began in 2008. Save the Children was asked to lead on strengthening community accountability and demand for education, and on improving access and equity within ESSPIN's work at community level under ESSPIN's Output Four – Community Engagement and Learner Participation. Much of this work has focused on supporting state governments to develop school-based management committees (SBMCs).
8. The key aim of ESSPIN's SBMC development work was not to pilot a model for best practice under any conditions, but to pilot a model for activating and developing SBMCs within the existing education system. Therefore many of the standard elements of a typical NGO-led SBMC development project, such as continuous training and mobilisation from local CSOs or staff teams at community level, were not appropriate, as they would have been seen as setting up 'parallel structures'.
9. The ESSPIN SBMC development approach was developed in 2010, with initial SBMC training rolled out across five states in the summer of 2010. Since then SBMCs have received a programme of follow-up training and mentoring designed to enable them to continually strengthen their capacity to address a range of key education access and quality issues. This programme of SBMC development has been delivered from the start by a partnership of civil society organisations (CSOs) and local government staff, managed by state government and provided with technical support by ESSPIN.
10. ESSPIN identified a need for an investigative report on its work for Output 4 – Community Engagement and Learner Participation. Just over a year after SBMCs had been brought together, trained and mentored in a period of continuous support and guidance on their role, were SBMCs taking any actions? Had these actions led to improvements in children's access to quality education? Were SBMCs working appropriately to foster community empowerment and participation? And were community members and government happy with SBMCs' roles and willing to support SBMCs for the longer term? Was there agreement or correlation between government, community members, children, SBMC members and

local CSOs about the impact that SBMCs appeared to be having? Ultimately, was the ESSPIN SBMC development approach close enough to best practice to be likely to sustainably improve inclusion, accountability and quality in schools?

11. This report highlights what was achieved through ESSPIN's support to SBMC development (from programme inception until October 2011), what has worked and why, plus remaining challenges and lessons learned. It assesses the training and mentoring of SBMCs through a partnership of civil society and government and progress towards increased community demand, voice and accountability for inclusive, quality education. It gives a sense of the scale of change as a result of the work. The report makes recommendations towards further strengthening and deepening the Community Engagement work in the context in which the future strategy is based (leveraging resources from government to support school improvement).

Findings and next steps

12. The research sought the views of education stakeholders around six key areas of inquiry relating to the establishment, operation, activities and results of SBMCs, specifically their role in:
 - mobilising and managing resources for school improvement according to community concerns
 - bringing more children from excluded groups into school
 - contributing to community empowerment and participation in education
 - enabling women, children and other excluded groups to have a voice
 - holding duty-bearers to account regarding improving schools and education for children
 - improving the capacity of civil society and government to stimulate demand, support and monitor SBMC development.
13. The information provided by stakeholders under these six main topic areas indicated that the majority of SBMCs were working well. Most SBMCs were taking ambitious action in response to a range of issues they had identified with communities, from enrolment to school infrastructure to teacher management, and were increasingly focusing on more complex child protection and exclusion issues.
14. SBMCs were mobilising substantial community contributions to improve education and were identifying issues that communities were not able to tackle on their own. To an extent, activated SBMCs were getting responses from government to address some of these issues. Local government's own funding shortages are a major limiting factor. Securing some government response has been extremely encouraging, particularly so soon into the initiative.

15. Stakeholders also confirmed that opportunities are arising through which SBMCs and communities can define and analyse problems, to enable better planning and resourcing of education. Ultimately, however, the SBMC process does not negate the need for greater and more regular flow of government funds and resources to schools in response to need. That will require state level and local level policy and political commitment.
16. SBMCs have made significant progress, and on the current evidence it would appear that – even after the ESSPIN support period ends – they will continue to operate, expand and improve. It was not so certain that the participatory elements of SBMC work (especially women’s and children’s participation and voice in mainstream activities) were well established or sustainable at the time of the research. More support efforts are needed to strengthen this vital area of SBMCs’ function.
17. Now that that replication of the ESSPIN SBMC development approach has started (see Appendix 2), part of the challenge will be to continue to strengthen work in the areas of concern highlighted in this research whilst government is already replicating the model. ESSPIN’s continued support to replication processes is likely to address these issues.

Introduction

18. The Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN) is a six year programme of education development assistance supported by the UK's Department for International Development (DFID). It is a part of a suite of programmes aimed at improvements in governance and the delivery of basic services. ESSPIN has a budget of £83.5 million to help Nigeria meet its targets for Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 2 – universal primary education. ESSPIN operates at four levels: federal, state, community, and school, and work to date has focused on six states: Enugu, Jigawa, Kaduna, Kano, Kwara and Lagos.
19. ESSPIN began in 2008. ESSPIN's theory of change was that the scale of the challenge of achieving universal basic education in Nigeria and the deep-rooted failures of public service delivery systems could only be addressed through an integrated, long-term approach. This would require systemic changes in the governance, organisation and management of education, and basic education in particular. In its first three years the programme has focused on providing technical assistance to introduce an integrated approach to improving schools, and to improve processes for planning, financing and managing reform at different levels of states' education systems.
20. Save the Children was asked to lead on strengthening community accountability and demand for education, and on improving access and equity within ESSPIN's work at community level under ESSPIN's Output Four – Community Engagement and Learner Participation. This Output seeks to "play a major role in involving local communities and mobilising them to support school transformation" and to enable "communities and civil society to articulate demand for educational services [and] requires that the school system makes space to hear and respond to community demands and voices and to those of children as the primary stakeholders in education" (ESSPIN, May 2009).
21. Much of this work has focused on supporting state governments to develop school-based management committees (SBMCs): "ESSPIN has focused on the establishment and functioning of School-based Management Committees (SBMCs) as the main vehicle for strengthening the capacity of communities to support schools and articulate demand for better quality, inclusive education. SBMCs are promoted as a vital link between service users and service providers and as a mechanism for channelling voice, including that of commonly marginalised groups (women, children, girls, nomadic community etc), and for improving accountability" (ESSPIN, December 2010). Despite national guidelines on the value and structure of SBMCs, very few SBMCs were active outside of specific donor or NGO-supported projects. A structure and process was needed to enable the education authorities to activate SBMCs and support them to achieve their potential.

22. The key aim of ESSPIN's SBMC development work was therefore not to pilot a model for best practice under any conditions, but to pilot a model for activating and developing SBMCs within the existing education system. Therefore many of the standard elements of a typical NGO-led SBMC development project, such as continuous engagement from local CSOs or staff teams, were not appropriate. The challenge was to reorient existing structures and resources towards SBMC development, while coming as close to internationally recognised good practice as possible in order to promote sustainable contributions by SBMCs to increasing education access and quality.
23. With this in mind, the ESSPIN SBMC development approach was developed in 2010, with initial SBMC training rolled out across five states in the summer of 2010. Since then SBMCs have received a programme of follow-up training and mentoring designed to enable them to continually strengthen their capacity to address a range of key education access and quality issues. This programme of SBMC development has been delivered from the start by a partnership of civil society organisations (CSOs) and local government staff, managed by state government and provided with technical support by ESSPIN.

Purpose of the research

24. ESSPIN identified a need for an investigative report on its work for Output 4 – Community Engagement and Learner Participation. Approximately a year after SBMCs had been brought together, trained and mentored to provide a period of continuous support and guidance on their role, were SBMCs taking any actions? Had these actions apparently led to any changes in children's access to quality education? Were SBMCs working appropriately to foster community empowerment and participation? And were community members and government happy with SBMCs' roles and willing to support SBMCs for the longer term? Was there agreement or correlation between government, community members, children, SBMC members and local CSOs about the apparent impact of SBMCs?
25. Ultimately, was the ESSPIN SBMC development approach close enough to best practice to be offering widespread improvements to access, accountability and quality in schools? Indications were positive, as regular internal monitoring visits to schools and reports highlighting SBMC successes were being received. But it was important to establish an independent view of the types of actions SBMCs were taking in their communities, and how SBMC work was perceived by community members.
26. Equally, it was important to find out whether the SBMC development model was showing signs of being sustainable in terms of government's capacity and enthusiasm for taking it forward and responding to increased demand. At the time of the research, several state governments had expressed commitment to replicate the model but investigation was needed as to how well SBMCs could be supported and responded to by education authorities at local levels. A qualitative and participatory research exercise was agreed as the most appropriate way to capture this information given available resources.

27. This report highlights EENET CIC's findings on what was achieved through ESSPIN's support to SBMC development until October 2011, focusing on what has worked and why, plus remaining challenges and lessons learned. It assesses the training and mentoring of SBMCs through a partnership of civil society and government and progress towards increased community demand, voice and accountability for inclusive, quality education. It will give a sense of the scale of change as a result of the work. The report makes recommendations towards further strengthening and deepening ESSPIN's Community Engagement work in the context in which future strategy is based: i.e. leveraging resources from government to support school improvement.

Methodology and main activities

Overview

28. This research primarily involved participatory, qualitative approaches to information collection for 53 ESSPIN-supported SBMCs, supplemented by a rapid desk review of existing project reports. The research design did not include a quantitative element, as the key focus was on capturing in-depth learning from stakeholders' perceptions of processes around SBMC activation and development.

Defining qualitative research

29. Qualitative research focuses on gathering in-depth understandings about a situation and about the experiences, beliefs, ideas and priorities of the stakeholders in this situation. It is concerned with investigating questions of why and how, not just with looking at what happened, when and where. Qualitative research also looks at the relationships between stakeholders and the links between aspects of life. The nature of qualitative research means that it can be done with smaller samples of participants.
30. Participatory qualitative research enables the stakeholders involved in the project to be actively involved in telling the project's story. Rather than 'outsiders' coming in simply to observe a situation and make their own interpretation of what is happening and why, the stakeholders get a chance to explain the situation from their perspective, and to have these views listened to and respected even if they do not match the interpretations of other people involved in the work.

The pros and cons of qualitative research

31. Informal, ad hoc qualitative investigation is being done all the time within projects, for instance, whenever staff and stakeholders talk to each other about what is happening, the problems they face and how things are progressing. This is likely to be quite a subjective process, involving personal opinions and one-off pieces of information. However, "when qualitative research is done systematically, the findings are as reliable and objective as

those produced by quantitative methods”.¹ Therefore, a larger-scale piece of qualitative investigation, using a structured methodology and pre-planned data gathering tools, and implemented by an experienced researcher, can generate valuable and trustworthy data.

32. Inevitably, qualitative research does not generate statistics. The process does not help us to find out, for instance, how many children are unhappy at school. It does, however, help us gain an insight into why children are unhappy at school. While quantitative research therefore would give us a sense of the scale of the problem, qualitative research provides us with the essential information we need (seen from the perspective of all key stakeholders) to make appropriate decisions about how to solve the problem.
33. Qualitative and quantitative researches often go hand-in-hand, helping us to build a complete picture of both scale and reasons. However, the two approaches cannot replace each other – that is, we cannot use only qualitative research if we want an end result that presents statistics; and we cannot use only quantitative research if we want to understand accurately the reasons behind a set of figures.

The choice of approach for this research

34. The consultants were chosen for this piece of work on the basis of their (and their organisation's) track record with participatory qualitative research involving education stakeholders. The consultants were therefore asked to take a qualitative approach for this piece of work, to help gain insights into the SBMC initiative from the stakeholders' perspectives. The research terms of reference asked the consultants to investigate “what has been achieved, what has worked and why, the challenges and lessons learned” – questions that are ideally suited to a qualitative approach.
35. The terms of reference also noted that the research report should “give a sense of the scale of change”. Here it must be noted that qualitative research can offer suggestions for possible trends or highlight common opinions or interpretations expressed by the research participants, but it cannot present a statistical analysis of scale (unless accompanied by a quantitative research element).
36. Comparisons between states were also anticipated in the terms of reference. However, the nature of qualitative research – where not every participant answers an identical set of questions – means that comparisons are often only possible at the level of ‘impressions’. For instance, we may be able to say that parents in state A expressed a certain view about schools, while those in state B didn't express this view. But we cannot conclude that no parents in state B hold this opinion – it may just be that the opportunity to express this view did not arise during the research activities they were involved in. For this reason, this

¹ Save the Children (2003) Toolkits: A Practical Guide to Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment, p.45

report does not attempt to 'force' comparisons of data where no clear and obvious trends are apparent.

Research stages

37. The research involved two main phases:

- Phase 1 – a rapid desk review followed by a pilot of the field research in two states (Kwara and Kaduna) during June 2011
- Phase 2 – field research in three states (Jigawa, Kano and Lagos) during October 2011.

38. SBMC, community members, CSO staff and government education officials covering 53 schools were interviewed and/or took part in focus group discussions. ESSPIN and Save the Children staff involved in designing and delivering support to SBMCs were also interviewed. In total approximately 1080 SBMC stakeholders took part in the research, ranging from 133 in Kaduna to 444 in Kwara (see Appendix 4 for more details).

39. ESSPIN covers more than 1,500 schools in total. In Lagos, 38 of these schools have been covered by 4 SBMCs, with one SBMC responsible for a cluster of schools. However, with support to SBMC development, Lagos state is now favouring a school-based system and some Local Government Education Authorities (LGEAs) have already started to put this in place.

Phase 1: rapid desk review

40. Various ESSPIN documents and other documents relating to education in Nigeria were reviewed (see References in Appendix 2). The rapid review sought to assess and understand the existing education provision in the areas in which ESSPIN is working, with a particular emphasis on how the community is participating in school life. The desk review was used to inform the consultants about the context of the research, and to inform their selection of field research sites. It also helped to identify issues that could become a focus for questioning during the field research. Finally, the desk review yielded information to be used in this report to supplement the field research findings. The review was not intended as a comprehensive literature review, due to the limited time available.

Phase 1: pilot field research

41. The phase 1 research took place during 8 days in June 2011. Details of the activities and participants are provided in Section 2.5. During their preparations, the consultants identified the key stakeholder groups to meet during the field research, developed guidance questions for each of these groups, and discussed with ESSPIN/Save the Children field staff about the ideal logistical arrangements for the qualitative research process (e.g. the size and composition of focus groups, preferred venue arrangements, timings, etc).

42. The research schedule in the first state (Kwara) was not always ideal, involving a large number of site visits and thus too little time with each group of stakeholders. Seven schools

were visited and four CSOs met to discuss their work with the SBMCs. Adjustments were therefore made to the schedule for the second state (Kaduna), to ensure that the consultant could focus more on gathering quality data, albeit from a smaller spread of stakeholders. In Kaduna State, three schools were visited and three CSOs met. In addition, a number of LGEA officials, such as the Education Secretary (ES) and School Mobilisation Officer (SMO) were visited, plus the Ojoku and his officials at his palace in Kaduna State.

43. Following the field research, an initial report was prepared outlining the information that had been gathered and drawing attention to key issues. The analysis of both phase 1 and phase 2 findings is presented in this report.

Phase 2: field research

44. Using the experiences of phase 1, the consultants with ESSPIN and Save the Children staff refined the research questions and developed a clearer six areas of questioning. This was done after careful consideration. In order to be able to make comparisons between states involved in the two phases, ideally the same lines of questioning would be used in both phases. However, phase 1 was considered a pilot and thus had the purpose of being a learning exercise, not just a data gathering process. The lessons learned in phase 1 led to the decision to improve the areas of questioning for phase 2, to enable the collection and analysis of data in a way that ESSPIN and Save the Children would find more useful in the future development of the initiative.
45. Inevitably, this means that some aspects of the data gathered in phases 1 and 2 are less comparable (e.g. questions were asked in phase 2 states that were not asked during phase 1). However, as explained above, qualitative research does not generate directly comparable data in the same way that quantitative research does. Thus the process of changing and improving questions during this research does not have the kind of impact on the overall results that changing a quantitative survey questionnaire would have.
46. The field research was carried out in 3 states over 2 weeks in October 2011. Ideally the process would have involved 2 states and an opportunity to 'dig deeper' into the issues in these states (e.g. spending a full day with one school community to enable a detailed picture to emerge from all stakeholder perspectives). However, the consultant was requested to work in 3 selected states which would represent the varied nature of the locations across the project.
47. In Lagos State, four clusters of schools, totalling 38 SBMCs, were visited. Three CSOs were met, along with a number of LGEA officials, such as an ES and SMOs, and the Director of Department of Social Mobilisation. In Jigawa State, three schools were visited, three CSOs were met, and a number of LGEA officials were interviewed, including two ESs and their staff, SMOs, an Enlightenment Officer (EO), and the Director of the Department of Social Mobilisation at the State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB). In Kano State, two schools were visited, two CSOs were met and a number of LGEA officials were visited

including two ESs, a School Support Officer (SSO) and a deputy SSO, SMOs, two SBMC desk officers (DOs) and the Albasu Town District Head.

State	Summary of visits in both phases (see Appendix 4 for detail)
Kwara	7 schools 4 CSOs
Kaduna	3 schools 3 CSOs ES SMO Ojukwo and officials
Lagos	4 clusters (38 SBMCs) 3 CSOs ES SMOs Director of Department of Social Mobilisation
Jigawa	3 schools 3 CSOs 2 ESs and staff SMOs EO Director of the Department of Social Mobilisation at SUBEB
Kano	2 schools 2 CSOs 2 ESs SSO deputy SSO SMOs 2 SBMC Dos Albasu Town District Head

Phase 2: analysis and reporting

48. The consultants developed a matrix for organising the hundreds of pieces of information (e.g. quotes from stakeholders) gathered during both phases of field research. The data was categorised according to the 6 areas of questioning chosen for the phase 2 field research. Within these 6 categories, sub-themes of commonly occurring issues were then identified. It is under these categories and sub-categories that the data is presented in the report (see Section 3).
49. In addition to the presentation of findings from the stakeholder research, the report also contains relevant evidence extracted during the desk review, and ‘reflection’ sections highlighting key findings and their implications.

Research questions

50. During phase 1, the consultants used the following broad areas of questioning when working with stakeholders and organising the findings:
- How did the community participate in school life before the ESSPIN initiative?

- What were the previous school problems?
- How has community participation changed since the ESSPIN initiative?
- What issues have the new SBMCs solved?
- What problems remain?
- How do you see the SBMCs continuing post-ESSPIN?

51. As explained above, after the pilot phase, the consultants, Save the Children and ESSPIN reflected on the areas of questioning and the data they had elicited. It was decided that improvements could be made before phase 2 field work started. The revised areas of questioning were:

- What role have SBMCs activated with ESSPIN support played in mobilising and managing/governing resources for school improvement according to community concerns?
- What role have SBMCs activated with ESSPIN support played in bringing more children from excluded groups into school?
- To what extent are SBMCs activated under the ESSPIN model contributing to processes of community empowerment and participation in education?
- To what extent have women/children and other excluded groups been enabled to have a voice?
- To what extent have SBMCs activated with ESSPIN support been able to hold duty-bearers to account on improvement of schools and education for children?
- How has the ESSPIN model of SBMC activation contributed to the capacity of civil society and government to stimulate demand, support and monitor the process of SBMC development?

52. The topics covered are broadly similar to phase 1, meaning that phase 1 data would still be relevant; but the questions were more targeted, enabling the findings to be organised and discussed in a more analytical way.

53. For both phases, the consultants developed more detailed question guides – lists of questions that could be asked to encourage participants to convey information relevant to the 6 main research questions. These guides were not used like questionnaires, however, so not every stakeholder or group of stakeholders was asked or answered every question in these guides. The guide questions can be found in Appendix 3.

Field research methods

54. During both phases of field work, the consultant carried out visits to schools, observed and/or participated in SBMC meetings, and conducted face-to-face interviews and focus group discussions. A range of stakeholders was involved: SBMC members, pupils, CSOs, LGFA officials and ESSPIN staff. Details of the participants are presented in Section 2.5.

55. The following methods were used:

Focus group discussions

56. These enabled the consultant to identify and discuss issues with a number of people in one place, and in a relatively short space of time. Focus groups help us to gain multiple perspectives that can help to develop, reinforce and/or challenge existing ideas. Contrary to the preparation guidance supplied by the consultants, some of the focus group sessions during this research involved a large number of participants; some over 40, and often of mixed ages, gender and status. This, combined with the short time available in some locations, may have limited the participatory nature of some focus groups (all participants may not have felt they had the time or confidence to speak), and made it more difficult to record who was speaking at any one time. However, participants were still able to offer an extensive amount of detailed information, as illustrated in the Findings (Section 3).

One-to-one semi-structured interviews

57. Interviews enabled the consultant to explore issues in greater depth with selected individuals. Interviews were a more appropriate form of engagement with certain stakeholders, such as education officials.

Creative methods

58. The use of creative approaches enabled the consultant to engage research participants, particularly younger ones, in ways they felt more familiar or comfortable with. The methods provide fun and interactive ways of exploring issues, particularly those issues which children may be reluctant or feel unable to discuss. Methods used in this study included drawing, sketching and annotating diagrams.

59. For instance, during some focus groups with pupils, participants discussed what they liked or did not like about school. The children were invited first to write and/or sketch their thoughts in small groups, pairs or by themselves. They then reported back to the whole group. The consultant then encouraged the children to speak with one another about the issue of their school, while a trusted adult (a woman committee member or CSO worker) translated. After a few minutes adapting to the situation the children became very animated and talkative.

Flexible questioning

60. A flexible framework for questioning was used throughout the activities, based on, but not necessarily using the entire guide questions mentioned in Section 2.3. This allowed interviews and group discussions to flow naturally, and enabled the consultant and participants to move away from the 6 main areas of investigation if they felt a certain topic could provide important information for ESSPIN. Participants were also encouraged to ask their own questions to each other, from which more in-depth information was gathered.

Research participants

61. School locations were selected to represent the range of communities supported by ESSPIN – some rural, some in semi-urban/rural, some urban. Participants were not selected using formal sampling methods, as one might with a larger-scale quantitative survey. Meetings and focus groups were arranged by ESSPIN staff within each state and involved participation by any community members, teachers, children, CSO workers and LGEA officials who had been invited and were able to attend. The size of the focus groups varied from three to approximately 30 people, totalling just under 1080. Full details of participants (schools, officials, locations, etc) are provided in Appendix 4.

SBMC focus groups

62. SBMC members were invited to focus group discussions in 19 settings. Seven were in Kwara State, three in Kaduna State, four in Lagos State, three in Jigawa State and two in Kano State. All involved community members and teacher and ex-pupil representatives. Only some SBMCs had invited their pupil representatives. The meetings held in Kwara State were in rural or semi-rural/semi-urban areas. The meetings in Kaduna State were in towns in rural settings. Three of the four meetings in Lagos State were in Lagos; one was in a rural area. In Jigawa and Kano States the meetings were near small towns in rural areas. The focus groups consisted of both males and females of mixed experience levels and mixed ages.

Teacher focus groups

63. Due to time limitations, teachers were invited to focus group discussions in only three school settings in Kwara State, and one setting in each of Kaduna State and Kano State. Teachers were also present during the SBMC focus group meetings, as teacher representatives and as interested parties and community members. The focus groups consisted of both male and female teachers of mixed experience levels and mixed ages.

LGEA focus groups

64. Focus group discussions with LGEA officials were held in all five states, at 12 locations. These officials included ESs, SMOs, SSOs, SBMC DOs, an Inclusion DO, an Islamiyya, Qur'anic and Tsangaya Education (IQTE) officer and an EO in Jigawa State. In addition, meetings were held with other officials such as Ojoku's Palace representatives in Kwara State, a District Head in Kano State and Directors of Department of Social Mobilisation.

Pupil focus groups

65. Pupil focus groups in all five states consisted of girls and boys from the primary schools that the consultant was visiting. In Kwara State the children were those involved in the SBMC children's committee, with the SBMC pupil representatives and a few additional children. In Kaduna and Lagos States children's committees had not yet been set up at the time of the research, so a small group of children were selected to do carry out the activities. The focus groups involved on average 15 to 20 children. In Bariki Primary School, Jigawa State, the

head boy and head girl, the pupils' representatives on the SBMC, joined a focus group in discussion with the consultant.

66. At some schools, e.g. Hayin Banki LGEA School, Kaduna State, St Theresa Primary School, Marine Beach, Central Primary School, Ikeja LGEA and Ayekoto Community Primary School, Imude, Lagos State, Sabon Gari Primary School, Jigawa State, time restrictions did not allow the children to be consulted separately, though children were present at the SBMC meeting. Sometimes these were the children's representatives and sometimes just a small group of children chosen to come to the meeting by the teachers. Although the information from the pupil focus group discussions does not contain voices of children who are totally excluded from the education system, it may contain voices of children who in the past had been excluded, or are nowadays excluded *within* school.
67. Children's ages ranged from nine years old to early teens. The focus groups were mixed sex groups, with the facilitator ensuring that neither boys nor girls dominated the conversations. Overall, the children involved in the focus groups appeared relaxed, happy to work in pairs and larger groups with the consultant, and seemingly not afraid to speak about 'what makes them happy and unhappy at school'. They were, however, noticeably a lot freer to speak once their teachers and other adults left the room.

CSO focus groups

68. CSOs that worked closely with the SBMCs were contacted and detailed discussions were held with three CSOs in Kwara State, two CSOs in Kaduna State, three CSOs in Lagos State, and one CSO in Jigawa State. Due to time restrictions a separate discussion outside of the SBMC meeting was not possible with Womankind in Kwara State, Youth in Support of Community Development (YOTASCID) in Kaduna State, Adolescent Health and Information Projects (AHIP) and Kamala Community Health Development Initiative (KAHDEV) in Jigawa State and Aminu Kano Centre for Democratic Research and Training (AKCDRT) and Turaki Education Service (TES) in Kano State, though their workers did participate in the SBMC meeting and TES was also interviewed with LGEA officials who they work with in Kano State.

Language interpretation

69. Interpretation was done by female ESSPIN staff, or by representatives from CSOs or women's committees, with the agreement of the consultant. This meant that the interpreters understood the context of the discussions, whereas an independent interpreter may have struggled to learn the key concepts in such a short amount of time. The potential problems with this arrangement included: opportunities for bias in the interpretation; and potential reluctance by participants to criticise the SBMC, school staff or ESSPIN in front of the interpreter. Nevertheless, the translation arrangements suited this piece of work, were of a high quality, and enabled a great deal of information to be gathered.

Findings

70. The findings are organised according to the six main research questions developed at the start of the second phase of research. The findings primarily present information provided by stakeholders during the field research, but augmented with relevant extracts from existing reports. Throughout the findings there are 'reflection boxes' offering further analysis of the findings, suggested implications and recommendations for moving forward with the initiative.


A note on interpretation

71. The summary of findings below gives an indication of the aggregated key issues which arose from semi-structured discussions with community members, children, SBMC members, local government representatives, and CSO staff working on SBMC development.
72. Issues have been prioritised in the table according to how often they came up in discussions with local school community stakeholders - i.e. parents, teachers, SBMC members, other community members and children. This gives an indication of local stakeholders' perceptions of what SBMC achievements were important to them, and what remaining challenges people perceived with improving schools through SBMC-led activity.
73. It is worth remembering that challenges articulated by stakeholders can be seen as positive indications that community voice and demand is being strengthened. A community which is not comfortable with expressing the problems it sees with education is more likely to be used to not having a voice.
74. It is important to note that due to the semi-structured nature of the inquiry, responses were not based on everyone answering identical questions. Therefore the issues raised by stakeholders only reflect topics that were able to be spoken about in a short time. Not every group would have had time to raise all issues. Therefore low incidence of an issue does not necessarily mean that communities had no interest in that topic.
75. Future research work could choose a small number of the issues from the table below and do a more detailed investigation into these few topics, to see if the initial impressions from these broader investigations are confirmed when talking to people for longer, using more diverse and engaging communication methods.


Summary of major findings


Categories of progress made in communities with ESSPIN-activated SBMCs

Resource mobilisation & management	More children in school	Community empowerment	Women & children's voices	Duty bearers held to account	Sustaining SBMC development
SBMCs have mobilised resources from the local community (Reported by community, government, CSOs)	School enrolment has increased due to SBMC activity (Reported by community, CSOs)	SBMCs have taken a problem-solving approach (Reported by community, government, CSOs)	Women have been involved in SBMC & school improvement activity (Reported by community, government, CSOs)	SBMCs have approached government for support (Reported by community, government, CSOs)	Demand for SBMC activity has increased (Reported by community, government, CSOs)
SBMCs have improved school infrastructure & environment (Reported by community, government, CSOs, children)	School attendance has been increased by SBMC activity (Reported by community, CSOs)	Mutual responsibility for improving education has increased (Reported by community, government)	Children have been involved in SBMC and school improvement activity (Reported by community, CSOs, children)	SBMCs have improved teacher management & presence (Reported by community, government, CSOs)	Monitoring of SBMCs' work has improved (Reported by government, CSOs)
SBMCs have delivered more teaching & learning resources (Reported by community, government, CSOs)	Working children's attendance has been increased by SBMC activity (Reported by community, government, CSOs)	Community sense of ownership of education has been increased (Reported by community, government, CSOs)	Children have been given a genuine voice in education (Reported by community, CSOs)	SBMC activity has improved teacher behaviour (Reported by community, CSOs, children)	Support for further SBMC development is in place (Reported by government, CSOs)
SBMCs have secured resources from government (Reported by community, government, CSOs)	Girls' attendance has been increased by SBMC activity (Reported by community, government, CSOs)		Women have been given a genuine voice in education (Reported by community, CSOs)	SBMCs have secured good responses from government (Reported by community, government, CSOs)	
	Attendance of children with disabilities has been increased by SBMC activity (Rep. by community, CSOs)				

 High incidence: over three-quarters of school community stakeholders consulted reported the issue


 **Common reported challenges**
Medium incidence: reported by approximately half school community stakeholders

 Low incidence: reported by a third or less of school community stakeholders

 Very low incidence: reported by two groups of community stakeholders

Main challenges reported by research participants

Resource mobilisation & management		More children in school		Duty bearers held to account	
<i>Dimension</i>		<i>Dimension</i>		<i>Dimension</i>	
Community resources not enough		Demands of work on children		Lack of government response	
<i>Incidence</i>	<i>Reported by</i>	<i>Incidence</i>	<i>Reported by</i>	<i>Incidence</i>	<i>Reported by</i>
High	Community, CSOs	High	Community, government, CSOs	High	Community, CSOs
Community inputs don't deliver high enough quality		Increased access creating new resource demands		Complexity of channels of communication with government	
Medium	Community, CSOs	Medium	Community, government, CSOs	Medium	Community, CSOs
Government resourcing not enough		Demands of early marriage		Problems with teacher supply	
High	Community, government, CSOs	Medium	Community, government, CSOs	High	Community, government, CSOs
Government resourcing not consistent		Journey to school difficult		Teacher behaviour still abusive/violent	
High	Community, CSOs	Medium	Community, government, CSOs	Medium	Children
		Lack of uniforms a barrier			
		Medium	Community, children, government, CSOs		
		Teaching not right for children's needs			
		Medium	Children, CSOs		

	High incidence: over three-quarters of school community stakeholders consulted reported the issue		Low incidence: reported by a third or less of school community stakeholders
	Medium incidence: reported by approx. half school community stakeholders		Very low incidence: reported by two groups of community stakeholders

Mobilising and managing resources for school improvement according to community concerns

76. Bodies like SBMCs can play a key role in enabling stakeholders to be more actively involved in managing the resources needed to run a school. SBMCs can also facilitate the finding of more diverse, creative and sustainable ways of resourcing education – not by replacing government support, but supplementing it in ways that enable greater improvements towards quality education for all children.
77. To be successful in this endeavour, SBMC members need to have an understanding of and sufficient skills in financial management. The SBMC needs to have the capacity and confidence to ‘own’ and manage the school’s funds. The members need to know where and how to mobilise financial, material and human resources that can support them in developing their school. And above all they need to have a clear mandate from the government to undertake this resource management role, and receive the necessary state support to fulfil the role effectively and independently.
78. The findings presented in this section indicate that SBMCs initiated under ESSPIN are building their skills and capacity as resource managers and mobilisers, confirming what was reported in 2010:

“SBMCs have assumed their new roles and responsibilities and are taking direct actions related to the improvement of education for children in their school communities. These actions include both mobilising community resources to support schools, and starting to approach local and state government education authorities to demand for their entitlements to government support” (ESSPIN, March, 2011c).

79. However, challenges remain, not least the school and community’s perceived lack of government inputs and enthusiasm to ‘match’ SBMC/community efforts.

Understanding financial management

Key message

- SBMCs are gaining financial management know-how, but it should not be assumed that this is uniform across all SBMCs.

80. SBMCs potentially carry a great deal of responsibility in relation to finding funding for their school, and ensuring that funding is well spent. It is essential therefore that they develop the skills and understanding needed for effective and transparent financial management.
81. Stakeholders who participated in the research indicated that ESSPIN’s approach to developing and supporting SBMCs has resulted in SBMCs and their members having a greater understanding of financial matters. Only 3 respondents/groups *explicitly* stated that there was better understanding (Kajuru Town LGEA School, Kaduna; Hayin Banki LGEA School, Kaduna North; Albasu Central Primary School, Kano). However, as will be seen below, many more respondents provided examples of improved mobilisation of resources

since the SBMCs started, thus implying improvements in their understanding of financial and fundraising matters. Many SBMC members also spoke about their treasurers keeping accurate records of the ESSPIN funding given to the schools (as a one-off grant) and of any monies raised by the SBMC and community.

82. Only one group of respondents (at Budo Oyo LGEA School, Kwara), seemed to express confusion about financial issues. Money had been given to the school under ESSPIN's School Development Grants programme, but *"they said we should not touch it [and it] is [still] in the bank"*.

Reflections on: understanding financial management

The research indicates that, on the whole, stakeholders believe SBMCs have a growing capacity to manage financial matters for their school.

The presence of some confusion, albeit expressed explicitly only once in this research, highlights the **need for agencies monitoring SBMC work to keep checking that all SBMCs have a good level of understanding and ability to implement the theory in practice and where necessary report confusion to the relevant authority for further support.**

Ownership of school funds and confidence to seek resources

"[The SBMC] is virtually independent, it can go out to source assistance from private individuals, different organisations, community members, etc" (reported at a meeting of SBMC, parents' forum and community members from 4 cluster schools, Marine Beach, Apapa, Lagos)

Key message

- SBMCs are enabling their members and the wider community to feel a sense of ownership over their school and its resources, and to have the confidence to take a lead in expressing demands for support to education. A lack of capacity to respond at the government level risks undermining these achievements.

83. Supporting SBMCs to be efficient finance managers depends to some extent on the members feeling a sense of purpose in their management role. They need to believe that it is their responsibility and that they have the mandate, capacity and confidence for the role. They also need to be able to instil a sense of school ownership among the community members.

Confidence

84. There were explicit statements from a few respondents in different locations that SBMCs now have greater confidence to deal with financial issues, and to be pro-active with seeking funding and/or with mobilising resources from within and beyond the community. For instance:

“The SBMC is more confident about approaching government departments [for resources].”
(FOMWAN CSO, Kwara)

85. Many stakeholders noted their increased confidence to hold other agencies and government departments to account for providing their school/SBMC with funds and materials.
86. The numerous examples gathered during the research of SBMC fundraising or resource mobilisation, also implicitly suggest increased confidence, as such actions were often not carried out before the SBMCs were reinstated.

Ownership

87. This growing confidence, in turn, has resulted in SBMC members and the wider school community feeling a greater sense of ownership over the resources and how they are used. For instance, FOMWAN (CSO) in Offa/Ojoku District, Kwara, noted that because the government does not control SBMC funds, they can spend the money as they wish, leading to greater willingness within the community to contribute. This is borne out in other project documentation:

“Since the concept of the SBMC ... we now know that the schools belong to the community and the government is just to help. So we have taken it upon ourselves to repair without going to government. There are projects that we normally wait for government to do but today we do it as community effort” (The Chair of the LGEA Magajin Gari SBMC, Kaduna State, quoted in ESSPIN, November 2011a).

Reflection: on ownership issues

Stakeholder ownership of school funds (and thus of the school) is a vital element in ensuring sustainability of the SBMC initiative (and other school improvement efforts) after ESSPIN's support ends. If the school/community doesn't 'own' the SBMC and its funds, and doesn't have the confidence to stand up for this ownership right, then ESSPIN's eventual withdrawal might allow government actors to resume greater control or to stall any change efforts made by the SBMC (even if just passively through inaction).

Ownership and sustainability could be undermined unless:

- there is a proportionate response from government to match SBMC efforts
- less complex and time-consuming mechanisms are put in place to respond to SBMC demands, including for example approvals for simple charges and expenditures.

Seeking ways to support the removal of these barriers needs to be a strong focus at local government level and in replication of the SBMC model, so that SBMC/community confidence or belief in their ownership of their school's finances and decisions grows rather than weakens.

Mobilising financial and practical support within the community

“Grandparents have donated school buildings as a result of [SBMC] advocacy and enlightenment” (children at Limawa Primary School, Kano)

Key message

- SBMCs are achieving success in eliciting voluntary support from within their communities. Volunteerism is largely dependent on community members feeling a sense of ownership of their school. This sense of ownership will grow as government response to school improvement is strengthened and communities feel that everyone is playing their role in supporting education.

88. SBMCs' financial skills and confidence are tested practically through their efforts to mobilise support for the school(s) among the local community.

89. Stakeholder responses suggest SBMCs have been successful in mobilising voluntary support (financial, material and practical) from within the community. There are also indications that schools with ESSPIN-supported SBMCs are better at doing this than schools without (as explained by a Social Mobilisation Desk Officer, in Jigawa State during the field research). This capacity to mobilise support is confirmed in other project documentation:

"SBMCs have found a range of ways to mobilise a range of resources for schools... Through targeting philanthropists in the community, tapping into former-pupil networks, approaching private organisations for assistance, taxing communities for what they can afford and using various other fund-raising methods, communities and SBMCs have been able to participate in supporting the education of their children and school improvement" (ESSPIN, March 2011c).



Engaging former pupils

90. Ex-pupils are key stakeholders who have been encouraged to contribute in various schools; making, repairing or donating furniture, instruments and sanitation facilities, and providing teaching support. (See Appendix 1 for examples.)

Raising funds and mobilising labour

91. Research participants explained that fundraising activities by SBMCs have enabled schools to invest in a wide range of materials and improvements. The fundraising activities they mentioned can be grouped into three main categories (see Appendix 1 for examples in each category):



- direct contributions from SBMC members
 - encouraging other community members to contribute
 - approaching and lobbying key figures in the community to 'do their bit'.
92. The issue of SBMC versus PTA fundraising was mentioned by various research participants. Some respondents (e.g. ES, Ringim, Jigawa) noted that SBMCs now seek voluntary

contributions, whereas previously the PTAs had raised levies. PTA levies have been abolished (in most states) and PTA influence has largely waned in response (Poulsen, 2009). Research participants, in the main, indicated that SBMCs raise more funds and contribute more to the schools through this voluntary channel than PTAs did through their compulsory levies.

93. As well as encouraging financial support from the community, SBMCs have mobilised people to give their time and labour voluntarily – again from within the SBMC membership and from the wider community. This donated time has supported renovations and provided inputs from skilled trades people.

Reflections on: raising funds and mobilising labour

Overall, more examples of community contributions and support from key local figures were mentioned, as opposed to SBMC members providing the finances themselves. This is a good sign for future sustainability, indicating SBMCs' awareness of and capacity to 'spread the load' rather than taking on the financial responsibility personally. **As SBMCs develop, it is important that they are not dependent solely on funding raised within their membership.** For school-based management to be successful and for SBMCs to be fully functional, **the intervention needs to be underwritten by direct funding to schools.**

Not all attempts to raise funds through key local individuals or institutions were successful, so SBMCs may need ongoing support to help them more accurately identify suitable potential supporters, and more effectively canvas them for support.

The comparisons made by stakeholders between the SBMC and PTA fundraising approaches, indicate that seeking voluntary community and local support is feasible and sustainable. This 'spirit of volunteerism' is (as highlighted by FOMWAN in Section 3.1.2.) linked with the issue of developing a greater sense of ownership and personal responsibility for one's local school. Community ownership and volunteerism (whether it be financial, material or physical support) may not be sustainable if SBMCs and communities perceive themselves to be acting alone to improve their schools without the relevant support from local education authorities. **Community volunteerism and support for schools varies according to capacity at community level and does not diminish the responsibility and role of government agencies (whether local, state or national) in delivering education services.**

Mobilising and controlling human resources for the school

"We have been able to approach the ES and get more teachers posted [to our school]" (SBMC, Kajuru Town School, Kaduna)

Key message

- SBMCs are taking bold steps to increase the quantity and quality of their teaching staff, and to support these teachers through improving their conditions, although many challenges remain with teacher supply. Practices relating to teacher transfers, however, could undermine SBMC and community ownership of school personnel issues.

94. SBMCs don't just have a role in securing and managing a school's finances, they can potentially play a part in choosing and managing the school's personnel, and handling any

problems that arise. New SBMC policies at state level support SBMCs monitoring and having a role in teacher selection. Traditionally state level SUBEB teams have been responsible for personnel management, but this will need to change to support locally responsive education.

95. Throughout both phases of the research, stakeholder groups in most locations mentioned the challenges of having too few teachers, and/or of needing better qualified/trained teachers or teachers with specific skills (e.g. Arabic, Nomadic Ojoku School, in Kwara). Increased enrolment, in part due to SBMCs' efforts to reach out-of-school children and improve retention rates, has led to shortages of teachers which the SBMCs now have to deal with too.
96. Stakeholders emphasised some of the challenges in finding and keeping teachers, and in increasing staff numbers, and the helpful roles SBMCs have played in tackling these problems.

Conditions

97. Globally, teachers' living conditions often create a barrier to effective recruitment and retention of quality teachers, especially in poorer or more remote locations. Providing accommodation for teachers can help a school to find and keep good teachers. During this research, the SBMC at Budo Oyo School, Kwara, indicated that it would provide a house for teachers, but CSO representatives were concerned about the standard of the accommodation.
98. Other problematic conditions were raised by stakeholders, such as the need for permanent contracts and better pay for teachers, which SBMCs could be fighting for (mentioned by teachers at the Christian School, Odo Owa, Kwara and Kajuru Town School, Kaduna; and by SBMC cluster 5, Ikeja, Lagos).

Funding and fighting for teachers

"Our head teacher was initially transferred but we had a protest with parents to the LGEA, and he was returned to us" (Kajuru Town School, Kaduna

99. Various respondents reported that SBMCs have helped to **fund extra teachers** for their school(s), including ones with better qualifications, and find and support voluntary teachers. However, this has still not resulted in schools having all the teachers they need. Other SBMCs reported successfully **lobbying the government agencies to provide more teachers**, by directly approaching officials or writing letters. During the research, some SBMCs demonstrated their power and confidence to retain teachers by **challenging the practice of transferring teachers** away from their schools without their consent. In some cases, SBMC engagement and discussion with LGEAs on teacher transfer led to the reversal of decisions to transfer competent teachers out of the school. (See Appendix 1 for examples mentioned by stakeholders.)

Local teachers

100. Finding more local teachers was considered important by some respondents. For instance the Social Mobilisation Officer in Odo Owa, Kwara, highlighted that teachers sent from urban to rural areas don't stay in post. The SMO suggested that LGEAs should be doing more localised recruitment, and that SBMCs should lobby LGEA and SUBEB about this.

Reflections: on mobilising and controlling human resources

Of those respondents who spoke about SBMCs mobilising teachers for their schools, more cited examples of direct intervention and funding, as opposed to indirect action through lobbying other agencies to act. This indicates that SBMCs have started to develop a clear role in controlling their schools' workforces, rather than relying entirely on government agencies to find and fund teachers, and make decisions about who works where.

This demonstration of empowerment is likely to support the drive for community ownership, and thus the motivation for the community to invest its own funds or labour into the school's development and management. Ensuring that this is able to continue, and that such control by SBMCs/schools is fully endorsed by the government, will be key for sustainability after ESSPIN.

Encouraging SBMCs to take charge of teacher issues makes them more accountable to education 'users' locally. SBMCs who have worked hard to secure and support staff and who are answerable to the community are, therefore, likely to be increasingly discontent with teacher placement and transfer practices that are beyond their control. Such practices again risk undermining SBMC and community sense of ownership, and thus the sustainability of the SBMC initiative. These examples of local government engagement with SBMCs on teacher transfer are fuelling debates at local level on teacher transfer policies and practices.

Despite their progress in this area, **SBMCs may need ongoing support to ensure that they are taking appropriate and effective action to support teachers**; whether through providing suitable accommodation, or helping to lobby for improved contractual and payment conditions, more localised recruitment and fewer compulsory transfers.

Inter-school and inter-SBMC support

101. Globally, evidence suggests that schools often benefit from sharing ideas, experiences and resources with each other. The SBMC approach offers opportunities for this, either where an SBMC supports multiple schools, or through SBMCs coming together formally in coalitions or informally on an ad hoc basis.
102. Respondents in the research mentioned how resources have sometimes been mobilised between SBMCs or schools, in the form of donations of funds, materials or labour. Further information about SBMC coalitions can be found in Section 3.6.3.

The government's role²

"The government still needs to pay its way" (stakeholders at Kajuru Town School, Kaduna)

²Further information about the government's role is discussed in Section 3.6, on holding duty-bearers to account.)

Key message

- SBMC and community support for schools augments but cannot replace government inputs into education. SBMC members often reported feeling that they will only achieve their ambitions for their schools if the requisite support and funding from government agencies is also provided. However, local government agencies feel that their current capacity to fund all SBMC requests for help is limited and they have little access to funds.

103. In any initiative which seeks to devolve more decision-making power and financial responsibility to the community or local institutions, it cannot be assumed that this automatically means a reduction in the role and responsibility of government agencies. Best practice shows that for community engagement and ownership to succeed, there needs to be a maintained level of government inputs, not least to reassure the community that they have not been left to fend entirely for themselves.

104. When discussing the mobilisation of resources by SBMCs, a number of research respondents mentioned the role of the various government agencies in matching community funding with resources from the state. Problems with such government resourcing were highlighted more often by SBMCs/schools and CSOs during the research, than by government respondents. Stakeholders from all backgrounds, however, noted that government departments all face their own funding shortages and acknowledged the genuinely limited capacity of local government to respond.

105. Non-government respondents highlighted instances of government support with accessing resources for the school, primarily from SUBEB and the LGEA. This included providing cleaning materials, computers and replacement window frames. Government representatives also noted SUBEB and LGEA contributions in the form of classroom building and repairs.

106. ESSPIN (March 2011b) also previously noted ways in which SBMCs, civil society and government are engaging on obligations and responsibilities for education, and discussing ways to address concerns. In Kaduna State, for instance, during training workshops with community leaders, Local Government Councillors and state and local government education officials, participants developed a “response strategy for government in *anticipation of increased demand for education by communities*”. This included how local government could have an open-door policy, listen to issues and respond to letters, etc.

107. Many research respondents highlighted the need for more government support and the existing gaps in relation to government obligations. Examples of missing classrooms roofs, substandard furniture supplied to schools, lack of response to SBMC requests for assistance were cited, as well as long delays (for example in getting approval for construction work).(See Appendix 1 for examples of support and lack of support mentioned by stakeholders.)

108. However, they also recognised that there is little funding available at the LGEA level for use on school improvements, and that even LGEA officials sometimes received irregular payment. ESSPIN (March 2011b) noted in Lagos State that the ESs lack funding and have too many requests to deal with: “ESs are only given small budgets to take care of minor repairs”.

Reflections: on government support for resourcing schools

As SBMC/community stakeholders highlighted, their own fundraising can help with paying for smaller things, like books and uniforms, but other costs facing the schools are enormous. Most SBMCs cannot cope with funding these purely from community or other local support (and certainly not in their early years of development).

SBMCs’ commitment to funding/resourcing schools, and ability to generate local support, may be dependent on the degree to which the government is also seen to play its part. While some stakeholders said they would achieve many things for their school regardless of the government’s inputs (see Section 3.7 on accountability), others felt that their hands were tied without the help of government.

To help SBMCs maintain their momentum in the face of state funding challenges, **there is a need for government to continue:**

- **responding effectively** to requests to match the resourcing efforts of SBMCs
- **supporting more direct funding to schools**
- **making more efficient use of the limited budgets** it has available.

It is important that **SBMCs are not seen as an alternative to government financial support** for the schools, or as a way of plugging gaps when the government has a shortfall or delay in providing resources.

ESSPIN may have a technical support role to play in further developing the SBMC training package to support SBMCs to write more effective letters/requests, with clear plans and budgets, which will increase their chances of accessing available funds. Some requests may be failing to elicit responses due to their weak presentation or because Local Government Authorities (LGAs) cannot cope with the volume of requests coming from individual SBMCs. More investigation to track the progress of SBMC efforts to seek resources from government will help to establish whether these are key issues.

The establishment of SBMC forums, as is planned in some states, bringing together SBMC representatives from across the LGEA with key government and civil society stakeholders at LGEA level, may present a more efficient mechanism for issues to be raised and for government to respond. (See the Postscript in Appendix 2 for an update on this issue.)

Improvements made and resource gaps remaining

Key message

- SBMCs are having a strong positive impact on mobilising local resources for school infrastructure improvement. These efforts should be treated as part of a continuum of change and improvement in schools, rather than expecting short-term end points

by which school resourcing challenges will be 'fixed' by SBMCs.

109. There is strong evidence of progress in relation to resourcing school improvements from the community, as well as correspondingly strong indications of huge unmet school resourcing needs. The research participants offered many details of improvements made and materials purchased by SBMCs, but also examples of outstanding resource gaps.

110. Respondents did not always clearly express where funds for improvements or purchases came from. Some noted that ESSPIN-piloted school grant funding to the SBMC was used, and others cited specific community/business support. However, often respondents just commented that the improvements/purchases had happened as a result of the existence of the SBMC, without specifying if the SBMC had raised the funds itself. Nevertheless even if the listed improvements were not (fully) funded by SBMC fundraising, at least the SBMCs appear to have used the funds from ESSPIN effectively for making improvements.

111. As this is qualitative research (i.e. not involving a standardised questionnaire to gather the same data from every respondent) it is not possible to provide rigorous statistics of what SBMC funds have been spent on and what improvements are still needed. However, the information received has been organised into tables, and it is possible to see basic trends.

Improvements

112. The school improvements (attributed to SBMCs) that were mentioned most frequently across the stakeholder groups were (in order of frequency):

- 1 Building new or renovating old classrooms
- 2 Repairing, making or buying furniture
- 3 Buying teaching and learning materials
- 4= IT and AV equipment
- 4= Repaired doors and windows
- 4= Provided first aid equipment and/or medicines
- 4= Toilets

Resource gaps

113. The resource gaps mentioned most frequently across stakeholder groups were (in order of frequency):

- 1 New or renovated classrooms
- 2 Teaching and learning materials

- 3= Furniture
- 3= Sports equipment
- 4= Electricity
- 4= Computers
- 5 School Fence

114. Many of these improvements and resource gaps were also mentioned by children's focus groups consulted during ESSPIN's Community Survey in 2010 (Pinnock, 2011) and in other ESSPIN documents, e.g. ESSPIN (March 2011b), (March, 2011c).

Reflection: on improvements made and still needed

It is interesting that the top 3 improvements mentioned are also the top 3 things that still need to be improved. Various SBMCs spoke about having started improvements in these areas (e.g. renovating a classroom block), but having much more still to do (e.g. many more classrooms in need of repair). It is important, therefore, not to interpret the improvements list as meaning 'problems solved', nor the resource gaps list as meaning 'totally unsolved problems'. Indeed, the lists help to illustrate a *continuum of improvement* – progress is made, but there is always more to do if schools/SBMCs are to deliver quality education to all and keep up with the evolving challenges they face.

This continuum of change and improvement idea is illustrated by the fact that many respondents cited the need for more or improved classrooms as being linked to increased enrolment (and thus overcrowding). The SBMCs had themselves enabled more children to attend: in tackling one challenge they raised another. Some found this demoralising. There will be a **continuing role for civil society working in strong partnership with government to reassure SBMC members that this is a normal part of development, and that the risk of 'knock-on' challenges should not deter improvements from happening.**

The high priority given to teaching and learning materials can be seen as a positive. It implies that SBMCs and other stakeholders are giving attention to the quality of teaching and learning, for which they need more and better materials. It may be useful for civil society and government partners to do **further work with SBMCs on quality education, given the high level of community interest. It would be useful to use such opportunities to promote the benefits of using learning materials and teaching approaches to foster child-centred, child-friendly learning.**

Some respondents also mentioned how SBMCs and school communities make their own low-cost teaching and learning materials (e.g. SBMC members at Muslim Community School, Kwara, noted that increased enrolment means there are not enough teaching and learning materials, so teachers are making some themselves). **Consideration may have to be given as to how these innovations can be documented, and support provided to community members to help them record and showcase the materials at grassroots level,** so that schools/communities learn from each other's ideas.

(Details of the improvements and gaps mentioned by stakeholders can be found in Appendix 1.)

Bringing more children from excluded groups into school

115. SBMCs under the model adopted by government in ESSPIN-supported states have a wider remit than raising and managing school resources to improve schools. According to the state policy guidelines domesticated in each of the ESSPIN-supported states they are expected to play a key role in promoting enrolment and supporting retention. Reports of the mentoring of SBMCs by civil society and government partners



highlight the *“immense efforts already being made by SBMCs and communities to support education”* especially in *“identifying children who are out-of-school, finding out why they are out of school, and supporting them to enrol in or return to school”*(ESSPIN, March 2011c).

116. During the research, community stakeholders raised many issues relating to enrolment and excluded groups, indicating that they had taken on board the messages in SBMC development around the importance of supporting excluded children into school. Many community members offered information about the general situation in their school or area, the SBMC interventions affecting enrolment, and the related policy issues. Others spoke about the enrolment or exclusion of specific groups of children, such as children from minority ethnic groups, working children, children with disabilities and girls. Other important issues relating to bringing excluded learners (back) into education were also raised, including the role played by parents, the impact of teaching and language issues, and the use of child-to-child approaches. This suggests that efforts to orient and train SBMCs, CSOs and government staff liaising with SBMCs on inclusion and access are helping SBMCs to address these issues. Many of these issues were promoted through the follow-up ‘SBMC mentoring’ stage of the SBMC development process which took place after initial training and activation.

General enrolment and attendance issues

“There has been an improvement in pupil population since SBMC inception” (Christian School, Kwara)

Key message

- SBMCs’ efforts are strongly linked with increased enrolment and attendance. There is more scope to encourage SBMCs to have a systematic focus on diversity and the inclusion of marginalised groups.

Overall situation

117. Stakeholders from all states involved in the research noted that there has generally been increased enrolment and/or attendance since the SBMC process started,³ and more prompt returns to school after school holidays. Some provided specific statistics (although as this is qualitative research it is not possible to offer statistical comparisons between locations or over time).

118. Some stakeholders showed awareness that improved attendance does not necessarily equate with improved enrolment. For instance, at a meeting with a cluster of schools in Marine Beach, Lagos, it was mentioned that “all children on the roll attend”, but that there are still some out-of-school children (who are not on the roll). The children’s focus groups consulted during ESSPIN’s Community Survey in 2010 also noted that they often knew of children who were not enrolled or who did not attend school (Pinnock, 2011).

119. Children’s increased enthusiasm to attend school was mentioned by some stakeholders, and attributed to the work being done by SBMCs:

“We observe changes in the attitudes of the children, interest and eagerness to go to school on time.” (Gazara School, Kaduna)

SBMC role in promoting enrolment and attendance

120. Various stakeholders indicated that SBMC members are proactive in identifying children who do not attend regularly, or who are not enrolled at all. The members’ actions included:

- making home and community visits to find absent children or advocate for their education
- directly intervening by escorting children to school or providing financial/material support to poor children
- collecting more systematic data about out-of-school children.

121. Reports of SBMC mentoring by CSO and government partners highlighted that *“SBMCs are already taking steps on inclusion and protection issues which children face in gaining access to quality education. There is increased focus by SBMCs and communities on access and support for commonly excluded groups, particularly girls, children with disabilities, the poorest children, children from minority groups, and children who have been shunned by the community”* (ESSPIN, March 2011a). The Chair of LGEA Magaji Gari SBMC, Kaduna State,

³ This was mentioned at: Alokolaro Afara School, Kwara; OkeOyi School, Kwara; Muslim Community School, Kwara; Christian School, Kwara; Nomadic Ojoku School, Kwara; FOMWAN CSO, Kwara; Gazara School, Kaduna; CSO Lifeline Development Centre, Kaduna; Kajuru Town School, Kaduna; Hayin Banki School, Kaduna North; Cluster 2, Imude, Lagos; Bariki Primary School, Jigawa; Sabon Gari Primary, Ringim, Jigawa; Limawa Primary School, Kano; Albasu Central Primary School, Kano.

noted that: “Based on our understanding of our role, we succeeded in bringing 22 out-of-school children back and provided school uniform for them” (ESSPIN, November 2011a).

Impact on resources

122. A few research participants commented on the impact that increased enrolment is having on school resources. For instance, the SBMC focus group meeting at OkeOyi School, Kwara, noted that the increased numbers enrolling causes problems with needing more learning materials.

Reflection: on enrolment issues and inclusion

In many instances, general enrolment/attendance information was offered by respondents, but few reflections on the situation for a range of specific groups who might be considered more marginalised in education. Some respondents mentioned one specific marginalised group, but not other groups (see Section 3.3.2 for details).

This lack of specificity may, in part, be due to the challenges of the research process. There was only a limited amount of time with each stakeholder group in which to cover a large number of questions, and then ‘drill deeper’ into their responses. Discussion of marginalised groups can be a sensitive issue needing a more gradual, longer-term investigation than possible in this research.

However, it could also indicate that stakeholders (like SBMC members, teachers, etc), were not yet as ‘diversity aware’ as they could be. **There is a role to be played by both civil society and government to ensure that everyone is thinking more about ensuring the presence, participation and achievement of *all* children** (girls, boys, children with and without disabilities, children from minority and majority ethnic and linguistic groups, etc). The question raised is: **what more can be done to ensure that SBMCs, their schools and communities prioritise diversity issues across all their efforts towards education for all children in the community?**

Minority ethnic groups

Key message

- There is a mixed picture of achievements and ongoing challenges related to improving participation and learning among children from minority ethnic groups. SBMCs’ general understanding and capacity to work towards inclusive education provision for diverse learners is encouraging, but they will need support to further strengthen understanding and action.

123. The effective enrolment and support of minority ethnic groups in education was identified by a range of stakeholders as a significant issue in many of the areas where the SBMC initiative is operating, (for instance in areas where nomadic Fulani children are very under-represented in education). Despite some respondents showing a good awareness of the challenges affecting minority ethnic children, those research participants who mentioned this issue offered a mixed response in terms of whether SBMCs have or have not enabled more children from minority ethnic groups to enrol, attend and participate in learning.

Improvements

124. Various improvements attributed to the SBMC initiative were mentioned by research participants, including:

- increased interaction between children from different ethnic groups
- improved enrolment in and performance at school by children from minority ethnic groups, with the knock-on effect of encouraging parents to enrol more children
- efforts by the school to provide teachers from minority ethnic groups and classes specifically for these groups.

125. Documentation by government and civil society partners also records the enrolment of Fulani nomadic herders' children in Gbadamu LGEA School, Kwara State, *"as a result of sensitisation and encouragement by the SBMC"* (ESSPIN, March 2011b). The same report notes that in Kwara State, the CSO WOKFEI and its government partners have encouraged Fulani girls to attend school, through supporting SBMC efforts to encourage *"the parents/family members of the girls to accompany them to school through the bush, where they are afraid the girls may be ambushed or attacked"*.

Challenges

126. Despite this evidence of progress, stakeholders raised just as many examples of ongoing challenges. These included: continued engagement in cattle herding by some children in the families, even when siblings go to school; transport difficulties and safety issues involved in getting to distant schools; lack of understanding and support by some teachers regarding the challenges faced by children who travel long distances to school and thus struggle to be punctual; and the lack of a water supply at school to act as an incentive to attend.

Reflection: on minority ethnic groups

While some respondents mentioned that children from minority ethnic groups were experiencing improved attendance and performance, an equal number indicated continued barriers to their genuine participation (such as being punished for arriving late after a long journey).

The use of separate classes for children from certain ethnic groups (such as Fulani) may have mixed implications. From a positive perspective it may be more effective at enabling learning, through the use of a mother-tongue teacher who understands the children's cultural and community backgrounds. However, separate classes for whatever reason risk perpetuating children's isolation from other groups, cultures and languages, which may not be in their best interests in the long term. Separation may go against inclusive education principles.

Further support may be needed to facilitate more comprehensive debates in schools/SBMCs around the issues of inclusion, ensuring for instance that efforts to address learners' language and cultural needs don't inadvertently result in segregation which ultimately may be harmful for social cohesion. (Further discussion of language issues in relation to SBMCs' efforts to include more excluded children can be found in Section 3.3.8.)

Stakeholders mentioned several issues that they felt would assist in improving education for children from minority ethnic groups – such as recruiting mobile teachers, and providing water supplies in schools to act as an incentive to attend. Solving such issues may be beyond the capacity of SBMCs on their own. **Civil society and government partners will need to continue to support SBMCs to develop skills in approaching and working with organisations from other sectors**, such as water and sanitation providers.

Minority ethnic groups were only mentioned in Kwara and Kaduna. In the other schools visited, the consultant was informed that minority children were not present. However, it is conceivable that minority children were out of school in the area and that SBMCs were not considering their needs. A stronger emphasis on the needs of minority groups could be incorporated into SBMC training and mentoring, based on the learning from states to date. ESSPIN could provide technical support to strengthen training/mentoring materials in this area.

Working children

“Poor families rely on children to earn money” (SBMC, Madobi Primary School, Jigawa)

Key message

- SBMCs have taken action to encourage families to educate children rather than sending them to work, with some success. More attention may need to be paid to supporting adapted or alternative education arrangements for children who simply cannot afford to give up work entirely.

127. The issue of child work presents a significant challenge for education provision across the locations where ESSPIN-initiated SBMCs operate (as well as across Nigeria as a whole). SBMCs, being community-based, are well-placed to tackle this issue of working children and develop localised education solutions that can respond to the families’ economic needs while upholding the children’s rights to a quality education.

128. In all states, research participants mentioned children who have to work, but offered a mixed picture of success in terms of whether and how SBMCs are tackling these problems.

Market trading and hawking

129. Several participants in Kwara commented that since the SBMCs started to work, fewer pupils are absent from school on market days or to do hawking. In Kano the children attributed a similar trend to SBMCs giving families financial support with school-related costs, so that children didn’t have to hawk to raise the funds. Their counterparts in Kaduna and Lagos, however, noted an ongoing problem with hawking.

130. Market trading and hawking were also commonly mentioned by children’s focus groups consulted during ESSPIN’s Community Survey in 2010 (Pinnock, 2011) as reasons for children’s non-attendance.

Domestic workers

131. The issue of house girls (who do domestic work for other families) was only raised in Lagos. Mentions mostly involved girls being brought to urban areas, because families in poorer rural areas cannot afford to keep them, or need the income they earn.

132. Some positive steps by SBMCs were mentioned by SBMC Cluster 4 in Ikeja, including advocacy with families and employers, asking them to allow girls to attend and stay in school. In contrast SBMC Cluster 5 in Ikeja felt that house girls were not allowed to attend school by their employers, and cited an instance of a community member trying to encourage a household to send their house girl to school and meeting resistance. Cluster schools in Marine Beach also noted that progress on this issue was made more difficult because of the complexities of registering girls for school when they arrive in the area.

133. Evidence from other ESSPIN reports confirms the stakeholders' perspectives.

"...this is a common phenomenon in Lagos and ...these children have very little hope of accessing education" (ESSPIN, November 2011b).

Children from Benin Republic and Kwara State were working with families in Lagos State. Defence for Children International CSO and the SBMC approached the guardians who *"were encouraged by the SBMC to allow the girls to have formal education at Muslim Primary School. The reflection is that these girls are now performing very well in the school and one of them is said to be a class monitor."* (ESSPIN, June 2011)

Cattle herding

134. Opinions from stakeholders indicated that, since the SBMCs became active, fewer children are expected to stay out of school to herd cattle, although the problem remains that someone still has to do this work. Some explained that older children now do the work while younger ones are given parental priority to attend school (e.g. Nomadic Ojoku School, Kwara).

135. CSO and government partner reports from Kwara State also noted that the Fulani nomadic herder communities in Kwara are now sending many of their children to school. For example, the SBMC for Gbadamu LGEA School made several visits to the Fulani communities to "convince them to bring their children to school. After the Fulani community eventually responded to the appeal by the SBMC and brought their school-age children to the school. The children were enrolled and ... this is an unprecedented achievement in the school and community" (ESSPIN, March 2011c).

Farming

136. More stakeholders who mentioned farm work offered a negative than a positive picture, with children still doing farm work rather than attending school. This was attributed both to family survival pressures and lack of parental awareness about education.

Reflections: on working children

The responses during this research provide a mixed picture: there are pockets of success and areas of persistent challenge in terms of enabling working children to fulfil their right to an education. In contexts of extreme poverty, sending children to work is inevitable, and it may be beyond the capacity of SBMCs to prevent it entirely. Mitigating the impact of child work on education and leisure time may be more appropriate than attempting to prevent children from working altogether.

Research participants did not convey ideas or experiences relating to SBMC efforts to mitigate the negative effects of work on children's education. They spoke mostly about advocating for parents to send their children to school (potentially asking them to make choices that could reduce family income and standard of living).

Mitigation tactics one might expect to hear about include changing school timetables or term dates to fit children's work schedules, or arranging evening or catch-up lessons. While ESSPIN reported (June 2011) that in Lagos State, some SBMCs arrange flexible adult education classes so that older children can work during the day and still learn in the evenings, no stakeholders in the research mentioned such initiatives by SBMCs. They may have lacked the opportunity to share information on this, may have been unaware of such initiatives, or such initiatives may not exist in their schools.

SBMCs, with support from government and civil society, will need to continue to find more innovative ways to support working children's education, if they really cannot stop working altogether (beyond basic awareness-raising and advocacy interventions). If approaches to mitigate the impact of work on education are already being used, **efforts to support the documentation and sharing of these experiences between SBMCs may need to be strengthened.**

Children with disabilities

Key message

- SBMCs were found to be responding to the access needs of children with disabilities in a minority of settings. The research suggests that SBMCs were not yet routinely considering the issue of education for children with disabilities in the community, although they were grappling with this new concept and idea. Government partners working closely with civil society may need to find ways to further support SBMCs to promote inclusive education for all marginalised groups.

137. Globally, children with disabilities face some of the biggest barriers to attending and participating or achieving in education – not because of their impairments but because of the inflexibility of the education system and environment in responding to their learning needs. Numerous initiatives and guidance documents exist to support schools in developing appropriate responses to inclusion barriers. These are often built around having a multi-stakeholder team in the school that has the responsibility to identify and address barriers to learning. SBMCs are potentially ideally placed to take on a similar role in spearheading disability inclusive policy and practice in their schools, as they are already meant to have a

focus on promoting education for out-of-school children (many of whom are likely to have disabilities).

138. The research elicited a small amount of information about children with disabilities from stakeholders –three discussions⁴ raised this issue. Action was being taken in two out of three cases. Two of the stakeholder groups (in Kwara and Kaduna) who mentioned disability noted that there is now more care and assistance for children with disabilities, and that more children with disabilities come to school (as a result of SBMCs encouraging parents to send them). The consultant was shown one child who had been given an adapted bicycle.
139. The other reference to children with disabilities (Kano) indicated that they “go to the traditional (Tsangaya) school or IQTE school. Others go to the special schools and others have never been to school”. In general, this SBMC’s attitude appeared to be that the school could not effectively teach children with disabilities, although a local community-based organisation (CBO) may offer them vocational training – indicative of the work that still needs to be done to promote understanding of and confidence to embrace inclusive education in regular schools.
140. The consultant was not explicitly asked to raise disability issues during the focus groups, interviews, etc, but given SBMCs’ remit to support out-of-school children, a litmus test of how well school communities have understood ‘Education For All’ (EFA) can be to see what information is offered up about children with disabilities.
141. No views were offered on the participation and achievement of children with disabilities in education; suggesting that disability is currently being considered in terms of access to school but not yet in terms of full inclusion in the learning process. Bearing in mind the very limited time for discussions, it was not possible to get an accurate sense of whether disability was an extremely marginal issue for SBMCs or whether it was a growing priority. More investigation would be helpful on the status and potential of SBMC action to support the inclusive education of children with disabilities.
142. Pinnock (2011) noted in relation to the SBMC initiative that “...experience suggests that investigations into disability barriers to education will need to take place with specific questions about disability”. There is limited evidence to date, in CSO and government reports of SBMC support, about SBMCs working with and succeeding to enrol children with disabilities. However, inclusive education training is part of the mentoring support package to SBMCs, stepped down by civil society and government partners (CGPs), and there is evidence that this is having some effect. For instance, one example from Kwara State (ESSPIN, November 2011b) noted that as “*the result of SBMCs sensitising the community on*

⁴ With OkeOyi School SBMC, Kwara; Lifeline Education Development Centre CSO, Kaduna; and Limawa Primary School, Kano.

inclusive education, Lawrence Alade Eguntola, a physically challenged child, is one of the pupils now enrolled in Bani KLGEA primary 2 of Kwara State and supported by his peers and teacher". Similar examples were mentioned in Kaduna by CSO Lifeline Education Development Centre.

Reflection: on disability issues

SBMCs were already carrying out activities to find and enrol out-of-school children, though are perhaps only beginning to understand and take action for children excluded because of disability.

Evidence gathered so far in reports of SBMC progress focuses mainly on case examples of individual children with disabilities who have been supported to attend school (like Lawrence, above). This is often how inclusive education starts, and is a commendable first step. However, it is just a first step, and CSOs and government partners need to ensure that the process does not stop here. Strong efforts are needed to move beyond focusing on providing access for individual children to the existing education set-up (i.e. integrated education), and towards systemic change so that schools and the education system become flexible enough to support the presence, participation and achievement of all children, including those with disabilities (i.e. inclusive education).⁵

It is suggested that **states initiate some specific investigations as to why children with disabilities are not yet routinely part of SBMCs' work on reaching out-of-school children** (e.g. finding out what the attitude and practice barriers are among SBMC members; what understandings there might be about schools' obligations towards EFA, etc). This would also look at the current understanding of inclusive education among the key players in the SBMC initiative, and the messages that they are conveying to other stakeholders. Such **research would ideally be participatory and make use of action research principles**, so that the investigation process leads to stakeholders identifying and addressing barriers themselves, and doesn't just generate data. The involvement of existing inclusive education structures at state level, such as the State Committee on Inclusive Education in Kaduna State which is also working closely with ESSPIN, would be central to such research and investigation.

Emphasis needs to be placed on ensuring that inclusion for children with disabilities grows into an integral part of the SBMC role.

Setting a future goal that **SBMCs should be talking about and acting on disability issues as frequently and naturally as they discuss children who work, or gender issues**, would also be very beneficial.

Girls and gender issues

"Some parents feel that education of boys is more important than education of girls." (Limawa Primary School, Kano)

Key message

- Gender parity and equality have been taken up as key issues for SBMCs seeking to bring

⁵ For more information see: http://www.eenet.org.uk/what_is_ie.php

excluded groups, such as girls, into education. This suggests that the gender components of SBMC training and development work are likely to have been effective and resonated well with school communities. Initiatives to support girls' enrolment and learning need to focus on tackling a range of specific barriers faced by girls, and thus will require interventions beyond community awareness-raising.

143. Throughout Nigeria, the position of girls in society and in education is often inferior to that of boys. SBMCs have a clear mandate (and opportunity) to support improved education opportunities for girls, as part of their efforts to bring more excluded children into schools. The terms of reference for the current research project also requested a focus on gender issues (more explicitly than on other marginalisation issues such as disability).

Improved enrolment for girls

144. As we saw above, SBMCs are generally credited with helping increase enrolment, retention and attendance. Research participants offered some information about how girls' enrolment is being improved through:

- financial support to girls from poorer families for buying uniforms, etc
- provision of evening or early morning classes
- the building of school facilities closer to the communities.



145. However, it was not possible to establish a clear trend as to whether this applied to both boys and girls. Some SBMCs/schools cited improved female enrolment and a smaller gap between boys and girls; others said that enrolment of girls was better but they were still far from having parity. However, some respondents (such as those from Bariki and Madobi schools) were not always explicit as to whether they attributed the positive enrolment changes to the SBMC.

Child marriage and pregnancy

146. The early marriage and motherhood of girls is, again, a persistent problem across Nigeria and the areas where ESSPIN-initiated SBMCs are working. Some respondents credited SBMCs for their role in reducing the prevalence of child marriage, although the details of this role were vague (e.g. "sensitising parents"). Other respondents mentioned SBMC efforts to tackle the problem, without indicating the success levels of their work.

Reflection: on gender issues

Improved enrolment and attendance by girls were attributed by many research respondents to SBMC efforts. Much of the focus of SBMC action appeared to be on raising parents' awareness of girls' educational rights and the benefits of educating girls.

As with other aspects of this research, information gaps on more detailed strategies may have resulted from the lack of time available with each group of respondents and the large number of questions required by the terms of reference, both of which limited how deeply the consultant could investigate specific issues. The gaps could also indicate that SBMCs are not yet reflecting on their own practices in a way that is easy for them to analyse and share (i.e. they are doing work on gender equality but don't yet have the capacity to articulate the details and results). **SBMCs may need further support to consider ways of reflecting on and conveying more explicitly the details of the work they are doing** for others to learn from.

Finally, information gaps could suggest that (at least some) SBMCs' activities towards gender equality at the time of the research were still at the level of community awareness-raising, and were not yet featuring more innovative activities that seek to identify and address the specific barriers to participation and learning that girls are facing in each location. **Further support may be needed to assist SBMCs to work beyond the general 'sensitisation' level of engagement in gender issues**, to help support this particular excluded group. Raising awareness is a key element of tackling gender inequality in education, but even once parents and girls are committed to education, there may be numerous other factors preventing girls' presence, participation and achievement.

Role of parents

Key message

- Parents are vital in any education initiative, especially when aiming to find, enrol and retain previously excluded children. Parents are not just the recipients of advocacy messages, however, and should play a central role in determining and delivering these messages to others through their engagement in SBMCs.

147. In any context, parents play a key role in their children's education. They often control whether or not children go to school and for how long, and they make decisions about which of their children will or will not get an education. SBMCs offer a community-based way of running schools and making improvements in education for all children. By definition, therefore, they should include a strong body of work with parents and family members.

148. The current research reaffirmed the role that parents play in their children's education, and offered examples of how SBMCs have encouraged parents to send previously excluded children, and children from marginalised or vulnerable groups, to school. SBMCs have also played a role in engaging parents and community members more generally in education processes, but this is discussed elsewhere in this report.

Advocacy with parents

149. As with much of the information received from research participants, many responses relating to SBMCs' work with parents featured 'general level' interventions (i.e. raising awareness, holding meetings, etc).

150. These general awareness-raising activities are very important in communities where school attendance may not be considered automatically for every child. However, there also needs

to be a range of more targeted intervention with parents, to address specific barriers that may exist in a particular context. Various SBMCs reported finding and talking to specific parents whose children are not enrolled or attending regularly or promptly (e.g. through home visits (Muslim Community School, Kwara)). Others mentioned innovative approaches to encouraging parents to support education, such as offering prizes for children's prompt attendance (SBMC cluster 5, Ikeja, Lagos).

151. Some respondents provided views that cast parents in a rather negative light, and as people who need to be told what to do.

Parents as advocates

152. Research participants mentioned a smaller number of initiatives through which parents involved with the SBMCs are the main advocates. However, since SBMC members are often parents, it may be that many more SBMC advocacy actions could be attributed to parents if the details were known.

153. The role of women/mothers as education advocates was highlighted by Albasu Central Primary School, Kano: *"The women try to encourage other parents to send their children to school, at local weddings and naming ceremonies"*. Aspirations to involve parents more as advocates were also mentioned. For instance, the SBMC at Oke Oyi School, Kwara, hopes to use parents who are already sending children to school to help them reach and advocate with nomadic and other hard-to-reach communities.

Reflection: on parents' roles

Often in education programmes that are dealing with children who are out-of-school, parents are seen as the main problem, even as the 'enemy'. In ESSPIN-initiated SBMCs it is encouraging that parents are members and are helping to encourage other parents to uphold their children's education rights. However, some responses still point to the potential for parents to be seen as the problem (in need of enlightenment and being told what to do).

SBMCs (with their initial membership that includes some parents) may need support to develop more parent-led advocacy for enrolment and attendance. For instance, SBMCs could encourage and support parent networks, especially within marginalised sections of the community. These networks could have the role not just to tell parents to send their children to school, but to offer parent-to-parent support and advice in how to overcome any barriers that prevent them from sending children to school. Such an approach would help to ensure that SBMCs avoid seeing parents as the problem, and more comprehensively embrace them as an essential part of the solution.

Child-to-child activities

"Hawking would not stop you from going to school, and school would not stop you from hawking [you can do them at different times]" (head girl explaining to other children, Hayin Banki School, Kaduna North).

Key message

- Like parents, children are at the heart of every education initiative and can play a crucial role, both in improving the school's understanding about excluded children and in supporting these children to come to school. The role of children in SBMCs therefore needs to be developed as comprehensively as possible.

154. Children are not just the recipients of education; they can and should play a central role in the development of education. As such, they can play an important role in helping their peers to come to school or to have a better experience in school. SBMCs initiated by Kaduna, Kwara, Lagos, Jigawa and Kano States are designed to have children's inputs, and state SBMC guidebooks highlight the importance of forming children's committees to enhance children's participation. (The extent to which this is happening will be discussed in Section 3.5.2.).

155. The research participants provided a few insights into children (those who are and are not directly in the SBMC) helping excluded peers to enrol or attend school. General improvements in school, thanks to the SBMC, have the potential knock-on effect of children who enjoy school encouraging more peers to come too (Hilltop Foundation CSO, Kwara). Not all of the child-to-child activities mentioned result in excluded children coming to school, but did nevertheless help them to get an education. For instance:

"Children teach friends who are out of school", although they do also "try to encourage them to come [to school]" (children's SBMC committee at Kajuru Town School, Kaduna).

156. Other project documentation provides specific child-to-child examples, too. For instance, in Lagos State a 10-year-old SBMC representative *"saw a group of children around his age range who were freely playing football during school hours. He confronted them, and talked to them on the importance of staying in school and why they should go back"*. The report notes that *"including young members such as him into the SBMC, promotes a sense of responsibility to their communities and themselves"* (ESSPIN, November 2011b).

Reflection: on child-to-child activities

Child-to-child activities, linked with the inclusion of children in SBMCs, have the potential to play a significant part in SBMCs' efforts to bring more excluded children into school. Children may be more tuned in to who is in their community and who isn't in school who should be; may be more able to approach and talk to these children in a way that they will accept and not fear, etc.

As we will see later in Section 3.5.2, SBMCs are meant to involve children, but this was taking time to develop, beyond children's attendance at SBMC meetings. The initial SBMC research (Poulsen, 2009) highlighted that children's participation in Nigeria is "often not accepted", due to cultural and traditional beliefs around the place and participation of children in society.

The examples of child-to-child actions given above suggest the far greater potential in using children to identify excluded peers, and bringing them (back) into school. **ESSPIN may therefore have a role to play in supporting government partners, CSOs and SBMCs to think progressively about child participation, and develop more child-led initiatives.**

Language issues

Key message

- Language is a major cause of exclusion, and thus SBMCs that seek to bring children from excluded groups into school need to be finding ways to identify and address any language-related barriers in their locality.

157. Language issues play a major role in education in Nigeria, a country where hundreds of languages are in use (Benson, 2004; Pinnock, 2009). The language of instruction as specified by the curriculum or the school, and the (un)availability of teachers who can speak children's mother tongues are common factors in the exclusion of children from education, especially children from groups whose language is in the minority in their location. SBMCs which are seeking to enrol and retain children who face exclusion, therefore, cannot ignore any language challenges that may be present in their school/community.

158. These issues were not widely raised by research participants, but some highlighted the need for teachers who speak certain languages, and the need for people who can interpret when SBMCs and other education personnel are doing 'mobilisation work'. Several children's focus groups consulted during ESSPIN's Community Survey in 2010 also noted that difficulties in understanding "the common language like English and Hausa" "...kept children out of school." (Pinnock, 2011).

Reflections on: language issues

Language issues, globally, are known to be a cause of widespread exclusion of children from education (and within education, when they are in class but unable to participate fully). Discussions with SBMCs and other stakeholders about excluded learners, yielded few responses relating specifically to language and SBMC activities to ensure that learners were not excluded because of language barriers. This could be due to the lack of time available for the research and the wide range of topics that needed to be covered, preventing participants from being able to share all they knew. It could also indicate that SBMCs are not engaging much with the issue, perhaps seeing it as beyond their remit as 'school managers', or as a policy-related issue that requires government leadership primarily.

CGPs may need to **research more fully the impact that the language of instruction is having on children's access and learning outcomes**, to help improve their and the SBMCs' understanding of the issue. CGPs may also need to **look at how to further support SBMCs to identify and respond to language-related barriers**, given that SBMCs are tasked with improving enrolment and retention for excluded groups and therefore cannot be idle on this issue (even if they only take on an advocacy rather than direct action role).

Contributing to community empowerment and participation in education

159. In organising and analysing the information gathered from research participants, the different levels of engagement that were mentioned have been considered.

160. Many stakeholders involved in the research spoke about ‘raising awareness’ among, ‘sensitising’ and/or ‘enlightening’ parents and the community about education-related issues. When considering such responses, we need to think carefully about these concepts. Such processes can be implemented in a top-down way (i.e. implementers perceive that ‘ignorant’ people have to be informed about what is best for them and their community or children; and the decisions about what is best come from those who are doing the ‘sensitising’). Alternatively these concepts can be implemented in a bottom-up way, through gradual participatory processes that facilitate people to reflect on and share their experiences and ideas, and thus reach better understandings about important issues without being ‘told’ what they should think and believe. And of course there are processes that fall somewhere between the two extremes.

161. Words like ‘sensitisation’, ‘enlightenment’ and ‘awareness-raising’ are heavily used in development to describe an array of actions, yet many people who use the words are often not able to pin down precisely what the concepts entail in practice. When consulting stakeholders about these issues, it is therefore important to bear in mind the potential for wide variations in their understanding of the concepts, and the potential for any activity that involves communication with stakeholders to be labelled as ‘sensitisation’, ‘awareness-raising’ or ‘enlightenment’ work, when that might not actually be its primary purpose.

Raising community awareness

Key message

- SBMCs are carrying out a range of community awareness activities, with reported success. For longer-term ‘buy-in’ by the community, a project’s initial awareness-raising stages need to be participatory and ‘bottom-up’ and need to guard against perceptions of communities as ignorant.

162. SBMCs, being community-based, are in an ideal position to engage the community in discussions about education and how it will benefit them as individuals and as a whole. The majority of SBMCs and schools represented in the research had done some sort of awareness-raising work with parents and the community. Various research participants spoke about their perceptions of the results of this awareness-raising work, including improved understanding of the education system by parents; and their positive attitude change towards education. For instance:

“[As a result of SBMC inputs] parents now understand the education system better and why they should educate their children” (OkeOyi School, Kwara). (See Appendix 1 for more examples.)

163. Many participants in the research used language that could potentially be interpreted as ‘top-down’. For instance they referred to ‘enlightening ignorant parents’, which implies processes that tell parents what they should do, rather than processes that facilitate parents to discuss what they do, reflect on the impact and consider alternatives. Just a few

respondents (e.g. Ipee School, Kwara) used more neutral language, describing advocacy in the community about children's education being everyone's responsibility.

"Before the introduction of SBMCs we were ignorant..." (parents, Gazara School, Kaduna)
The SBMC *"hold regular meetings to enlighten parents"* (Sabon Gari Primary School, Jigawa)

Reflection: on community awareness-raising

In any context, dealing with any topic, community awareness-raising can be a sensitive issue. SBMCs have clearly done a lot of work to open doors in the community, communicate with community members and promote messages about education – and they have seen positive results. (See Appendix 1 for details of examples.)

The research participants' use of terminology that implies 'top down' (informing 'ignorant' parents) rather than bottom-up (asking parents what they think education is for/should be like and building from that starting point) may be more a reflection of how documentation takes place rather than an indication that the awareness-raising work is itself top-down. However, the impact of terminology on initiatives like this should not be under-estimated, because negative terminology often reflects negative attitudes, which can have the potential to undermine positive practice.

The SBMC processes for bringing parents on board are likely to be more successful if SBMC members can guard against language that might make it seem acceptable to view parents as the ignorant (inferior) ones in the relationship. For instance, where SBMC members are talking about "asking parents about their perceptions of education and discussing how education might benefit their community" they are likely to get better long-term support and response from parents than where they see themselves as "enlightening parents about what education is and why they should see it as valuable".

SBMC community awareness-raising processes strive to be 'bottom-up' processes, building on existing positives in the community. CGPs would benefit from being supported to **keep a closer eye on awareness-raising work to ensure that there is a balance between work that starts by 'giving the community a message' and work that starts by 'asking the community what they think about an issue'**.

Community ownership of school management

"They [SBMC] make everybody in the community see the school as their own and not really a government school" (Ipee School, Kwara).

Key message

- SBMC members express a growing sense of ownership over their school and the management process. It will be important to continue to build on this towards a more complete understanding of what 'community ownership' means, how it can be strengthened, and how it sits alongside government's overall responsibility for delivering education.

164. SBMCs are (or should be) a mechanism for improving community ownership of schools by empowering parents, children and other interested parties to have a voice in the decisions affecting their school (and thus their society).

165. A range of comments from stakeholders during the research suggest that this process of ownership is happening – people know their rights, and actively engage as ‘owners’ of the school and education processes. Respondents cited financial control, community-initiated meetings, a sense of care towards the school and people working together as evidence of ownership. It was also mentioned that ownership is not restricted to direct stakeholders (e.g. parents) but open to anyone with a genuine interest in education in the community. This sense of ownership has grown in a very short space of time and it will be important to keep up the momentum with which SBMCs are supporting their schools.

Reflection: on ownership

A sense of school ownership was prominent throughout the research, and this is a very positive achievement for the SBMC initiative. It will be important to build on this as the SBMC model is strengthened and replicated within ESSPIN-supported states and new states. A key challenge is to ensure that in practice, the process continues to be genuinely empowering and participatory for communities and not tokenistic.

One key thing to keep an eye on is ensuring that practice keeps up with the theory among all stakeholder groups. There is extensive evidence that increased ownership of schools/SBMCs has led to resources and support being mobilised for the school (see Section 3.2). But not all stakeholders were explicitly ‘putting two and two together’ – they spoke about ‘owning our school’, but did not in the same conversations expand on these ideas to explain what actually happens to manifest this ownership in practice.

Other than the problem of time shortages in focus groups, this may be (a) because they are not used to articulating these issues (indicating a possible need for more support in reflective thinking about and documenting of their experiences); or (b) because some stakeholders have heard about the theory of ownership, but haven’t yet experienced what ownership feels like in practical terms. This is inevitable in a large and relatively new initiative. Ongoing efforts to support practical experience exchanges within and between SBMCs will help increasing numbers of stakeholders to understand and see for themselves what ownership looks like in practice.

State government and the CGP therefore have a dual role when it comes to SBMCs and ownership:

- **Helping to build on SBMCs’ understanding of ownership and build upon the action they are already taking**, for instance by supporting SBMCs to challenge any barriers that undermine community ownership (e.g. slow government responses when the school ‘owners’ have identified a problem).
- **Helping SBMCs and communities to reflect on their existing actions to identify how they are already building ownership of the school**. It is encouraging that so many research participants commented that there is ownership, but (for the sake of experience exchanges and accountability to donors, etc) more need to be able to explain what this ownership looks like in terms of who does what, etc.

Teachers’ relationships with communities

“[There is now] good understanding and harmony between teachers, pupils and SBMC” (Hayin Banki School, Kaduna North).

Key message

- SBMCs seem to be supporting improved relationships between teachers and parents/community members. ‘Power-balanced’ relationships are a vital part of the process of developing stakeholder empowerment and participation in the education development process.

166. Participation and empowerment may be a stated aim in a lot of development work, but often the existing relationships in a situation prevent certain groups from realising their right to join in on an equal basis. A traditional relationship between parents and teachers (globally, and also in the research locations) is one of unequal power – with teachers and education staff being more ‘powerful’, knowledgeable, informed, etc, than parents. So for there to be a genuine process of community empowerment and participation, equal relationships in terms of power and respect need to be achieved.

167. This has ramifications for the work of SBMCs: if they are to achieve the desired community engagement and participation in education and the running of the school, they need to look at the relationship between their teachers and the community.

168. All stakeholders who mentioned relationships between teachers and parents/communities, felt that there had been improvements since the SBMCs became active. These relationships were defined in terms of improved co-ordination and co-operation between teachers and parents and better understanding between the parties, with some citing improved child attendance as a result. (See Appendix 1 for examples mentioned by respondents.)

Reflection: on teacher/community relations

The information presented by research participants offers a very positive picture of improving relations between the school and the community⁶.

It will be important for all stakeholders, community leaders, head teachers, SBMCs, local government and civil society partners to continue to support these cordial relations.

Engagement in the education process by children and parents

“Since the SBMC, children now arrive early at school” (teachers, Limawa Primary School, Kano).

169. Children are an integral part of every community, so we could not look at the issue of community empowerment and participation in education without reference to children.

⁶It is important to note that the logistics of the research meant that we cannot easily tell whether these comments were made by parents or teachers, or others (many of the focus groups were with mixed and/or large groups of stakeholders, making it difficult to record the status of each individual who spoke)

Likewise, parents are key stakeholders in education, and their confidence and ability to participate actively in education-related decisions and actions can have a significant impact on the pace and nature of educational improvements.

170. We will look in more detail at ‘children’s voice’ issues in Section 3.5.2, so in this section we simply review information stakeholders provided about children’s general engagement in the learning process. Various stakeholders suggested that the work SBMCs have done to improve schools has boosted children’s interest and engagement in education, to the benefit of themselves and others. For instance, they cited examples of children more effectively sharing what they learn at school with their family; willingly doing homework and studying together with friends after school; and being punctual for class.

171. The research participants gave promising indications that parents are speaking up on education (and being listened to), and that they are engaging practically by taking a closer interest in what their children are doing and learning. A common comment from a range of respondents was that SBMCs and schools have developed systems for parents to check their children’s work, and thus monitor progress and teaching/learning quality.

Enabling women, children and other excluded groups to have a voice

“[SBMCs] may not yet have attained ... the full participation of marginalised groups such as women ... in the decision-making process.” (ESSPIN, March 2011b)

“Whilst genuine participation is still variable, there are signs of women and children becoming involved in decision-making processes, and of SBMCs forming committees to enhance their participation” (ESSPIN, March 2011c).



172. SBMCs are seeking to give women and children a voice in education decision making. To some extent they are making progress.

173. Research participants offered information about women’s, children’s and nomadic herders’ voices (either being heard or not), but offered no information about other excluded groups being listened to. This may be due to the limited time available for discussions, and/or to the stakeholders’ lack of awareness about the rights and abilities of other marginalised people in the community to speak out on education. For instance, there were no mentions by the research participants of people with disabilities having an explicit voice in SBMCs.

174. Some nomadic herders are becoming involved in the SBMCs. For instance an SBMC in Alokolaro Afara, Kwara State has a Fulani SBMC member who is working with the parents and the community and having an impact on the numbers of Fulani children attending the school (ESSPIN, March 2011b). However, this example doesn’t tell us much about the extent

to which the Fulani SBMC member has a voice in the SBMC decision-making processes, as opposed to voicing his education opinions with his community.

175. There remain concerns over the lack of women's participation in the SBMC process. In some areas, notably in Kano and Jigawa States, the participation of women was found to be particularly low and was a major challenge for CGPs and SBMCs to address. In many communities it was not accepted for women and men to sit together and discuss.
176. CSOs have expressed the view that achievement in these areas perhaps needs to be re-defined, whereby even the representation of women on the SBMC is a major change in comparison to what was there before, even if they do not visibly participate. They highlight that whilst women may not have been participating at the SBMC meetings, they may still have been using the information and knowledge they have gained to encourage, influence and enable children in the community to attend school, and take other actions to support education" (ESSPIN, March 2011b). This should be encouraged, but it should only be the first step towards the equality for women's voices that the SBMC process is striving to achieve.
177. Overall, the research participants' responses (and evidence from other documents) suggest that giving genuine voice to women and children will need continued support and emphasis if SBMCs are to become truly representative of the wider community. Supporting the women's and children's SBMC committees to enhance participation is one strategy that can be strengthened further; as long as this is matched with these committees getting stronger voices within the main SBMC meetings.

Women's involvement and women's committees

"[Women don't attend SBMC meetings] because they are at the market" (cluster 2, Imude, Lagos).

Key message

- There are cultural differences related to women's participation generally across and within the ESSPIN supported states. Despite these differences, women's participation in SBMCs and in matters related to education is growing and having an impact. However it does appear at this stage that women's involvement in SBMC decision-making is still relatively weak, and that further efforts must be made to ensure that the voices of women, and other commonly excluded groups, are part of the decision-making processes of SBMCs. Separate women's committees are very active in supporting education in their communities, but the extent to which the women's voices are heard and acted upon by SBMCs is not yet clear.

178. SBMC Guidebooks highlight that SBMCs should have women's committees, to help ensure that the views of mothers, female teachers and other women in the community are represented in the SBMC and thus in the school development/governance process. Women are also supposed to sit in the main SBMC, and thus have a 'mainstream' voice as well as a separate focal group to work through. SBMCs, as bodies with growing influence in their

communities, offer ideal opportunities to model practices which promote gender equality; and could even be seen as having a moral responsibility to 'set a good example' in this regard.

179. However, as pointed out in initial SBMC research conducted in ESSPIN supported states, "a requirement for female membership in the [SBMC] guidelines does not necessarily ensure women's inclusion...[their] inclusion in membership does not ensure their attendance at meetings; and that their attendance at meetings does not ensure that they will be able to influence the proceedings". This insight from Poulsen (2009) is mirrored to some extent in the findings from the qualitative research.

Actions and achievements of women's committees

180. The women's committee *"mobilises pupils to come to school"* and *"assists in providing school uniforms and PTA levy to pupils who are less privileged"* (Budo Oyo School, Kwara).
181. Responses from research participants indicate that the women's committees have been very active in promoting education issues, and raising funds for education, within their communities. They were reported to have done extensive work to raise parents' (especially mothers') awareness of education and encourage them to send their children to school. Many committees have helped to find money for teachers, materials, individual support for poor children, as well as making items for the school. Some have engaged in more complex tasks such as working with the police against violence and offering vocational training. (See Appendix 1 for examples.)

Women's committees and participation in the SBMC

182. Responses from research participants indicated that even in some of the most conservative settings, women do have active seats on SBMCs. For example, a female teacher and female philanthropist were cited as active SBMC members in Jigawa State.
183. Not much information about the extent of women's 'voices' was provided during the focus groups and interviews, or there were indications of women's poor attendance and thus limited voice in meetings. Quantitative improvements were mentioned, for instance in terms of SBMCs having more women members than the old PTAs had. One SBMC (Albasu Central Primary School, Kano) reported gender parity among its membership, although the majority of SBMCs were still reported to have a higher proportion of male representatives (up to 8 times more men than women). Cultural issues and workloads were mentioned as reasons for lower participation by women.
184. Documentation from the work of CGPs working with SBMCs confirms a similarly mixed picture of women's participation. For instance, FOMWAN in Kano State noted that 6 of the schools they work with had no females on their SBMCs; 14 had women representatives, although the scale of their activity was not mentioned (ESSPIN, March 2011b).

185. One SBMC meeting observed during the research (Cluster 4 focus group meeting at Ikeja, Lagos) had 16 women and 4 men present. Participants stated that usually about 80 people attend their meetings (35 women and 45 men). A similar instance was documented by ESSPIN in Insame LGEA, Kaduna State (a Muslim community), where there was “high participation of women in an SBMC meeting” and “the participation of women of all ages... beyond the number which are represented on the SBMC” (ESSPIN, March 2011c). These appear to be unusual examples, however. Participation at most of the SBMC meetings that formed part of the research was generally biased towards men, usually with few women attending (5 or less). Occasionally no women were present, and when the consultant asked why, one or two women were called from the community to attend.
186. Many SBMCs have women’s committees, which are reported to be active (e.g. in Oke Ero LGEA, Kwara State “10 schools have set up Women’s Committees...They have discussed the importance of women’s participation and agreed on the kinds of roles that women can play in supporting children to attend and stay in school” (ESSPIN, March 2011b).
187. Evidence from the research respondents, however, suggests that women’s committees may not yet have been facilitating women’s participation in the main SBMC meetings. For instance, Gazara School, Kaduna, reported that there is a women’s committee but not yet any women on the SBMC. Various other respondents mentioned the women’s committees’ separate activities, but none indicated the extent to which these activities then fed into the main SBMC meetings/decisions. As women’s committees are new entities still, it is expected that these issues will be resolved as SBMCs develop.

Links between SBMCs, women’s committees and other women’s groups

188. The actual or potential ways in which SBMC women’s committees could link with or build on existing initiatives in the community, to give a voice to women, were not raised at all by stakeholders involved in the research. However, ideas are presented in existing documentation about SBMCs which are worth highlighting here.
189. For instance, in Kaduna, there are discussions ongoing as to how existing community associations for women can be linked to women’s committees “as a way of strengthening and empowering the female SBMC members, and increase women’s voice in the SBMC” (ESSPIN, March 2011b). Also in Jigawa State, “the SBMC composition includes women’s groups and the plan is to look at how to strengthen and link the women’s groups to the female SBMC members for increased voice in the SBMC and education decision-making”.

Reflections: on women’s voices

In general, women (and girls) were not yet playing an equal role in the SBMCs. They are significantly under-represented, and those who are involved may not attend meetings regularly, or may not feel free to speak in mixed company. SBMC women’s committees are offering a forum through which women can engage in promoting education in their community (often just with other women), and

these are reportedly very active and effective. However, the extent to which the committee activities link with the main SBMC was unclear. **There will be a need to maintain a guard against women's committees offering tokenistic participation for women, as opposed to promoting a way to empower them to join in the mainstream decision-making processes.**

The gender parity and equality issues facing SBMCs stem from deeply rooted gender power relations in the communities they represent. The SBMC initiative on its own is unlikely to be able to bring about significant changes to these power dynamics. However, without greater equality in the SBMCs they may fail to represent the education needs and rights of a large section of their community. **Those who have the responsibility for mentoring and monitoring SBMCs, and SBMC members themselves, have a key role to play in helping to address the gender issues that pervade some SBMCs.** As mentioned above, there are already moves to make **better links between the SBMCs/women's committees and established women's associations.** This should help to bring more expertise on board (e.g. culturally appropriate ideas for tackling inequality) as well as offer motivation and inspiration to women who are, or want to be, involved in the SBMCs.

SBMCs can also be supported to find solutions to the cultural and workload barriers cited as reasons why few women participate in SBMCs. Research respondents discussed holding SBMC meetings in community meeting places rather than in the chief's house, and move the times of meetings to give women a better opportunity to attend (women participants, Cluster 2, Imude, Lagos). More flexible timing of SBMC meetings would be a very workable strategy towards ensuring that women have the opportunity to attend and contribute.

In addition, separate meetings before the main SBMC meetings would enable women to discuss ideas about agenda items to agree their arguments and build a stronger group voice. This already happens in some places. It was unclear whether women's group meetings were enabling a degree of participation but lacked the power to access core SBMC discussions. **CGPs have a role to play in strengthening the mechanisms through which the voices of separate committees are heard in mainstream SBMC meetings.**

Children's involvement and children's committees

Key message

- Children are at the heart of education initiatives, and have a right to be heard in all matters affecting their lives. It is therefore vital that they have a role in SBMCs. Child participation is not a commonly accepted approach in the SBMC states and thus it remains weak. Some SBMCs are taking positive steps, although there is a risk that adults want to speak for children instead of letting them voice their concerns directly, making their participation tokenistic. There is a need to continue to strengthen stakeholders' understanding of and commitment to listening to children's experiences and ideas. This also requires investments in the development of tools and approaches that SBMCs can use to facilitate child participation, and to help communities understand its value.

"Children were mostly absent from meetings and where they were present, were silent onlookers" (ESSPIN, March 2011b)

190. Children are the primary stakeholders in education and there is general recognition that seeking children's views on their educational experience is vital to effectively improve both learning outcomes and attendance in school. SBMCs offer an ideal mechanism for

demonstrating the power and potential of children's participation in education decision-making.

191. The participatory process used for this research provided children with an opportunity to speak (and to otherwise convey ideas through drawings, etc) without authoritative adult figures present. Despite being constrained by a lack of time, the children offered many insights into their schools and their views on education generally – giving a snapshot of the kind of ideas and inputs that children have the capacity to offer, if encouraged and facilitated to do so. They were able to highlight education-related challenges and offer innovative solutions.

Free to speak?

192. The quote at the start of this section above is a reflection at the beginning of ESSPIN's support to states' engagement with SBMCs. Various other documents offer similar records of this starting point where *"children's participation is not accepted... In some cases where children were members, they were not invited to meetings. In the few cases where children went to SBMC meetings, they were silent"* (Poulsen, 2009).
193. The research respondents offered various comments suggesting that the situation has not greatly changed, and that cultural expectations that children will not speak in front of adults persist. During the research some young participants were clearly reluctant to talk, especially about their views of the SBMCs. They indicated that children are generally still not speaking freely or being heard in SBMC matters, especially where this might involve being critical or negative. For instance, children at Government Reservation Area Primary School, Lagos, initially said about the SBMC that *"we tell them what we want"*, but later admitted that they would be *"afraid to tell them about the beatings"* that happened in school.
194. The environment of SBMC meetings also has the potential to deter or intimidate children from speaking freely. Only two children are selected to attend meetings (the head boy and girl) creating a potentially intimidating environment in which there is no 'back-up' from one's peers.
195. The head boy and head girl may not automatically possess the confidence and skills to speak in front of a large group of adults about potentially controversial topics, so having peer support can assist. During the research focus groups with children it was observed that children other than the head boy and head girl were often more talkative. Indeed children suggested on a number of occasions that these more confident/vocal children could also attend SBMC meetings. The head boys and head girls at both Limawa Primary School, Kano, and Bariki Primary School, Jigawa, along with their fellow focus group peers, further suggested that peers or a neutral adult mediator (such as someone from a CSO) could attend SBMC meetings to offer support to child participants.

196. Deeply held attitudes about whether and when children should speak out in front of adults may pose barriers to eliciting children's ideas for improving education. For SBMCs and communities the idea of children's participation and voice is very new and many are welcoming it. However, even if they see the value and want to support it they may not know how best to do it. This can lead to a situation where children are 'forced' to talk suddenly in SBMC meetings without the kind of preparation and support that might help them to contribute something very useful for all with confidence.

Children's participation on SBMCs

197. Only one focus group during the research explicitly admitted that children do not come to SBMC meetings and there is no children's committee (Cluster of 4 schools, St Theresa Primary School, Marine Beach, Lagos). This is due to the system of clustering many schools under one SBMC in Lagos, rather than having school-based management committees, making the formation of women's and children's committees very challenging. However, whilst this was mentioned by only one focus group, it does not necessarily mean that children are fully participating in all other SBMCs.

198. Some respondents did feel that the SBMCs and children's committees were offering useful opportunities for children to voice opinions. They also noted that children have become more confident about speaking in SBMC meetings, are consulting their peers for views to represent at meetings, and that adults are beginning to appreciate and even enjoy listening to them. This is a major step forward for those SBMCs and for the children concerned.

199. Existing documentation also mentions instances of pupils voicing opinions at meetings, though these are not necessarily common occurrences. For example, in Central Primary School, Kumbotso LGEA, Kano State, "the Head Boy and SBMC member was quoted as saying: *'I feel proud to be allowed to talk during SBMC meetings. There are many things worrying the children but we didn't know how to report them. Now we have the chance'*" (ESSPIN, March 2011b).

200. Other pieces of information offered by stakeholders still point to less fully participatory approaches to consulting children, with adults determining when they meet, what issues they discuss, and at what point(s) in the discussions they are allowed to provide a comment. They might meet only when told to or arranged by adults. Some noted that they might not have an opportunity to consult their peers before joining in the meeting with adults, meaning that views of children across the school are not being represented in SBMC meetings. Or if they do get a chance to consult, it may be restricted to seeking answers on questions set by adults.

201. Some research respondents indicated a tendency to see children's SBMC role primarily in terms of encouraging their peers to come to school; either by sharing what they have learned at school, or by following adults' instructions to go and tell their peers to attend.

202. Yet child participants in the research clearly wanted more active engagement and consultation in a wider range of SBMC matters. For instance, one children's focus group (Bariki Primary School, LGEA Gumel, Jigawa State) thought the children's committee could meet before and after the SBMC to brief and get feedback from their representatives.
203. Further challenges were mentioned regarding SBMCs that support school clusters in Lagos State. The problem of bringing together children to meet at cluster-based SBMCs was considered too much by the adults in the SBMCs (e.g. Cluster 2, Imude, Lagos, would need to bring children from 14 schools to one place to meet). It was felt that the move to school-based SBMCs in Lagos State would help to solve the child participation difficulties. Since the research took place, some LGEAs in Lagos have begun re-structuring to make SBMCs school-based rather than cluster-based as the result of learning from the SBMC development work in the state.
204. This qualitative research did not have the scope to quantify child participation in SBMCs, but one indication of the scale of the challenge comes from ESSPIN documentation at an early stage of support to SBMCs (March 2011b): "in Kano, [one] CSO highlights ... that out of 50 schools and SBMCs visited, there is zero participation of children in the SBMC".

Reflections: on children's voices

Children have rights to voice opinions and participate in decisions affecting their lives, and the benefits of this are internationally recognised. SBMCs are making efforts towards the participation of children. On a scale of 'no participation' to 'full participation', the research so far indicated that the process is still at the lower end of the scale, although support for the idea was good as a first step.

A limited amount of information was offered to suggest that these rights were being effectively upheld within the SBMC process. In some instances there was an explicit failure to promote this right (e.g. no children's committee and no children attending SBMC meetings); in others it was implicit or unintended (e.g. allowing children to discuss only set questions, not providing opportunities to consult peers, or providing intimidating environments in which to participate). This may point to school communities being less far along the 'ladder of participation'⁷ than may have been hoped at this stage.

Globally in education, the trend is towards developing mechanisms for genuine participation by children in school development and governance. The SBMC mechanisms and training support this, but the research found there is much still to be done to translate this to changed practice. Further investigation is recommended into what has been happening between SBMC training on child participation and voice, and SBMC practice. What would be the best ways to give SBMCs enough support to identify practical ways of listening to children which are appropriate for context? How can more work be done to challenge beliefs that children cannot or should not participate?

A great deal of effort still needs to focus on enabling better child voice in the SBMCs. Various

areas of focus may be needed:

- **demonstrating to adults** that children can and should participate and can shoulder this responsibility, and have valued contributions to make
- **developing and sharing mechanisms or tools** that SBMCs can use to facilitate children to speak out:
 - creating ‘safe spaces’ for them to speak (not just adult-centred meetings)
 - using varied communication methods (not just plenary debates, but writing, drawing, photos or video, or drama/role play and performance)
 - enabling support systems (a friendly CSO worker or community volunteer to mentor child representatives; or a small team of representatives rather than individual children). This model is being implemented in Spring 2012.

Continued and intensive support to children’s participation in SBMCs, as well as their participation in and around the school, is needed to ensure that the opportunity for taking forward child participation principles in education in Nigeria is not missed. This should be an area of targeted focus for Departments of Social Mobilisation and civil society partners if the SBMC initiative is to become as sustainable, participatory and empowering as is desired.

Holding duty-bearers to account regarding improving schools and education for children

205. We saw in Section 3.2. that – in terms of mobilising resources – the SBMCs have been building their confidence and capacity to act directly and to demand action and investment from the government. They have approached government departments to ask for support or resources, taken a strong stance in recruiting/retaining teaching staff, and sourced material and financial inputs from community and former students (see Appendix 1 for more examples). The SBMCs cannot address all of their schools’ challenges themselves, however. They therefore need to be strong enough to hold a range of stakeholders to account (including their own members) for wider investments and improvements in their schools and in the way that children are educated.

Building the confidence and capacity that is needed to hold duty-bearers to account

Key message

- SBMCs, with training and support from CSOs, are developing a high level of confidence and capacity to hold duty bearers to account (within and beyond the community).

206. Various participants in the research indicated examples of the growth in confidence levels needed for holding others to account (e.g. the SBMC at Gazara School, Kaduna, refused to allow its teachers to be transferred away without its permission).

207. They referred to the legal status and government authorisation that SBMCs have (which PTAs lacked), which gives them more capacity and power to act or ask others to act; and to the fact that they can operate independently of the government, allowing greater flexibility and community buy-in.

208. Reference was also made to the training SBMCs have received which improved understanding of education rights and their skills to lobby for action in upholding these rights. SBMCs feel more able to take on role in monitoring school/teaching quality. CSOs have been a valuable part in this confidence building process. They “...have supported SBMCs to identify the relevant person/authority to help them with their requests and challenges, therefore building a more sustainable approach where requests are made to relevant authorities and response expected” (ESSPIN, December 2010) .

Holding teachers and school staff to account

Key message

- SBMCs are taking bold steps in determining the recruitment/retention of schools’ teaching staff, and in taking action against inappropriate behaviour, including action that requires advocacy beyond the school. There needs to be ongoing work by SBMCs to monitor and tackle persistent issues such as the use of harsh punishment (e.g. beatings) and poor quality teaching practices.

209. Teachers are direct duty-bearers in education. It is their responsibility to ensure that children are receiving a quality education, and that they are participating and learning and not just sitting in class. Teachers also have a duty to ensure that children are present in school, and to notice and tackle pupil absences; and they have a duty to care for children, and to prioritise children’s welfare.

210. There was a great deal of information offered during the research about how SBMCs are holding teachers and school staff to account. This seems to be one of the SBMCs’ strongest, and/or perhaps most visible, roles at the moment, or a role that they feel particularly confident to talk about.

211. Stakeholders at (or linked with) all schools mentioned that in some way the SBMCs make checks on the school, observe lessons, etc. Stakeholders at the Muslim Community School, Kwara, summed up this common response: the SBMC comes into school to monitor pupil welfare, and the attendance of pupils and teachers; it “works together checking pupils and teachers”.

Teacher-student relations

212. The way teachers behave in the classroom and with students has a significant impact on the other goals that SBMCs are aiming for (such as enrolling or retaining more pupils, or raising the quality of education). It is therefore important that SBMCs know what teachers’ behaviour is like and have the ability to address problems.

213. Perhaps the most common comments from research participants in this topic area related to holding teachers accountable for their punctuality, regular attendance, commitment and practices. For instance, SBMCs were credited with making sure teachers turn up on time and stay for all of their lessons, and that they actively teach whilst in the classroom rather than

doing nothing. Others mentioned that teachers now set (and mark) more assignments and homework.

214. A key example mentioned by respondents (and in ESSPIN documentation, March 2011b) is Budo Oyo School, Kwara, where a previous head teacher had been dismissed and the post was given to the deputy head-teacher. The head had often been absent and allowed 'rotational attendance' by teachers. SBMC intervention led to short-lived improvements, but when the situation deteriorated again the SBMC approached the LGEA demanding a replacement head. They even hired a bus to visit the LGEA in person. They informed the ES that the deputy head was suitable, and the head was replaced by the deputy. Stakeholders in the research commented that teachers are not "lazy" now and that the SBMC exercises its right to demand accountability from the teachers.
215. Other positive results of SBMC monitoring of teachers were mentioned by research participants, including a reduction in complaints about beatings, and improved teaching practices (e.g. more patience and encouragement; use of group work and child-centred methods).
216. Existing documentation also notes positive change resulting from SBMC monitoring. Girls at Alabasu LGA School, Kano State, explained: "bad behaviours by teachers towards us have stopped because they know the SBMC will take action" (ESSPIN, March 2011a).
217. Further strengthening of SBMC capacity to monitor education access and quality is needed to help SBMCs better address other issues raised by respondents, including the issue of beatings in schools, which can have a strongly negative effect on children's enrolment, attendance, retention and transition. Some respondents also mentioned the need to continue to monitor teachers to ensure that teaching is child-centred and gender-sensitive.
218. Interestingly, the majority of these kinds of practice by teachers were mentioned by children and not adults – highlighting the vital importance of enabling children to speak out because adults do not always know everything that is going on, or give priority to issues that children find most important.

Monitoring by others

219. Information from research participants indicates that it is not just SBMCs who monitor teachers and education practices. Parents also now are involved, and have been encouraged to take on a monitoring role by the SBMCs. Many schools involved in the research have encouraged parents to get involved in monitoring. Parents feel more aware of what quality teaching should be like, and even those who can't read have been shown ways to check their children's progress (at least in terms of the quantity of work if not the quality). Links between the SBMC monitoring of teachers and monitoring by local government agencies were also mentioned by respondents, including the LGEA issuing formal warnings based on SBMC reports of teacher absence.

Reflection: on holding teachers to account

The SBMCs appear to be making good progress in holding teachers to account, most obviously in terms of attendance and punctuality, but also with regard to their teaching practices. However, the continuation of some teacher-centred practices, and in particular of ‘beatings’ indicates that SBMCs may still be able to do more to monitor the broad spectrum of teaching issues, and to challenge inappropriate behaviour. Exploring whether CSOs can highlight teaching practice as an advocacy issue may help boost change.

There will be a need for **relevant government departments, including the Department of Social Mobilisation and School Services, to forge effective links to tackle classroom practices**, and to ensure that the SBMCs have the knowledge, skills, remit and personal beliefs/commitments to challenge physical punishment in their schools.

CGPs, SBMCs, Women’s Committees, teachers and community volunteers working with children all need to support an increased focus on listening to the views of children so that more children can speak about and challenge bad treatment, and more adults respect their right and ability to do so.

Some SBMCs seem to feel sufficiently empowered to deal with teachers who behave in inappropriate ways (and to set these rules for teacher behaviour), and/or to raise these issues with the relevant government agencies, and pursue the issue to a suitable conclusion. But **ways may need to be found to help these ‘strong’ SBMCs to share their experiences** with others who may not feel as confident in tackling these problems yet. At a local level mechanisms for reporting bad or inappropriate treatment of children in schools can be developed beyond the school, and the use of the teachers’ code of conduct can be promoted more.

Holding parents to account

220. When it comes to children and education, parents are very important duty-bearers, and while it is important to avoid a culture of blaming parents for children’s poor educational attendance, etc, parents do need to be informed about and held responsible for their role in upholding their children’s rights to education.
221. There were indications from the research respondents that the SBMC process is helping parents to become stronger at fulfilling their duty in this regard. We already saw details of advocacy with and by parents in Section 3.2, and details of empowering parents to engage more with education in Section 3.3. The role that parents are playing in monitoring teachers and the quality and quantity of their children’s learning was also explained above.
222. On the whole, the evidence from research participants is that parents are responding positively to calls on them to fulfil their duty towards their children regarding education (for instance, by sending children punctually and in a cleaner condition), with just a few examples cited of parents or guardians who have resisted, or who will send some but not all children to school.

Holding government to account

Key message

- SBMCs are actively trying to hold government agencies to account, with varying success, given the government's own funding shortages. The process could be made more effective on the government's side through less complex bureaucracy. On the SBMCs' side the process could be made more effective through more professional funding requests, by using an SBMC forum as a platform for engagement between SBMCs and LGEAs rather than schools bringing issues individually to LGEAs.

223. Perhaps the biggest challenge for SBMCs is in holding the government to account, through its various agencies. We have already seen in Section 3.2 that SBMCs are doing this – they have managed to work with government agencies which have supplied materials and equipment, fund teachers and building works, etc. Existing documentation suggests that about a quarter of SBMCs who have made improvements to their schools are using this evidence of community commitment to lobby for government support (ESSPIN, March, 2011c).

When the DPO suggested during the research that teachers from schools with successful SBMCs could transfer to other schools without SBMCs, the SBMC at Gazara School, Kaduna, said: "No teacher from our school would leave on transfer without our consent. We know our rights!"

224. However, SBMCs are also facing many challenges in engaging government to respond when they submit requests for assistance. Stakeholders (such as those at Budo Oyo School, Kwara), stated that SBMCs know their right to demand accountability from the government. But how are demands being made by SBMCs, and with what results?

225. Lifeline Education Development Centre CSO, Kaduna, suggested that despite knowing their rights, SBMCs are being held back because the "lack of government support discourages the community". They suggested the need for SBMCs and CSOs to work together to hold government to account.

Procedures for holding government agencies to account

226. Research participants explained various ways in which SBMCs and CSOs already try to put across their needs or arguments to government agencies, and have these needs actively dealt with. This included sending written requests, backed up with personal visits; approaching key individuals in government agencies to ask for help; attending meetings with SUBEB/LGEA; tightening financial controls so that funds cannot be misappropriated; SBMC/school funds; getting CSOs to write letters with the SBMC; and finding a 'champion' within the government agency who can help push your case. Not all of the requests were met with positive (or any) responses, however.

227. Suggestions were also made by respondents for actions that could improve SBMCs' chances of getting a successful response. These included sending photographic evidence with written

requests; using networks to help resolve conflicts with the government agencies; and asking CSOs to advocate with the government to improve its response times and processes.

228. ESSPIN (March 2011b) has also noted that SBMCs are more proactive in asking questions to the government. For example, *“SBMC members in Kaduna State have begun to take a more in-depth interest in projects taking place in their schools and monitoring the quality of work going on”*. In particular, they reported the use of sub-standard materials in the drilling of boreholes to the head teacher, DO, ES and ESSPIN and got the work redone to ensure clean water was available to schools.

229. Some of the procedures that stakeholders mentioned for getting SBMC requests heard and acted upon involve relatively complex and potentially confusing chains of communication, delegation, and bureaucracy. This might involve requests being passed from ES to SMO who then calls in CSO help; or from SMO to ES to SUBEB, and so on. Also some small requests could be handled by one government agency, while others for larger capital investment projects would need to be requested from other agencies. In addition to the complexity and inevitable delays resulting from the passing on of requests, research participants mentioned other problems. For instance even if SBMCs want to use their own funds for larger building projects, they still need letters of authorisation from ES and SUBEB, which can be very delayed and hold up the building work.

Reflections: on holding government to account

SBMCs are clearly building their confidence to hold government agencies to account. They are contacting them (through letters and in person) and know the importance of following up, finding ‘champions’ within these agencies, etc. There have been many examples of government agencies responding to SBMCs.

As mentioned in Section 3.2.6, the government itself lacks funds, especially at local level, which means that its response is to an extent limited, which makes it harder for SBMCs to hold them to account. However, the poor and/or complex communication mechanisms often involved inevitably risk demotivating SBMCs.

CGPs and SBMCs will need to help advocate for better communication channels for SBMCs wishing to make requests, and for faster responses, building on what is already beginning to occur in the field. This way, even if the government answer is that there are no funds available, the SBMC knows it has been listened to and that its request has been respected and considered. The SBMC also finds out more quickly that it needs to seek alternative funding. The commitment demonstrated by SBMCs above, and the determination of some to be independent of government help, shows that they can operate with limited government input – but they probably still need the ‘moral support’ of knowing the government has listened to them if they are going to keep on fighting for resources independently.

CSOs and SBMCs must work more effectively together for joint action/voice. This might also include work to support SBMCs to develop more effective funding requests(through SBMC members doing more research into the nature of the problem; providing more details about the proposed solutions(s), plans and budgets; and generally presenting this in more professional formats).

Improving the capacity of civil society and government to stimulate demand, support and monitor SBMC development

Growth of SBMC 'movement'

Key message

- There is an interest in seeing SBMCs replicated beyond those supported by ESSPIN, and positive steps are already being taken by some government agencies towards this

230. As with any development initiative, it is vital that the SBMC process has a focus on capacity-building and sustainability, so that the work can be maintained after the ESSPIN project period ends. ESSPIN (March 2011a) noted that: "Estimates suggest that at least 85% of SBMCs activated and trained are fully up and running currently" (with 'active' meaning those SBMCs that meet regularly and take action to improve education). In addition, there are already positive signs of the SBMC process being scaled up. It is being adopted more widely within ESSPIN-supported states and others, and is being formally adopted for nationwide replication by the federal Universal Basic Education Commission.

231. Various participants in the research wanted to see SBMCs expand to other areas, or mentioned plans and activities for this to happen, and even highlighted that since only a few clusters had been selected for the ESSPIN project, other schools are learning about SBMCs and implementing the idea for themselves.

232. ESSPIN (March 2011a) documents some SBMC replication activities that are already happening in Kwara where "replication into new LGEAs came about as the result of advocacy, high-level engagement and reporting by the State Task Team" which led to the Commissioner advocating for replication in the remaining 12 LGEAs of the state, and SMOs from these LGEAs have already received some training using state resources. In addition, at "national level UBEC [Universal Basic Education Commission] are committed to replicating the SBMC model in states beyond ESSPIN supported states" (ESSPIN, March 2011c).

Relationships between key players

Before ESSPIN "*there were gaps between CSOs and between CSOs and the government, but ESSPIN has brought [them] closer*" (Talent Plus International, CSO, Imude, Lagos).

Key message

- Relationships between SBMCs, CSOs and government agencies experienced various challenges at the start of the SBMC initiative, but these are slowly being ironed out to build greater trust and support between the main actors.

233. For sustainability there need to be positive, functioning relationships between the different actors in the SBMC process. As we have already seen in previous sections, there remain

tensions relating to the government's capacity or willingness to respond effectively to SBMC's work and the mechanism by which SBMCs engage with government. The research participants also spoke about the various other relationships that exist, related to the SBMC process. They mentioned positive and negative aspects of these relationships, and hinted at some of the complexities that exist.

ESSPIN

234. ESSPIN has obviously played a pivotal role through providing technical support to the current SBMC development initiative. The nature of its role at this point is likely to influence the strength of the SBMC initiative further down the line (in particular the capacity of SBMCs to operate independently).
235. ESSPIN's role in supporting the SBMC process was generally welcomed by research participants. For instance its role in facilitating better connections between CSOs and the government, and between schools and the LGEA was highlighted. Some felt ESSPIN could do more to inform people about available training, and could do more advocacy with the government. And as we will see below, various stakeholders expressed views to indicate that they do not feel dependent on ESSPIN for their SBMC's survival.
236. ESSPIN has also recorded positive feedback on its SBMC work; "ESSPIN is the first organization that works with us at the community level focusing on education. The communities have the school but do not know they have responsibilities, now they see the school as their own and are contributing to it through the existence of a functional SBMC" (Education Programme Co-ordinator, Hope for the Village Child Foundation CSO, Kaduna State, cited in ESSPIN, November 2011a).

Key role of CSOs

237. CSOs have played a key role in training and mentoring SBMCs, and generally supporting their development. Their non-government status was considered by some research respondents to be a key benefit to SBMCs, because it means they can tackle issues that government staff may not be able to. The CSOs were also credited by participants with promoting a voluntary spirit in SBMCs, and with generally helping the school improvement process and facilitating information gathering and sharing. CSOs have also collaborated on their work to support SBMCs, helping each other to fill skill gaps and share ideas.

Government agencies/officials

238. SBMCs to a great extent are dependent on having functioning relationships with government agencies. In the long run (if not already) SBMC will have more contact with these agencies than with ESSPIN – so the relationships need to 'work'.
239. There were mixed responses from research participants regarding the relationships with government departments and officials, and how this helps or hinders SBMC development. For instance, participants at the SBMC meeting at the Muslim Community School, Kwara, felt that they can't yet rely on the government; and those at a meeting of Cluster 2, Imude,

Lagos, indicated that bureaucratic bottlenecks at SUBEB level are a challenge. . However, while still recounting problems, CSOs generally offered signs of improving government relations (as did the government respondents).

Relations between CSOs and government agencies

240. The CSOs' relationships with government agencies (in relation to the SBMC initiative) have not always been good, despite the CSOs' central role in the SBMC development process. Respondents recounted a range of problems including government mistrust of CSOs (especially at LGEA/ES level), resistance to the perceived challenges presented by CSOs, and a perception of CSOs as not separate from ESSPIN – although they also gave indications that things are improving. Research respondents from government agencies tended to offer slightly more positive views of the CSO/government relationship – talking more often in terms of 'synergy' and 'mutual understanding'.

241. ESSPIN's reports already document the changes and improvements in the CSO/government relationships over the years.

- “[After initial] reluctance to the idea of a civil society-government partnership... co-ordinators in Jigawa and Kwara States highlighted a more equal partnership than at the beginning of the process, with CSOs better understanding how to support their government partners, and government partners realising the benefits of working alongside civil society to improve education for all children” (ESSPIN, December 2010).
- “[There is a] successful partnership of Civil Society and Government in activating, training and providing on-going mentoring support to SBMCs and school communities” (ESSPIN, March 2011b).
- “[CSOs] have indicated that the [CGP] relationship is working well and that a great deal of trust now exists between them and their government partners. They highlight a mutually reinforcing relationship ...and that both parties learn from their different experiences and perspectives. ...it has been a learning process which has been worthwhile and yielded positive results to date for education delivery.” (ESSPIN, March 2011b)

Relations between CSOs and SMOs

242. During the qualitative research, good relationships were more frequently mentioned between CSOs and SMOs than between CSOs and other government agencies. SMOs were perceived to have better connections with the schools and communities, that there is mutual collaboration and support between CSOs and SMOs.

Reflections: on relationships

After a sometimes shaky and distrustful start, relations between schools/SBMCs, communities, CSOs and government agencies have clearly improved. SBMCs (as we have seen earlier in the report) still feel they experience too many barriers and delays when dealing directly with government agencies. CSOs – who to some extent act as ‘go-betweens’ in the SBMC/government relationship – are reporting improvements in the nature and effectiveness of the connections they have with government agencies.

Great progress has been made in demonstrating that CSOs and government can work together to strengthen education. **Continuing support to help these relationships grow further will be valuable** - such as supporting state governments to contract and fund CSO contributions to SBMC development and local resource planning.

SBMC coalitions

Key message

- SBMC coalitions, forums and networks offer great potential for the future sustainability of SBMCs and for experience exchange and mutual support between schools. This is still a relatively untried aspect of the SBMC initiative, however, and needs further attention.

243. Entities like SBMCs, that are attempting to make potentially quite radical changes to education, within a context of limited resources and sometimes facing resistance to change from different levels, are likely to find significant benefits from working together. This can offer opportunities to share ideas and experiences, fill skill gaps and present a more powerful ‘united front’ when tackling major challenges.

244. A few research participants mentioned the concept of different SBMCs collaborating with each other. For instance, in Kaduna, SBMC chairs, secretaries and treasurers from an SBMC collation involving 12 schools meet monthly (reported by SBMC meeting participants, Gazara School, Kaduna). Albasu LGEA, Kano, has also been arranging an SBMC network, where participants discuss cluster training, mentor training and other issues which are then reported back to the ES and LGEA.

245. Networks are informally developing as SBMCs identify strengths in meeting with each other and sharing good practice. In Lagos State, the SBMC cluster system will remain and function as a network, even after individual schools set up their own SBMCs (bringing them in line with the system in the other five participating states).

246. ESSPIN (March 2011b) also noted that “three LGEA SBMC forums have been planned ... bring[ing] SBMC representatives together with LGA and LGEA representatives to talk about common and urgent issues and support needs with education improvement.”

Reflections: coalitions

Coalitions and networking offer ways to help SBMCs become more self-sufficient, and thus more

sustainable post-ESSPIN. Various of the 'reflection boxes' in previous sections of this report have highlighted that SBMCs need to improve the way they prepare funding requests, or document their experiences; and that SBMC members and other education stakeholders would benefit from support that helps them reflect on and understand their experiences better so that they can articulate them more clearly to others. The SBMC forums planned under the next phase of ESSPIN, and similar coalitions/networks have the potential to offer a forum for this sort of experience exchange and skills development work.

A focus on developing an SBMC forum at each LGEA level should be maintained with the participation of CSOs, a cluster of SBMCs and other key stakeholders. This can enable regular meetings, and joint SBMC action research initiatives aimed at working together to identify and solve a wide range of challenges facing their schools.

The future and sustainability after ESSPIN

Key message

- SBMCs appear to have a good chance of being sustainable post-ESSPIN. There is a good level of commitment to the initiative, although various persistent challenges to sustainability (including patchy support from government) will need to be given attention.

247. For any initiative to be sustainable, all stakeholders involved need to be thinking about the issue of sustainability and what their role is ensuring the work can continue in an effective and viable way. They need to consider challenges they might face and how to address these.

248. Various research participants spoke about future plans for SBMCs and offered opinions about their sustainability after the ESSPIN project comes to an end. On the whole these were positive reflections, though these can be divided into two main groups: people who simply stated that the work would survive; and those who offered more detailed insights into why and SBMCs would strengthen even without ESSPIN inputs.

249. Some respondents felt that the work is becoming 'institutionalised' as a regular task of other agencies, and that CSOs would seek to maintain the work and even expand it to others who had not benefitted from the ESSPIN inputs. Others commented that the solid basis that ESSPIN has given to the SBMC concept (including memoranda of understanding and guidelines) would aid future success. Government obligations were again raised, with respondents commenting that they would strive to maintain SBMCs but the government would also need to do its bit to ensure they succeeded.

250. Despite the generally very positive responses from stakeholders, some challenges to sustainability were highlighted. No one said that the SBMCs would have collapsed once ESSPIN withdrew, but a few people highlighted concerns. One concern was the need for more and wider involvement of parents and children to ensure sustainability of SBMCs.

251. Lack of resources were also inevitably mentioned, as was the issue that SMOs could be withdrawn from supporting SBMCs if LGEAs change their role once the ESSPIN project partnership period ends. Several participants also noted that more training for SBMC

members, CSOs and government officials (in issues such as EFA and advocacy) was needed to help sustainability chances.

Reflection: on sustainability

Respondents on the whole presented a very positive picture of the future for SBMCs, after the ESSPIN support phase ends. There were challenges mentioned but far more declarations of commitment. This is encouraging given the range of barriers that were also mentioned at other points in the discussions (such as the bureaucratic barriers to accessing government funding, and the challenges of developing genuine representation of and participation by all sectors of the school community).

ESSPIN should continue to engage with federal and state government on replicating the SBMC development process while at the same time making further improvements to it. These improvements will probably need to include ways of strengthening children's and women's participation in education improvement; ways of continuing progress on inclusion of children with disabilities; supporting more positive and alternative methods of discipline in schools; ways of supporting government to respond consistently to SBMC-led demands; and ways of linking resource flows to issues identified by communities.

Conclusions

252. This participatory, qualitative research sought the views of education stakeholders around six key areas of inquiry relating to the establishment, operation, activities and results of SBMCs, specifically their role in:

- mobilising and managing resources for school improvement according to community concerns
- bringing more children from excluded groups into school
- contributing to community empowerment and participation in education
- enabling women, children and other excluded groups to have a voice
- holding duty-bearers to account regarding improving schools and education for children
- improving the capacity of civil society and government to stimulate demand, support and monitor SBMC development.

253. The information provided by stakeholders under these six main topic areas indicates that SBMCs were working well at the time of the research. They are mobilising community contributions to education and identifying issues that communities are not able to tackle on their own. To a limited extent, activated SBMCs are getting responses from government to address some of these issues. Government staff's own funding shortages, especially at local level, are a major limiting factor here. Securing some government response is extremely encouraging, particularly so soon into the initiative.

254. Stakeholders also confirmed that opportunities are arising through which SBMCs and communities can define and analyse problems, to enable better planning and resourcing of

education. Ultimately, however, the SBMC process does not negate the need for greater and more regular flow of government funds and resources to schools in response to need. That will require state level and local level policy and political commitment. While many of the 'next steps' in SBMC development require CGP actions (as opposed to direct ESSPIN interventions), ESSPIN may have a role to play in supporting or encouraging these government-level commitments.

255. The information from stakeholders highlights that – as should be expected in any initiative like this – the process of developing community-led responses in education takes time. SBMCs have made significant progress, and on the current evidence it would appear that – even after the ESSPIN support period ends – they will continue to operate, expand and improve. This is a major achievement in such a short time.
256. It is not so certain that the participatory elements of the SBMCs (especially women's and children's participation and voice in mainstream activities) were sustainable by the time of the research – but based on global experience, this is neither a surprise nor a reason to give up.
257. Ongoing challenges were found: this is normal and should not be interpreted as 'failure' but as signposts as to where subsequent work needs to focus or be intensified. It would be unrealistic to expect any project (whether direct intervention by an NGO or indirect support through government systems) to move from no stakeholder participation to full participation in 2 years. The fact that the SBMCs had not solved all participation challenges should not be used to justify arguments that participation is not possible or appropriate. Instead this should be used to lobby for ongoing commitment and support.
258. Given the right amount of time and support SBMCs will be able to address more participation challenges. If support to strengthen participation was not to be continued, SBMCs and stakeholders would not have been given a fair chance to show the extent to which they can ultimately grapple with the challenging dichotomy of tradition vs participation, and the potential they have to understand, embrace and implement participation to strengthen their school, SBMC and community.
259. Now that that replication of the SBMC development approach has started (see Appendix 2), part of the challenge will be to continue to strengthen the areas of concern highlighted in this research whilst government is already replicating the model. However, ESSPIN's continued support to replication processes is likely to support this.

Summary of findings and implications

Successes	Challenges	Moving forward
Mobilising and managing resources for school improvement according to community concerns		
SBMCs are gaining financial management know-how and confidence in handling school financial matters.	This capacity may not be uniform across all SBMCs.	Agencies monitoring SBMC work need to check levels of understanding and ability to implement theory in practice; and if confusion is found, help SBMCs to access support.
SBMCs are enabling their members and the wider community to feel a sense of ownership over their school and its resources , and to have the confidence to take a lead in expressing demands for support to education.	There is a lack of capacity at government level to respond to all requests, which may de-motivate SBMCs, or reduce their confidence and sense of ownership.	Finding ways to remove these barriers needs to be a strong focus at local government level and in replication of the SBMC model.
SBMCs are eliciting voluntary support (financial, material and practical) from within their communities.	Volunteering is stronger when community members feel a sense of ownership of their school. Volunteerism therefore is at risk when government responses do not meet community expectations.	SBMCs need to be encouraged to keep generating support from beyond their own membership. Direct funding for schools is also needed to help underwrite the voluntary inputs, as is general government commitment to education service delivery.
SBMCs are taking bold steps to increase the quantity and quality of their teaching staff , and to support these teachers through improving their conditions.	Practices relating to teacher transfers could undermine SBMC and community ownership of school personnel issues.	SBMCs need ongoing support to ensure they are taking appropriate and effective action to support teachers (e.g. through providing suitable accommodation, & helping lobby for improved contractual/payment conditions, more localised recruitment and fewer compulsory transfers).
SBMC and community support for schools augments but cannot replace government inputs into education. SBMCs are gaining confidence and levels of success in accessing support from NGO and government agencies .	SBMC members feel they need enhanced government support to reach their goals for schools. Local government staff feel that their current capacity to fund SBMC requests for help is limited by their own inadequate funding.	Government needs to continue responding effectively to SBMC resource requests, support more direct funding to schools, and make efficient use of available budgets. Technical support could be used to train SBMCs to write more effective letters/requests. SBMC forums/networks may also be a better way for schools to make (joint) requests to government.
SBMCs are having a strong positive impact on mobilising local resources for school infrastructure	SBMC/community efforts need to be seen more as part of a continuum of	Civil society needs to maintain strong partnerships with the government to reassure SBMC members that, not being able to

Successes	Challenges	Moving forward
improvement.	change and improvement in schools, without expectations that SBMCs will 'fix' resourcing challenges in the short term.	solve all problems at once is normal and not cause for de-motivation. Supporting SBMCs to effectively document their experiences can also help them in learning from and building on their own and each other's experiences.
Bringing more children from excluded groups into school		
SBMCs' efforts are strongly linked with increased enrolment and attendance .	SBMCs need to keep working on developing a more systematic focus on diversity and the inclusion of marginalised groups.	Civil society and government need to ensure that everyone is thinking more about the <i>presence, participation and achievement</i> of all children, and considering what more could be done to ensure that SBMCs, their schools and communities prioritise diversity issues across all their education efforts.
SBMCs are achieving some success in supporting education for minority ethnic groups and growth in SBMCs' general understanding and capacity to work towards inclusive education provision for diverse learners is encouraging	Challenges related to improving participation and learning among children from minority ethnic groups remain, including the dilemma of whether or not to provide separate classes for children from different language groups.	Support to facilitate more comprehensive debates in schools/SBMCs around inclusion for minority ethnic groups is needed. CGPs need to continue supporting SBMCs' capacity to work with organisations from other sectors, such as those who provide water to pastoralist communities. The needs of minority groups could be incorporated more into SBMC training and mentoring, with ESSPIN's technical support.
SBMCs have taken action to encourage families to educate children rather than sending them to work , with some success.	Many children simply cannot afford to give up work entirely, as advocated by many SBMC messages.	More creative solutions for flexible and adaptive education for children who cannot give up work entirely are needed. Any such efforts already happening need to be documented, with SBMCs given support in how to document and share practical learning like this.
A minority of SBMCs are responding to the access needs of children with disabilities in a minority of settings, with a growing number willing to consider it.	SBMCs are not yet routinely considering the issue of education for children with disabilities in the community, particularly at the participation and achievement levels, beyond initial access.	Government partners working closely with civil society need to find ways to further support SBMCs to promote inclusive education for children with disabilities, and to see their education as an integral (not extra) part of their role and responsibility. States need to initiate participatory investigations into why children with disabilities are not yet routinely part of SBMCs' work on reaching out-of-school children.

Successes	Challenges	Moving forward
Gender parity and equality have been taken up as key issues by SBMCs, suggesting that the gender components of SBMC training and development work have been effective.	A range of specific barriers are still faced by girls, and these require interventions beyond community awareness-raising.	Further support may be needed to assist SBMCs to work beyond the general 'sensitisation' level of engagement in gender issues, and focus on identifying and addressing specific inclusion barriers faced by girls and boys. Support to reflect on and document existing good practices would also assist SBMCs to learn from and share their own and each other's successes and challenges in this area.
Parents are members of SBMCs and are playing active roles, such as by encouraging other parents to send children to school	Work by some SBMCs is focusing on informing parents about education (i.e. parents as recipients of information), as opposed to being creators of information.	Parents should play a central role in determining and delivering any advocacy messages the SBMCs convey. There may need to be encouragement for some SBMCs to develop more explicitly parent-led advocacy work.
Some SBMCs have enabled children to engage actively in education issues , such as encouraging other children to attend school.	Children have great potential to inform and support education but are not yet being enabled to have as full a role as they are capable of.	Children are at the heart of every education initiative and can play a crucial role in improving understanding about excluded children and in supporting these children to come to school. The role of children in SBMCs therefore needs to be developed as comprehensively as possible. ESSPIN may have a role to play in supporting CGPs and SBMCs to think progressively about child participation, and develop more child-led initiatives.
Language issues were discussed by only a few research participants	Language has the potential to be a major cause of exclusion in the states where SBMCs are operating	CGPs need to research more fully the impact that the language of instruction is having on children's access and learning outcomes, to help improve SBMCs' understanding of the issue. CGPs may also need to look at how to further support SBMCs to identify and respond to language-related barriers.
Contributing to community empowerment and participation in education		
SBMCs are carrying out a range of community awareness activities , and reporting success in generating more community interest in and support for education.	Research participants often used 'top-down' language to describe the awareness-raising work they are doing (such as referring to 'ignorant' parents).	CGPs may need to focus on ensuring that the ways in which people describe and document these processes use language that accurately reflects the participatory actions being taken. CGPs may also need to monitor awareness-raising work to ensure a balance between work that 'gives the community a

Successes	Challenges	Moving forward
		message' and work that starts by 'asking the community what they think about an issue'.
SBMC members express a growing sense of ownership over their school and the management process.	There may be varying degrees of understanding about what 'community ownership' means in practical terms, how it can be strengthened, and how it sits alongside government's overall responsibility for delivering education.	States may have a role in helping to build on SBMCs' understanding of ownership and build upon the action they are already taking, for instance by supporting SBMCs to challenge any barriers that undermine community ownership (e.g. slow government responses when the school 'owners' have identified a problem). States may also have a role in helping SBMCs and communities to reflect on their existing actions for building ownership and developing effective ways of articulating this for use in advocacy, scale-up and sharing experiences between SBMCs.
SBMCs seem to be supporting improved relationships between teachers and parents/community members.	Building positive school community relations takes time and whilst evidence suggests improvements as a result of SBMCs, it also indicates scope for continuing to strengthen these relationships.	'Power-balanced' relationships are vital in developing empowerment and participation. All stakeholders, community leaders, head teachers, SBMCs and CGPs should keep supporting cordial relations grounded in equality.
Enabling women, children and other excluded groups to have a voice		
Women's participation in SBMCs and in matters related to education is growing and having an impact. Separate women's committees are very active in supporting education in their communities, through awareness-raising and providing practical/material support	There are cultural differences related to women's participation across and within the ESSPIN supported states. Women's involvement in SBMC decision-making remains somewhat limited. The extent to which the women's voices from women's committees are heard and acted upon by SBMCs is not yet clear.	Ongoing efforts are needed to ensure that the voices of women are part of SBMC decision-making. There is a need to guard against women's committees offering tokenistic participation for women. All partners have a key role to play in addressing gender issues that pervade some SBMCs. Better links between the SBMCs/women's committees and established women's associations will be helpful. SBMCs can also be supported to find solutions to cultural & workload barriers hindering women's participation, to ensure that women are present at SBMC meetings.
Some SBMCs are taking positive steps to engage children , such as establishing children's committees	Child participation is not a commonly accepted approach in the SBMC states	There is a need to continue to strengthen stakeholders' understanding of and commitment to listening to children's

Successes	Challenges	Moving forward
and enabling children to attend SBMC meetings.	and thus remains weak. There is a risk that adults want to speak for children instead of letting them voice their concerns directly, making their participation tokenistic.	experiences and ideas. There is a need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate to adults that children can and should participate and can shoulder this responsibility, and have valued contributions to make • develop and share mechanisms or tools that SBMCs can use to facilitate children to speak out (such as creating child-centred meeting opportunities, using varied communication methods, and enabling child representatives to have support from other children or a suitable adult • ensure that groups of confident children, rather than a tokenistic one or two representatives, take part in SBMC meetings.
Holding duty-bearers to account regarding improving schools and education for children		
SBMCs, with training and support from CSOs, are developing a high level of confidence and capacity to hold duty bearers to account (within and beyond the community).	Levels of confidence and capacity to hold duty bearers to account do vary. There are differences by school community, by LGEA and by State.	Continuous follow-up mentoring support to SBMCs is crucial post SBMC training and the provision of this via a civil society/government partnership has proved successful. Ensure that mentoring support is a standard component of SBMC roll-out and replication.
SBMCs are taking bold steps in determining the recruitment/retention of schools' teaching staff, and in taking action against inappropriate behaviour , including action that requires advocacy beyond the school.	Some practices were reported during the research which need ongoing attention, such as harsh punishment of children by teachers.	There needs to be ongoing work by SBMCs to monitor and tackle persistent issues such as the use of harsh punishment and poor quality teaching practices. Relevant departments, including the Department of Social Mobilisation and School Services, need to forge effective links to tackle classroom practices. CGPs, SBMCs, Women's Committees, teachers and volunteers working with children all need an increased focus on listening to children so that more children can speak about and challenge bad treatment. 'Strong' SBMCs should be encouraged to share their experiences in addressing teacher practice issues.
SBMCs are actively trying to hold government agencies to account – through direct meetings, letters, use of 'champions' etc – with some examples	Local government's own funding shortages make SBMC's task more challenging.	The process could be made more effective on government's side through less complex bureaucracy. On the SBMCs' side the process could be made more effective through more

Successes	Challenges	Moving forward
of successes.		professional funding requests, and by using an SBMC forum as a platform for engagement between SBMCs and LGEAs rather than schools bringing issues individually to LGEAs. CSOs and SBMCs should work more effectively together for joint action/voice.
Improving the capacity of civil society and government to stimulate demand, support and monitor SBMC development.		
Research participants expressed keen interest in seeing SBMCs replicated beyond those LGEAs supported by ESSPIN, and positive steps are already being taken by some government agencies towards this.	Not all of the ESSPIN-supported states have yet moved ahead to engage CSOs and roll-out of SBMC development to new LGEAs in the state.	Since the research was conducted 3 states are going ahead to roll-out SBMCs to new LGEAs with their own funding and have committed to engaging CSOs to support the process. Continued advocacy on the part of CGPs and others who have been part of the process is key to the future and sustainability of the SBMC intervention.
Relationships between SBMCs and CGPs experienced challenges at the start, but these are slowly being ironed out to build greater trust and support between the main actors.	A few instances of mistrust or lack of confidence remain, although respondents noted progress in the right direction for reducing these.	Considering how to support these relationships further will be valuable, such as supporting state governments to contract and fund CSO contributions to SBMC development and local resource planning.
SBMC coalitions, forums and networks offer great potential for the future sustainability of SBMCs and for experience exchange and mutual support between schools.	Events have been planned in some states which bring SBMCs together at LGEA level and these have yet to take shape, hosted and funded by LGA/LGEA.	5 SBMC forums at LGEA level have taken place in Lagos State and 2 in Kwara State. However this is still a relatively new aspect of the SBMC initiative which needs further strengthening. A focus on developing an SBMC forum/network at LGEA level should be maintained with the participation of CSOs, a cluster of SBMCs and other key stakeholders. This could enable regular meetings, and joint SBMC action research initiatives aimed at working together to identify and solve a wide range of challenges facing their schools.
SBMCs appear to have a good chance of being sustainable after the ESSPIN support period. There is a good level of commitment to the initiative.	Various challenges to sustainability remain, such as the need for continued/greater commitment by the government.	ESSPIN should continue to engage with federal and state government on replicating the SBMC development process while at the same time making further improvements to it.

Annex 1: Examples of key findings from stakeholders

1. The quotes and examples listed here have been grouped according to the sections in the Findings chapter.

Mobilising and managing resources for school improvement according to community concerns

Mobilising financial and practical support within the community

Engaging support from former pupils

2. *Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders*

- benches and chairs made and donated (Muslim Community School, Kwara)
- drums repaired and help with building work (Christian School, Kwara)
- help with school improvements and teaching younger pupils (Nomadic Ojoku School, Kwara)
- “constructed 3 toilets and water systems” with the PTA and SBMC in Nassarawa LGEA (reported at a meeting with the ES, SMO and SBMC DO in Kumbotso LGEA, Kano)

3. *Examples from previous documentation*

- At St. Barnabas School A, “an ex-pupil gave the SBMC N10,000 to fumigate the school against termites.” (ESSPIN, March 2011c)

Raising funds and mobilising labour

4. *Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders*

SBMC members contributing financially

- two schools use contributions from SBMC members to pay extra teachers and night security (Director, Department of Social Mobilisation, SUBEB, Dulse, Jigawa)

Encouraging community members to contribute

- Gazara school community members give 20-50N each (SBMC, Gazara Primary School, Kaduna)
- As a result of their efforts to increase community awareness around education, the SBMC is now able to ask for larger donations (community members of SBMC cluster 4, Ikeja, Lagos)
- The community has helped to finance classroom building and renovation, furniture, exercise books and medicines (SBMC, Albasu Central Primary, Kano)
- 30,000-40,000N raised through community mobilisation has paid for teaching materials, classroom renovation and furniture repairs at Biyauri and Zakailawa Primary Schools (meeting with the ES, SSO, SMO and SBMC DO, Albasu, Kano)

- Grandparents have donated school buildings as a result of advocacy and “enlightenment” (children at Limawa Primary School, Kano)
- The SBMC at Madobi Primary School, Jigawa, has managed to raise 50,000N to buy furniture.
- SBMC members have given their own time to do renovation work (Lifeline Education Development Centre CSO, Gazara, Kaduna)
- Artisans, such as carpenters, masons, bricklayers and labourers, have given their time voluntarily to help with school refurbishment (teachers at Limawa Primary School, Kano).

Approaching key figures in the community

- Kajuru Town School SBMC approached a councillor to donate a computer centre.
 - Limawa Primary School, Kano, encouraged an elderly community member to donate 6
 - A traditional ruler funded barbed wire for the school’s perimeter wall, and a local church funded the connection of toilets to a water supply (SBMC members and teachers at a meeting with SBMC cluster 4, Ikeja, Lagos).
 - Large businesses have supported renovations, such as the Nigeria Bottling Company responding to an SBMC letter in Marine Beach, Lagos
5. Not all such efforts are successful though – SBMC cluster 5, Ikeja, Lagos, reported having written to a local church for support but received no reply.

Examples from previous documentation

- At Panda LGEA School “families donated a sum of N30,000” (ESSPIN, March 2011c)
- At Magaji Area School, “the SBMC raised a sum of N17,000 from the community” (ESSPIN, March 2011c)

Mobilising and controlling human resources for the school

6. Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders

SBMCs funding extra staff

- The SBMC for Oke Oyi LGEA School, Kwara, has funded extra teachers, but still has only 5 teachers when it needs 12.
- At the Christian School in Odo Owa, Kwara, the community pays the kindergarten teacher’s salary, though stakeholders said it is still too low.
- SBMC members in Ipee School, Kwara, noted that they now have more qualified teachers due to the SBMC’s efforts.
- Two schools in Jigawa have each recruited 5 voluntary teachers who receive 10,000N a month, funded by SBMC members (reported by Director, Department of Social Mobilisation, SUBEB, Dutse, Jigawa).
- Limawa Primary School, Kano, has mobilised two former pupils as volunteer teachers, funded by the SBMC.

SBMCs lobbying the government for staff

- “We have been able to approach the ES and get more teachers posted [to our school]” (SBMC, Kajuru Town School, Kaduna)
- Children reported that the SBMC at Limawa Primary School, Kano, wrote to the LGEA to complain about the lack of a science teacher, and now the school has one.

SBMCs challenging teacher transfers

- “Our head teacher was initially transferred but we had a protest with parents to the LGEA, and he was returned to us” (Kajuru Town School, Kaduna)
- When the DPO suggested during the research that teachers from schools with successful SBMCs could transfer to other schools without SBMCs, the SBMC at Gazara Primary School, Kaduna, said: “No teacher from our school would leave on transfer without our consent. We know our rights!”

Inter-school and inter-SBMC support

Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders

- The SBMC at Gazara Primary School, Kaduna, mentioned that other SBMCs have donated broken furniture to them, which they could repair and use.
- In Ikeja a neighbouring private school helped to raise the height of the school perimeter wall and provided ceiling fans (SBMC members and teachers at a meeting with SBMC cluster 4, Ikeja, Lagos).

The government's role

Encouraging government towards meeting its obligations

Mentioned by non-government stakeholders

- SUBEB gave some materials (CSO Hilltop Foundation, Kwara).
- SUBEB gave the school shovels, brooms, dustbins, etc, and so there is a much cleaner environment now (Bariki Primary School, Gumel, Jigawa).
- Following advocacy by the SBMC with the LGEA (and in line with the SDP), rotten wooden window frames were replaced with metal ones and computers were provided (SBMC members and teachers at a meeting with SBMC cluster 4, Ikeja, Lagos).

Mentioned by government stakeholders

- “[Everything is]...working very perfectly with SUBEB.” For example, in January, one school had 400 children learning under a tree. The SBMC asked the SMO for help. The SMO raised this issue with the ES, who contacted SUBEB and now new classrooms have been built (Director, Department of Social Mobilisation, SUBEB, Apapa, Lagos).
- LGEAs do minor repairs for schools, and SUBEB assists with any major building work – but only if LGEA/SUBEB have money. SUBEB has a World Bank fund for selected schools

to receive 1 million Naira per school for agreed building work/repairs (SMO, Appa, Jigawa).

- Apanda Primary School, Albasu, Kano, was able to ask a contact in the Federal House to persuade SUBEB to provide a block of 3 classrooms for the school (meeting with ES, SSO and deputy SSO, SMO, SBMC DO, Turaki Education Service CSO).

Obligations not being met by government

7. Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders

- “There are still children studying under the sun and rain and we don’t have the capacity to fix all the blown off roofs. We’ve written and visited the LGEA chair but to no avail. We were asked to get a carpenter to cost the work, yet nothing has been done” SBMC, Gazara Primary School, Kaduna
- The LGEA “...provides working materials – but less than before.”(ES, Gumel, Jigawa)
- “The chairs bought by the government for the new block are sub-standard and we would like them changed” (stakeholders at Gazara Primary School, Kaduna).
- Stakeholders at Kajuru Town School, Kaduna, mentioned that financial issues remain and the government still needs to “pay its way”.
- The SBMC at Limawa Primary School, Kano, has “written several letters without a single thing attended to”. SUBEB has never answered their letters.
- Madobi Primary School, Jigawa, said it has “good relations with all” (LGEA, ES, SUBEB) but gets no action or response, even after sending three reminder letters.
- SBMC members at Hayin Banki School, Kaduna North, explained that they can resource small things but they need the government to contribute too, and unfortunately there has been a slow response from the government since last September when they promised funding at the last workshop.
- Apanda Primary School, Kano, gained ES approval to build much-needed JSS classes (so girls didn’t have to travel so far to the nearest JSS), so that work could start while the school was still waiting for LGEA and SUBEB to formally approve the work (meeting with ES, SSO and deputy SSO, SMO, SBMC DO, Turaki Education Service CSO).

Bringing more children from excluded groups into school

Overall situation

8. Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders

- “There has been an improvement in pupil population since SBMC inception” (Christian School, Kwara).
- FOMWAN noted that the Nomadic Okoku School, Kwara, now has 42 pupils, rather than less than 20 before the SBMC, although many children are still absent.
- Hayin Banki School, Kaduna North, noted increased retention and enrolment, taking the school population from 1,400 to 1,900.

- Madobi Primary School, Jigawa, almost doubled enrolment since the SBMC started, from 330 to 636.

SBMC role in promoting enrolment and attendance

9. *Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders*

- “Most children are now in school and if they are irregular the SBMC visits parents to find out why” (Muslim Community School, Kwara, SBMC).
- “I am one of the mobilisers that go street by street to ensure children go to school. I did the same this morning before coming here” (Gazara Primary School, Kaduna).
- “We try to encourage them to come” (Kajuru Town School, Kaduna, children’s committee).
- “Through the village head (SBMC chair) we are collecting data [on out-of-school children], ward by ward and identify barriers to their attendance and how to address them...” (Hayin Banki School, Kaduna North, SBMC).
- Participants at a meeting with Cluster 2, Imude, Lagos, mentioned that before the ESSPIN initiative, pupils would attend irregularly, but “co-operation between parents, teachers and pupils has increased attendance...The students are not roaming any more like at other schools”.
- One SBMC chair described that when he sees children out of school “I pick them up in my car and take them to school” then follow up with the parents about ensuring attendance. The SBMC members are generally more vigilant and prefects ensure that their peers are not late (meeting at Cluster 2, Imude, and Lagos).
- Various research participants mentioned that SBMCs help by supporting poorer pupils or orphaned children, by providing uniforms, books or money (e.g. children at Bariki Primary School, Jigawa; Sabon Gari Primary School, Jigawa; children at Limawa Primary School, Kano).

Minority ethnic groups

Improvements

10. Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders

- There are “mutual interactions” now between Fulani, Hausa and Yoruba children in school, and improved performance of those Fulani and Hausa children who are in school (Alokolaro Afara School, Kwara).
- One Fulani father saw 2 of his children improving in school (as a result of SBMC-initiated changes) and so was encouraged to enrol his other children too (Hilltop Foundation CSO, Kwara).
- Fulani and Agatus children had increased from 6 to 52 in one school, as a result of the SBMC initiative (Hilltop Foundation CSO, Kwara).
- There was improved enrolment among Bororo children, and even the head boy was from a nomadic family (Ipee School, Kwara).
- Lifeline Education Development Centre CSO, Gazara, Kaduna, highlighted that in the school(s) they work with, Fulani children attend school because they have a Fulani class with a Fulani teacher.

Challenges

11. Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders

- While some children from minority groups like the Fulani are now at school, families may only be sending some children, and keeping others at home to tend cattle (Hilltop Foundation CSO, Kwara).
- Reaching children from communities that move around a lot (e.g. Bororo) is still a challenge, according to the SBMC at Nomadic Ojoku School, Kwara. They suggested that a mobile teacher who moves with the children would be a solution. FOMWAN confirmed this issue: the SBMC had encourage the local king to meet with Bororo heads to discuss the importance of children attending school, but the distances to school were considered too far and thus often too dangerous.
- Children at Ipee School, Kwara, explained that nomadic children were punished for arriving late, despite their long walk. This is in contrast with the more positive picture of attendance by Bororo children presented by the SBMC.
- The role that an improved water supply would play in encouraging Fulani and Hausa parents to send their children to school was mentioned by the SBMC at Alokolaro Afara School, Kwara.

Working children

Market trading and hawking

12. Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders

- “Children’s hawking has stopped”. SMO, confirming the views of the SBMC at OkeOyi School, Kwara.
- “There is still work to be done in getting children back to school, especially those whose families send them to hawk” (SBMC, Gazara Primary School, Kaduna. View shared by SBMC Cluster 5, Ikeja, Lagos).
- The SBMC has tried to end hawking by giving families some money to cover uniform, books, etc, so that they don’t send their children to hawk to raise these funds (children at Limawa Primary School, Kano State).

Domestic workers

13. *Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders*

- House girls used to arrive late at school due to their workloads in the mornings, or were withdrawn from school altogether. SBMC advocacy efforts with families and employers have enabled more girls to attend on time and/or stay in school longer (SBMC cluster 4, Ikeja, Lagos; reiterated by 4 cluster schools in Marine Beach, Lagos).
- House girls are not allowed to attend school by their employers. One community member tried to encourage a household to send their house girl to school and was met with a refusal (SBMC cluster 5, Ikeja, Lagos).
- Registering girls for school (when they move to a new area) is often delayed by the process of form-filling, especially if parents/guardians are illiterate or if bribes are demanded (4 cluster schools, Marine Beach, Lagos).

Farming

14. *Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders*

- Fewer parents keep children away from school during the cashew-harvesting season now (FOMWAN CSO in Kwara).
- Families still send their children to farm which “is cheating and exploitation” (ex-student, Bariki Primary School, Jigawa).
- There are problems with parents needing their children’s labour on the farms to earn enough to survive. Lack of ‘enlightenment’ about education also contributes to this (Limawa Primary School, Kano).

Children with disabilities

15. One example from Kwara State (ESSPIN, November 2011b) noted that as “*the result of SBMCs sensitising the community on inclusive education, Lawrence Alade Eguntola, a physically challenged child, is one of the pupils now enrolled in Bani KLGEA primary 2 of Kwara State and supported by his peers and teacher*”. Similar examples were mentioned in Kaduna by CSO Lifeline Education Centre.

Girls and gender issues

16. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- There is increased enrolment generally, but girls' enrolment is still lower than boys' (CSO Lifeline Education Development Centre CSO, Kaduna).
- There are as many girls as boys benefitting from increased enrolment (Kajuru Town School, Kaduna).
- There is increased enrolment for girls as well as boys, but with 197 girls and 478 boys there are still big disparity problems to tackle (Limawa Primary School, Kano).
- The school is now 60% boys and 40% girls (Bariki Primary School, Jigawa).
- The school now has 375 boys and 263 girls (Madobi Primary School, Jigawa).

17. However, some respondents (such as those cited above from Bariki and Madobi schools) were not always explicit as to whether they attributed the positive enrolment changes to the SBMC. Research participants offered some information about how girls' enrolment is being improved through: financial support to girls from poorer families for buying uniforms etc; through provision of evening or early morning classes; and through the building of school facilities closer to the communities.

18. Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders

- "The SBMC gives support to the girl child to further their education. 2500N is given to some poorer families of girl children for uniforms, shoes, etc, to encourage them to send their daughters to school" (children at Albasu Central Primary, Kano).
- A JSS block was built at the school, meaning girls can continue in education for longer. Previously the nearest JSS had been too far away and parents feared for their safety if they travelled that far.
- Running evening classes (or early morning classes) in Islamic and western education (Albasu Town District Head, Kano).

Child marriage and pregnancy

19. Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders

- Work by the SBMCs, CSOs and SMOs has led to a reduction in early marriages (SMO, Kwara).
- "Before parents withdrew pupils for marriage and hawking but following the SBMC sensitisation there has been retention..." (SBMC, Hayin Banki School, Kaduna North).
- Marriage of 11-year-olds is common, and so the SBMCs advocate with parents to allow girls to stay in school until 15-16 years of age. They have also advocated with parents for pregnant girls to be allowed back to school. (Results were not provided for either) (SBMC cluster 4, Ikeja, Lagos).

Role of parents

Advocacy with parents

20. Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders

- The SBMC raises awareness among parents of out-of-school children “to send them to school” (SBMC Ipee School, Kwara).
- As a result of better co-operation “parents are more aware now and are making sure the children are on time” (Cluster 2, Imude, Lagos).
- “Now SBMC holds regular meetings to enlighten parents. Every 2 to 4 weeks at the school. There has been a great improvement in attendance. Even distant communities’ children are attending” (Sabon Gari Primary School, Jigawa).
- Successes in improving attendance rates are due to the SBMC mobilising parents and the community about the benefits of education, through “enlightenment meetings” (stakeholders at Limawa Primary School, Kano).

21. Various SMBCs reported finding and talking to specific parents whose children are not enrolled or attending regularly or promptly. Some respondents provided views that cast parents as people who need to be told what to do.

22. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- “Parents don’t attach much importance to education... rather party, buying clothes not books” (meeting at cluster 2, Imude, Lagos).
- “Mothers have been told to send their children to school on time” (children at Limawa Primary School, Kano).

Language issues

23. Specific examples mentioned by stakeholders

- The school still needs Hausa-speaking teachers, to better support Hausa-speaking children (SBMC, Alokolaro Afara School, Kwara).
- Fulani children now attend school because they have a Fulani class with a Fulani teacher (Lifeline Education Development Centre CSO, Gazara, Kaduna)
- There are many challenges of working in school communities where many different languages are spoken, and not enough interpreters are available to assist with the mobilisation work (SMO, Kwara).

Contributing to community empowerment and participation in education

24. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- The SBMC does “sensitisation of parents about the value and benefits of education” and goes to houses telling them about the right to education (Christian School, Kwara).

- “Before the introduction of SBMCs we were ignorant, but now we are trained” (parents and SBMC members, Gazara Primary School, Kaduna)
- The SBMC “hold regular meetings to enlighten parents” (Sabon Gari Primary School, Jigawa).
- The SBMC “enlightens parents about the importance of education” (children, Limawa Primary School, Kano).
- As a result of SBMC inputs, “parents now understand the education system better and why they should educate their children” (OkeOyi School SBMC, Kwara).
- There is “positive attitudinal change in the responses of parents and community members towards school improvement” (SBMC, Hayin Banki School, Kaduna North).
- The SBMC’s mobilisation of the community at meetings with parents has resulted in “...wider community understanding of the importance of education” (Bariki Primary School, Jigawa).
- Parents have a “better understanding of the school’s problems” (Limawa Primary School, Kano).

Community ownership of school management

25. Examples of principles mentioned by stakeholders

- The SBMC has the “ability to control funds [so] people are more committed, they know their rights... [so the community is] willing to put in some money, materials...” (FOMWAN CSO, Kwara).
- Meetings had previously been called by the SMO and CSO, but now communities are starting to initiate meetings (Defence for Children International CSO, Apapa, Lagos).
- There is a “sense of ownership...now they take care of their schools” (meeting with ES, SMO, SBMC DO, Kumbotso, Kano).
- “The entire community is mobilised and will continue to work together (Madobi Primary School, Jigawa).
- “[Being in the SBMC] is also a privilege for those who don’t have children in the school but are interested in school improvement and participation” (Gazara Primary School, Kaduna).
- “They [SBMC] make everybody in the community see the school as their own and not really a government school” (Ipee School, Kwara).
- “The relationship will stand because the school is ours, the children are ours, and the teachers are ours” (Kajuru Town School, Kaduna).
- The community see “the education set up as their responsibility” (meeting with SMO and ES, Apapa, Lagos).
- If the community “...owns the project it [SBMC] becomes the voice of the people and will take their concerns to the government” (meeting with cluster 2, Imude, Lagos).
- Communities are sensitised about ownership and that “the school belongs to you” (Director, Department of Social Mobilisation, SUBEB, Dulse, Jigawa).

- “Education is not the sole responsibility of government, local people should come in and contribute as well...If there is a problem in the school, local people should help to solve the problems.” (children at Limawa Primary School, Kano).
- “If the parents and teachers are not carried along [we] will still experience the same problems” (school cluster, Marine Beach, Lagos).

Teachers’ relationships with communities

26. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- There have been better relations between teachers and the community since the SBMC started (Christian School, Kwara)
- The SBMC has led to better co-operation between parents, children and teachers (Kajuru Town School, Kaduna).
- There is now “good understanding and harmony between teachers, pupils and SBMC” (Hayin Banki School, Kaduna North).
- “Co-operation between parents, teachers and pupils has increased attendance” (cluster 2, Imude, Lagos).
- Increased community involvement in school matters has improved school-community relations” (Limawa Primary School, Kano).

Engagement in the education process by children and parents

27. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- Children share their learning more at home, with parents and siblings (Muslim Community School, Kwara).
- Children now practise work at home with siblings, and are more happy to go to school (adult participants, Kajuru Town School, Kaduna).
- Children meet up after school for “informal tutorials” where they read together and ask questions (child participants, Kajuru Town School, Kaduna).
- “Before children abandoned their books once they got home. But now they are eager to do their homework and also ask for assistance from their older brothers and sisters” (Hayin Banki School, Kaduna North).
- Since the SBMC children now arrive early at school (teachers, Limawa Primary School, Kano).
- The chair of school head teachers said that he had hated CSOs “because the parents were so demanding...but now I see it’s to our advantage” (Hilltop Foundation CSO, Ilorin East, Kwara).
- Various schools reportedly now have systems where parents check their children’s work, as a way of monitoring progress and teaching/learning quality (e.g. Muslim Community School, Kwara; Kajuru Town School, Kaduna).

- Parents “sit with their children now and ask them what is happening at school. They have realised the importance of discussing things with their children” (meeting with ES, SSO, deputy SSO, SMO, SBMC DO, Turaki Education Service CSO, Albasu, Kano).

Enabling women, children and other excluded groups to have a voice

Women’s involvement and women’s committees

28. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- There are now more women on the SBMC than on the old PTA, which had just 3 (Kajuru Town School, Kaduna).
- There are 2 women SBMC members, but 16 men (Bariki Primary School, Jigawa)
- There are 2 women, 3 children and 13 men on the SBMC. The small number of women was “because of our religious and cultural customs” (Sabon Gari Primary School, Jigawa)
- There are 18 members on the SBMC, including 5 women and the head boy and girl – this is more women than the PTA had pre-ESSPIN. There is no women’s committee, but the women on the SBMC “alert women about the importance of education at ceremonies” (Madobi Primary School, Jigawa).
- There are 13 men and 4 women on the SBMC. Women often don’t attend because they are busy, and (according to the men) because of the cultural issues deterring women from speaking in front of their husbands (Limawa Primary School, Kano).
- Women don’t attend SBMC meetings “because they are at the market”, and only 2 out of 11 members are women anyway (cluster 2, Imude, Lagos).
- Half of the SBMC is made up of women (Albasu Central Primary School, Kano).
- There are no women on the SBMC, although there is a women’s group (Gazara Primary School, Kaduna).
- The women’s committee meets before the main SBMC meetings, but the mechanisms for their views feeding into the main meeting were not explained (Sabon Gari Primary School, Jigawa).

Actions and achievements of women’s committees

29. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- The women’s committee “mobilises pupils to come to school” and “assists in providing school uniforms and PTA levy to pupils who are less privileged” (Budo Oyo School, Kwara).
- The women’s committee meets after prayers, fundraises for teachers’ pay, for building costs, teaching materials, etc. They also do community advocacy around education (Muslim Community School, Kwara).
- The women’s committee fundraises and makes things for the school (Christian School, Kwara).

- The women's committee discusses issues affecting enrolment and attendance (especially the matter of girls who hawk) (Kajuru Town School, Kaduna).
- Sari Iganmu Primary School's women's committee is working with a police officer to tackle violence in the community (Defence for Children International, Apapa, Lagos).
- The women's committee carried out sensitisation work, especially with mothers, about the importance of education (Bariki Primary School, Jigawa).
- The committee runs vocational training for girls, making bangles and soap (Sabon Gari Primary School, Jigawa).

Children's involvement and children's committees

Children's participation in SBMCs: improvements

30. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- Children's voices are heard and the elders now enjoy hearing children talk and feel proud about child participation (FOMWAN CSO, Kwara).
- Initially children had been quiet and "fearful" at SBMC meetings, but members "encourage them to speak and they now speak" (Cluster 2, Imude, Lagos).
- The children's committee meets before SBMC meetings to discuss issues such as getting absent children into school (Sabon Gari Primary School, Jigawa).
- "Now pupils voice out" to the LGEAs (meeting with ES, SMO and SBMC DO, Kumbotso, Kano).
- Five children attend SBMC meetings, they consult with peers beforehand, and all speak at meetings without being prompted (children, Albasu Central Primary School, Kano).
- Children's participation in the SBMC involves the representatives discussing concerns with friends and at the children's committee, before bringing issues to the SBMC meeting (Madobi Primary School, Jigawa). The children's focus group at this school didn't offer any information about the SBMC to help verify this, however.
- The women's committee calls the children's committee together and asks them their views (Muslim Community School, Kwara).
- The head teacher gives questions for discussion with friends before coming to the SBMC meeting (head boy and girl, Limawa Primary School, Kano).

Challenges

31. *Examples mentioned by stakeholders*

- Children don't get a chance to meet with the young SBMC representatives before SBMC meetings, so their views cannot be passed on for discussion at the meetings (children, Kajuru School, Kaduna).
- There is no children's committee, and the SBMC focus group did not mention other ways in which they consult children. The children's focus group participants did however indicate that children attend SBMC meetings, but they have no chance to consult peers before or after the meetings (Bariki Primary School, Jigawa).
- At the Nomadic Ojoku School, Kwara, children's voices were mentioned only in terms of the telling others about what they learned, to encourage more to attend
- Gazara Primary School's SBMC child representative are reportedly told (by the adults) to tell other children to come to school.

Holding duty-bearers to account regarding improving schools and education for children

Building confidence and capacity to hold duty-bearers to account

32. *Examples mentioned by stakeholders*

- Head teachers no longer feel "cornered" by the ES, and SBMCs have a growing advocacy role, allowing them to be independent of the government and more confident (Lifeline Education Development Centre CSO, Kaduna).
- SBMCs, unlike PTAs, now have legal backing, which helps them in their work. Also "through training we now know our rights to advocate and solicit" and as a result had successfully lobbied for more teachers for the school (Kajuru Town School, Kaduna).
- Having government authorisation for their work means they have greater power and influence than PTAs have/had (SBMC cluster 4, Ikeja, Lagos).
- "We don't do anything at the moment without the permission of the SBMC". There is less demand on the LGEA also, because the SBMC feels ownership of its children's education (Bariki Primary School, Jigawa).
- Training has made SBMCs "aware of doing things for themselves...education is their responsibility" and they don't need the government all the time (Hope for the Village Child CSO, Kaduna).
- SBMC will act as a pressure group to "demand what we want for our children, our community, etc" (Cluster 2, Imude, Lagos).
- The SMO in Imude, Lagos, explained that she is now having to spend less time monitoring schools because SBMCs are doing this themselves.
- The only thing they now ask the LGEA for is teachers – "sometimes we get them, and sometimes we don't" (Albasu Central Primary School, Kano)

Holding teachers and school staff to account

Teachers' behaviour

33. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- The SBMC monitors teachers' attendance, leading to regular attendance (OkeOyi School, Kwara).
- "There is punctuality on the part of the teachers" and they give more assignments (Ipee School, Kwara).
- There is better teaching and performance, and more homework set (Nomadic Ojoku School, Kwara).
- Teachers are more committed. The SBMC chair's role is to ensure that teachers are present and on time, which has improved teachers conduct and punctuality. "The introduction of the SBMC gave us the opportunity to visit the school to find out which teachers attended and which did not" (Gazara Primary School, Kaduna).
- "Before [SBMC] teachers only came to class once, now they always teach us" (pupil representatives of SBMC at Hayin Banki School, Kaduna North).
- "Teachers now know their roles and responsibilities better" as a result of SBMCs (meeting with SMO and ES, Apapa, Lagos).
- "There were reports that the teachers were not reporting for duty", but the SBMC now monitors this and teachers turn up on time (Cluster 2, Imude, Lagos).
- "Before the teachers were reluctant to go into class; now they are always in class" because the SBMC monitors them every week (children, Limawa Primary School, Kano).
- The timing of the monitoring (for teachers' attendance and other matters) was raised by SBMC members at Albasu Central Primary School, Kano. SBMC members 'pop in' at different times each month to check up on the school/teachers.

Other positive results of SBMC monitoring of teachers

34. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- The SBMC used to have complaints about children being beaten, but not anymore (Budo Oyo School, Kwara).
- Teachers are more patient and encouraging, they play and using group work, and are not late and don't beat the children (although some teachers still don't plan the timing of their lessons accurately) (children's committee, Kajuru Town School, Kaduna).
- There is improved child-centred learning which enables children to "learn from others... there is no fear... there are free discussions" (children, Bariki Primary School, Jigawa)
- There have been improvements in teaching and learning through more child-centred approaches (Limawa Primary School, Kano).

Ongoing challenges with teacher practices

35. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- Children still face harsh punishments, like having to stand in strange positions and teachers making fun of them (children's committee, Ipee School, Kwara).
- There is still teacher-centred teaching, beatings, name-calling by teachers, and preference for male pupils (children's committee, Gazara Primary School)
- "I don't like the way they beat us at school", children at Government Reservation Area Primary School, Lagos, said. This suggests that monitoring by SBMCs has not yet prevented this, despite the fact that the children also said that the SBMC are the people who "check what is going in the school...check everything is in order in the school."
- "Some teachers are good and don't beat, but some are bad and beat" (children at Albasu Central Primary School, Kano).

Monitoring by others encouraged through SBMCs

36. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- "Parents are enlightened about quality teachers" (OkeOyi School, Kwara).
- "Even illiterate parents have been shown ways they can monitor children's work" (for instance they fold the corners of exercise books so they can see how much work the teacher gets through with them each day) (Hilltop Foundation CSO, Kwara).
- Children now tell their parents when the teachers are not in school (Kajuru Town School, Kaduna)
- When there is "...absenteeism, after 2 to 3 days the LGEA gives a warning letter [to the teacher]" (SMO, Dulse, Jigawa).
- Ward heads visit schools every two weeks to "find out about absentees, especially during harvest and rainy seasons" and then discuss with families. Every village head must visit the school once a month, and the district head makes random visits. (Albasu Town District Head).

Holding parents to account

37. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- "The parents are more aware now and are making sure the children are on time" (meeting at cluster 2, Imude, Lagos). However, the same meeting also spoke about parents who prefer to party rather than spend money on children's clothes and books.
- Parents now support children to come to school "in a cleaner and tidier state" (teachers, Budo Oyo School, Kwara).

- Parents now “understand the education system better and why they should educate their children” (stakeholders at OkeOyi School, Kwara).

Holding the government to account

Procedures for holding government agencies to account

38. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- The SBMC should send requests to the LGEA and other government departments, perhaps with photographs attached, and should do proper follow-up (Christian School, Kwara).
- ESs want to see which schools are ‘porous’, but SBMCs now know their rights to control their finances and can prevent such misuse of funds by insisting all cheques are counter-signed (Lifeline Education Development Centre CSO, Kaduna).
- “There’s every tendency to have conflicts between the government and others [for instance over] deployment/recruitment of teachers, disbursement of funds, power play between CSOs and political interest bodies”. But they felt that they could “use our networks to resolve such conflicts” (Kajuru Town School, Kaduna).
- SUBEB/LGEA call meetings and the SBMC attends. The SBMC “tables challenges, asks for advice and discusses how to find solutions” (cluster 4, Marine Beach, Lagos).
- The SMO and ES at LGEA level “always listen... when a classroom roof collapsed, the SBMC spoke to the ES and he acted” (Cluster 2, Imude, Lagos).
- The CSO writes letters with the school to the ES and SUBEB. The SBMC monitors any work that is done on behalf of SUBEB (Talent Plus International CSO, Imude, Lagos).
- CSOs should advocate with the government officials to ensure that they respond promptly to SBMCs’ correspondence (Gadawur Development Initiative CSO, Jigawa).

Challenges

- “If you want to do something you must write” to the LGEA. But the LGEA “lacks commitment... they don’t answer letters” so SBMC members have to go in person. They also find a ‘champion’ in the LGEA who supports their work and helps to get things done (SBMC member, Sabon Gari Primary School, Jigawa).
- The SBMC wrote to and visited the LGEA to request support with fixing damaged roofs. They were asked to get quotes for the cost of the work, but nothing more has been done by the LGEA (Gazara Primary School, Kaduna).
- Cluster 4 members (Ikeja, Lagos) noted that they write and send a list of needs to the LGEA, and sometimes get a few things like uniforms. They sent a list in early 2011 but received little response. They acknowledged that this needed their follow-up.
- Letters of concerns from SBMCs go to the ES, who passes them to the SMO, who can then ask the CSOs for help (meeting with the SMO and Female Leader Forum CSO, Ikeja, Lagos).

Working through complex lines of communication

- It is difficult to meet with the ES, so the CSO works through the SMO to advocate for things. But since ESSPIN's initiative, "the SMO and ES are realising that they have to provide" (Defence for Children International CSO, Lagos).
- "...one school had 400 children learning under a tree. The SBMC asked the SMO for help. The SMO raised the issue with the ES who contacted SUBEB and now new classrooms have been built." (Director, Department of Social Mobilisation at SUBEB, Apapa, Lagos).
- The SBMC chair phones the SMO about issues, who speaks to the ES who then speaks to SUBEB. Their new ES was praised for "breaking the bureaucracy" and responding faster (Cluster 2, Imude, and Lagos).
- Even if SBMCs want to use their own funds for larger building projects, they still need letters of authorisation from ES and SUBEB, yet SBMCs report slow responses in getting these letters which holds up their work. The Director, Department of Social Mobilisation, SUBEB, Dutse, Jigawa, said that SBMCs can visit him if this happens, and they should send duplicate requests to all relevant offices to minimise delays. The ES in Gumel, Jigawa, also recognised the problem of "some bureaucracy for the capital projects".
- SBMC letters that are sent here are then forwarded to ES, LGEA, LG and/or SUBEB as relevant. There can be problems when these departments don't respond to SBMCs. Communications need to be simplified (SMO, Jigawa).
- The ES at Kumbotso, Kano, explained that he can help with small requests for assistance from SBMCs, but for big issues (like a new school roof) the SBMC needs to contact the LG or SUBEB, but still inform the ES/LGEA.

Improving the capacity of civil society and government to stimulate demand, support and monitor SBMC development

Growth of SBMC 'movement'

39. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- CSOs and government officials should advocate for SBMCs in Kwara's 12 other areas (Hilltop Foundation CSO, Kwara).
- SBMCs could be replicated in other LGEAs using the SMOs who now know how to set them up (SMO in OdaOwa, Kwara).
- CSOs plan to replicate SBMCs in other LGEAs, to assist other organisations and schools (SBMC meeting, Hayin Banki School, Kaduna North).
- State policy now is for all schools to have an SBMC (Female Leader Forum, Ikeja, Lagos, and the Director, Department of Social Mobilisation at SUBEB, Apapa).

- Other LGEAs need to promote SBMC approaches, and they should talk to ESSPIN's SBMCs to get advice (ES, Ringim, Jigawa).

Relationships between key players

40. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- Before ESSPIN “there were gaps between CSOs and between CSOs and the government, but ESSPIN has brought [them] closer” (Talent Plus International CSO, Imude, Lagos).
- ESSPIN's SBMC process brings the LGEA/government and schools closer together (SBMC meeting, Ipee School, Kwara).
- Because of “partnership between Lagos state government and ESSPIN, there have been tremendous changes in technical support and assistance for teachers and schools” (meeting with SMO and ES, Apapa, Lagos).
- ESSPIN should do more to let people know what's available in the way of trainings (Cluster 2, Imude, Lagos).
- ESSPIN should do more advocacy with the government, especially in relation to the SMO's workload (Talent Plus International CSO, Imude, Lagos).

CSOs

41. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- Hilltop Foundation CSO, Kwara, felt that they are the “gatekeepers” of SBMCs.
- CSOs' independent status means that they can tackle things that LGEA staff perhaps cannot, because of their status as government servants. This makes CSOs useful in the SBMC process (Agents for Change CSO, Kwara).
- SBMCs must use CSOs to get support (Nomadic Ojoku School, Kwara).
- Lifeline Education Development Centre CSO, Kaduna, believed that their training and mentoring has enabled better partnerships between CSO and SBMCs.
- “The introduction of the SBMC by the CSO has been an eye opener to us and has contributed to the visible development of our school” (Kajuru Town School, Kaduna).
- CSOs have helped to make SBMCs more active, encouraging SBMCs to be voluntary bodies that contribute because they want to help the school/children not for financial reward (Female Leader Forum CSO, Ikeja, Lagos).
- Hilltop Foundation CSO, Kwara, reported working with women's and youth groups, while Agents for Change CSO, Kwara, have met with other CSOs to share ideas on SBMCs, with a view to replication in areas that don't have SBMCs.
- Female Leader Forum CSO, Ikeja, Lagos has been linking with other CSOs, for mutual assistance where skills are lacking (e.g. around children with special educational needs).
- Agents for Change CSO, Kwara, explained that CSOs make information available.

Government agencies/officials

42. *Examples mentioned by stakeholders*

- Before the SBMC process, there had been tensions because LGEAs thought CSOs were challenging them. Even now the CSO feels that LGEAs want to by-pass them, and need help in seeing how CSOs can enhance the LGEAs' work. Officials at 'grassroots' were OK with working with CSOs, as were SUBEB executives. But in the middle – LGEA/ES level – there are still some tensions (including the fact that ESs do not see CSOs as independent from ESSPIN). (Lifeline Education Development Centre CSO, Kaduna).
- LGEAs were initially suspicious of CSOs, but now that they are more aware of the CSO's work there is "more trust, like a partnership" (Hope for the Village Child CSO, Kaduna).
- Gadawur Development Initiative, Jigawa has a very good relationship with the LGEA.
- "CSOs are building synergy with the DOs, ESs, etc" (Director, Department of Social Mobilisation, SUBEB, Dutse, Jigawa).
- There is now more contact with CSOs and a "mutual understanding" (ES, Gumel, Jigawa)
- CSOs are "middleman, passing information between SBMCs and ES, LG, LGEA and SUBEB" (ES, Ringim, Jigawa).
- "The government doesn't just impose, now there is collaboration" (ES, Kumbotso, Kano).

Relations between CSOs and SMOs

43. *Examples mentioned by stakeholders*

- The SMO in Kwara felt they had a "good rapport with schools, community and CSOs".
- The CSO Defence for Children International, Apapa, Lagos also felt it had a very cordial relationship with the SMO, who lives in the community and is always available to help. This SMO and CSO work on training sessions together.
- The SMO in Imude, Lagos, explained that she often asks the SBMCs for help, and there is a "collaborative effect" with the SBMCs, CSOs and SMO.
- Working together has "strengthened the project... it would have achieved less [otherwise]" (meeting with the SMO and Female Leader Forum CSO in Ikeja, Lagos).

The future and sustainability after ESSPIN

44. *Examples mentioned by stakeholders*

- The SBMC work will continue because it is "being institutionalised. CSOs are on the ground, so there is much integration of work of the government, CSOs and the people" (Hilltop Foundation CSO, Kwara).
- The SBMC will be sustainable and build on ESSPIN-laid foundations (Christian School, Kwara).

- SMOs in Kwara stated that after ESSPIN ends the LGEAs will still collect information, do training and work with SBMCs.
- Participants at the SBMC meeting at Nomadic Okoku School, Kwara, stated that after ESSPIN they want to work together: teachers doing their duty, government supplying adequate teachers, SBMC assisting, etc. The SBMC will ensure that children keep going to school, but the government must meet them half way. This need for improved government financial support was re-iterated by SBMC meeting participants at Kajuru Town School, Kaduna.
- FOMWAN CSO, Kwara, believed that the advocacy and training to date have created a solid foundation for the future of SBMCs, and “if the government still asks the CSOs to work with them, then they will work together”.
- “Things will not fall apart”, the SBMC will continue (SBMC meeting, Ipee School, Kwara).
- “We not only plan to continue in the afterwards [post-ESSPIN] but also to share best practice with other communities that were not able to benefit from this training.” Also the CSO’s capacity has been expanded through this project so they will continue to provide technical support. In terms of continued work with the government they commented: “as long as we hear from the desk officers we will still work with them”. Everyone plans to work together to maintain a strong SBMC system (SBMC meeting, Hayin Banki, Kaduna North).
- The schools and communities “will still be there, they are not leaving, so it [SBMC work] will continue. Many are very committed and volunteer” (meeting with SMO and Female Leader Forum CSO, Ikeja, Lagos).

Challenges to sustainability

45. Examples mentioned by stakeholders

- The SBMC will continue to meet but “if the parents and teachers are not carried along they will still experience the same problems” (cluster of schools, Marine Beach, Lagos).
- According to the SMO, Dutse, Jigawa, the LGEA wants to keep working with CSOs and SBMCs once ESSPIN ends, but poverty and lack of awareness about education remain a problem.
- SMOs in Kwara noted that SMOs are civil servants, so after ESSPIN finishes SMOs’ roles could be changed by the LGEA, away from SBMC support.

Annex 2: Postscript -update on SBMC replication

1. Since this research was conducted, documented and finalised, some key developments have taken place both at national and state level, which add value and further context to this report, and link closely to some of the recommendations. This postscript is an opportunity to briefly include and describe some of these developments.
2. National Level: During 2010 and 2011 experience sharing and participatory visits to states by the Federal level Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC), supported by ESSPIN, enabled states to showcase the process, impact and potential of SBMC development on basic education based on their particular state domestication of the national SBMC Guidelines. This engagement of UBEC at Federal level with states which had domesticated the national SBMC guidelines of 2006 and were now implementing accordingly, was instrumental in UBEC's decision to start the process of replicating SBMC development across all states.
3. UBEC is now leading on the replication of SBMC development across all states of Nigeria and in early 2012, with technical support from ESSPIN, they revised the 2006 national SBMC guideline, adopted the SBMC training manual and conducted a first level training of Master SBMC Trainers in four centres of the country.
4. These trainers, made up of SUBEB Social Mobilisation Directors, SBMC State Task Team Chairs and Desk Officers will cover 36 states and the Federal Capital Territory in rolling out SBMC training to State Task Team members which are being formed in all states as well as to staff of the Federal Ministry of Education, the UBEC Department of Social Mobilisation and Zonal Coordinators.
5. UBEC has printed and disseminated 10,000 copies of the revised SBMC Guidelines and 1,000 copies of the SBMC training manual to all states. It has also been agreed that the State Universal Basic Education Boards should set aside funds for the next stages and levels of training in the process of SBMC development including the state domestication 'visioning' process, the adaption of the revised national SBMC guidelines in all states, the training, mentoring and monitoring of SBMCs. UBEC has also set aside funds to support the second level training of master trainers at state level.
6. The first non-ESSPIN-supported states to successfully conduct the visioning process are Osun and Ogun States in March and April 2012, with UBEC requesting ESSPIN to provide technical support to the same in 5 other states between May and June 2012. They are Rivers, Taraba, Katsina, Anambra and Akwa-Ibom States. As other states show interest and are ready, the process will continue.

7. Now that that replication of the SBMC development approach has started, part of the challenge will be to continue to strengthen the areas of concern highlighted in this research whilst government is already replicating the model. However, ESSPIN's continued support to replication processes is likely to support this.
8. State Level SBMC Roll-Out: Not all LGEAs within each ESSPIN-supported state initially received support from ESSPIN, however states are now making efforts to ensure that SBMC development is taking place state-wide by rolling out the process in new LGEAs. In some cases this process had started before the national level replication. States are finding different ways to fund this roll-out, for example in Kaduna State UBEC Teacher Development funds are being used to roll-out the integrated school improvement model with technical support from ESSPIN. Kaduna State is promoting the partnership of government and civil society in rolling out SBMC development as part of this, contracting the CSOs which have been part of the SBMC capacity development process to assist with training.
9. Lagos State has taken a decision to restructure their SBMC model, until recently a cluster system with one SBMC covering many schools. Seeing the value in the model of a School Based Management Committee attached to each school, Lagos have embarked upon a massive programme of SBMC restructuring which will involve finding ways to conduct the original SBMC training and programme of mentoring support with new SBMC members.
10. Jigawa, Kano, Kwara and Enugu States are also making progress towards rolling out SBMC development to all LGEAs with a desire to find ways to continue and build upon the partnership which now exists between civil society and government in improving schools and education for all children.
11. State Level Advocacy – Voice and Accountability: The overall objective of the community engagement and learner participation aspect of ESSPIN is to support the capacity of communities and civil society, including those who often do not have a voice such as minority ethnic groups, women and children, to articulate demand for inclusive, quality basic education. ESSPIN support to states to achieve this, with SBMCs as the 'vehicle', has included support to states to domesticate the national SBMC guidelines, and to activate, train and mentor SBMCs. SBMC training, followed by a programme of 8 mentoring and monitoring follow-up visits to SBMCs further developed the capacity of SBMCs and communities to carry out the roles and responsibilities assigned to them. Training and mentoring included capacity development in the areas of resource mobilisation, child protection and participation, communication skills, relationship and change management, gender and inclusive education, report and case-study writing and advocacy. Mentoring of SBMCs following initial training has been critical in developing the capacity of SBMCs, communities, civil society and the government partners involved to begin to articulate

bottom-up demand for quality education which does not discriminate against any groups of children.

12. The process has highlighted and reinforced the fact that it takes time, as is indicated in other sections of this report, to develop capacity, stimulate demand and support community voice on education, including that of commonly marginalised groups. However subsequent to this research further key developments in the area of voice and accountability have taken place, which focus largely on the capacity of schools and the education system to include all children.
13. In Lagos State the civil society organisations which have partnered with the state and ESSPIN in SBMC development are now collaborating closely with the umbrella civil society groups Lagos Civil Society Organisation Partnership (LACSOP) and the Civil Society Action Coalition on Education for All (CSACEFA) on issues directly raised from the community level/SBMC work. The most key advocacy issues emerging from this collaboration are school infrastructure, inclusive education and teaching quality and the organisations are bringing together all of the evidence they have on these issues to help them make a strong case to government. Evidence will include the qualitative and quantitative evidence amassed by the ESSPIN supported CSOs during their mentoring programme of support to SBMCs. An action plan for this advocacy is being developed – which will focus on one main issue, to be ready for the Lagos Education Medium Term Sector Strategy (MTSS) process. The organisations also intend to engage with the media on their selected advocacy issue and are developing key advocacy messages within their action plan.
14. In Kwara State two LGEAs have organised and held LGEA SBMC Forums which bring together SBMC Chairs from different schools with other key stakeholders including key LGEA and LGA officials, civil society organisations and traditional and religious leaders. These forums are acting as platforms for experience-sharing and advocacy at community and SBMC level and provide an opportunity for all key stakeholders to come together to discuss and resolve the challenges of improving schools and ensuring that all children attend, participate and achieve. Some of the common issues and challenges raised and discussed at the forums have included the frequent deployment of teachers out of the LGEA, the non-employment of local teachers in LGEAs leading to lateness and absenteeism of teachers in schools, lack of capacity of some Head Teachers to manage their teaching staff and lack of or inadequate funding to schools for school improvement and support to children.
15. The LGEAs in Kwara which have started these forums are intending to support them on a quarterly basis, and following a 1-day experience sharing meeting of the 6 Social Mobilisation Directors (Kano, Jigawa, Kwara, Kaduna, Lagos and Enugu States), supported by ESSPIN, other states are intending to institute SBMC forums at LGEA level.

Annex 3: References

- Adediran and Mohammed (2009) ESSPIN Input Visit Report School Based Management Committee Development: Progress Report 1, Report Number: ESSPIN 405
- Benson (2004) *The Quality Imperative: The importance of mother tongue-based schooling for educational quality* Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2005, Paris: UNESCO
- ESSPIN (May 2009) ESSPIN Community Demand and Accountability – Position Paper Doc. No: ESSPIN 023 May, 2009
- ESSPIN (December 2010) Community Engagement and School Governance Output 4, December 2010
- ESSPIN (March 2011a) ESSPIN Position Paper: Community Engagement – March 2011
- ESSPIN (March 2011b) ESSPIN Community Engagement April 2010 – March 2011: Early Evidence of Impact
- ESSPIN (March 2011c) ESSPIN Community Engagement and Learner Participation in School Improvement April 2010 – March 2011: Early Impact
- ESSPIN (June 2011) Lagos Results – Highlights April – June 2011: Community Engagement and Learner Participation
- ESSPIN (November 2011a) Kaduna State Case Study Quotes
- ESSPIN (November 2011b) ESSPIN Experiences Text: Community Engagement and Learner Participation
- Poulsen (2009) School Based Management Committees (SBMCs) in Policy and Practice, Volume 1: Research Synthesis Report, Report No: ESSPIN 404, July 2009
- Pinnock (2009) Language and education: the missing link. Reading: CfBT and Save the Children
- Pinnock (2011) Qualitative Analysis of Children's Focus Group Discussions, ESSPIN Community Survey

Annex 4: Guide questions used in phase 1 and phase 2 field research

1. The following questions were used by the consultant to guide discussions during focus groups and interviews. Not every respondent group was asked every question, and the flexibility of the format meant that additional questions, not predicted in the guide, were also asked.

Teachers

Ice-breakers

- What do you think the parents and children like about the school?
- What makes the parents and children happy/unhappy about the school/coming to school, etc?
- How do you make the parents and children feel welcome in the school?

Practical issues re: SBMCs

- Do you know what the SBMC is? How long has it been established?
- Is the SBMC more active now that the ESSPIN project has been involved?
- Have you or any of the teachers attended/been involved in a SBMC meeting?
- If so, what was it like, what did you say, has anything changed as a consequence, etc.
- If not, why not?
- Do you now get asked questions to be raised at the SBMC/by your representative at the SBMC?
- How do you think your views should be represented at a SBMC meeting?
- How has school life changed since the SBMC was started/became more active due to ESSPIN input? Are there any changes to the school/any changes for you personally?

Conceptual understanding of making education more inclusive for all

- What do they think education is for?
- How do they perceive the role of the pupil in this process? Disabled and non-disabled, girl or boy, nomadic or settled, street child or living at home, etc.
- How do they perceive their role as a teacher?
- What is quality education?
- What is the situation at present in their school of helping all children come to, participate in, and achieve their full potential at, school?
- How do they help all children come to, participate in, and achieve their full potential at, school?

Attitudes

- How did they feel about helping all children come to and participate in school?
- How do they feel about beginning/supporting this type of teaching in schools [if it hasn't started]?

- How do they feel now?
- What has helped them to change their view, if it has changed?
- What would change their views [if they are still resistant to helping more children attend/participate]?
- How did they feel about accepting children with disabilities/nomadic/girls, etc, into their class/school?
- How did they feel about accepting all children into their class/school?

Practical issues re: training and mentoring SBMCs

- Who introduced the concept of education for all children to them and what did they learn about this at the start, during ongoing training, etc?
- What challenges have they faced with teaching a more diverse group of children? How have they maintained/raised quality at the same time?
- How did they overcome these problems, and who helped them? Any examples of solving inclusion challenges on their own or with other teachers?
- What challenges do they think they may face?
- What teaching/learning methods do they think help/would help make education more inclusive? Examples of making their own teaching/learning materials/ideas, etc?
- Do they still have problems with delivering a quality education to certain children that they can't solve? If so, what ideas do they have for solving these problems? Who will they talk to, to help them solve these problems?
- What are their main tasks working with the SBMCs?
- What challenges have they encountered? How have these been solved?
- What challenges are still outstanding? What ideas do they have for solutions?
- Who will they talk to, to try to solve these problems?
- How have the SBMCs helped with their teaching?
- How has school attendance changed during the setting up and initial running of the SBMCs/making existing ones more active?
- What has changed? [examples of groups of children, e.g., nomadic, hard to reach, children with disabilities, girls, street and working children, etc, and numbers if possible]
- How has the children's learning changed?

2. How have the SBMCs played a role in:

Strengthening government response to the demands made by communities and civil society [working with others]

- What relationship do they have with, and what mechanisms are there for interacting with:
 - parents and the local community

- the government education officials (desk officers) continuing with the mentoring and training of the SBMC
- other CSO/NGO/grassroots organisations?
- Do they have disagreements with parents/teachers/the community over their work and the practical solutions to any problems raised? If so, how do they deal with this?
- How have you worked together with the CSO trainers/mentors and the government education officials during the SBMC training/mentoring phases?
- What has worked well?
- What challenges have you had?
- What solutions/improvements could be made to the existing SBMC set up?
- How else could you work with the CSOs/grassroots organisations/community members to support school improvement and inclusive education?

Improving links between communities and civil society in making demands for better quality, inclusive education through the SBMC

- At present, what links occur between the parents, local communities, CSOs/other grassroots organisations and the SBMCs?
- What has worked well? Results/impacts on children's education? [Also, working together, communication, sharing ideas and resources, getting people to attend, getting marginalised groups to attend, etc]
- What challenges have you had?
- What improvements/changes could be made to make the existing links better?
- What relationships do they have with parents/carers of disabled and non-disabled children/children with any form of learning disability/marginalised children, etc? What mechanisms do they use for interacting with parents/carers?
- What relationships do they have with fellow teachers in the school? What mechanisms do they have for sharing problems and ideas with colleagues?
- What relationships do they have with the government education desk officers? What mechanisms do they use for interacting with these staff?
- What relationship do they have with any grassroots organisations concerned with children's needs?

Increasing the availability of information on education quality and inclusion at the school and community level

- Before the ESSPIN project began, what types of information did you give/send out to parents/communities about quality inclusive education?
- Now that the project has begun and SBMCs have been set up/existing ones are more active, what types of quality inclusive education information do you give to:
 - the SBMCs?
 - parents and community members?
 - other community members/organisations [if any]?

- How useful do you think this information has been to the parents/SBMCs/local communities? [Give examples]

Enhancing community participation (including women and children) in school governance and the preparation and implementation of school development plans

- Before the SBMC, how was the wider community involved in the running of schools? [Give examples]
- How have you encouraged the wider community, especially women and children, to take part in the SBMCs? [Give examples]
- What has the results been?
- Are there community members who are still reluctant or hard to reach? [If any, why]
- In what other ways could you involve the whole community in school issues?

Future

- What would they most like to see achieved through making education more inclusive for all children? Give one example?
- How do they see this happening?
- How could they build on existing practices to help them support schools and deliver a more quality inclusive education for all children?
- How do you see the SBMC assisting with this?
- What further assistance do you see yourself giving the SBMCs?
- What would they most like to see achieved through working with the SBMC? Give one example?
- How do they see this happening?
- How could they build on existing SBMC structure to help them deliver a more inclusive quality education for all children?

Parents/grassroots community members, etc

Ice-breakers

- What do you/your children like about the school?
- What makes you/your children feel happy/unhappy about the school?
- Does the school make you/your children feel welcome/unwelcome in the school? Why?

Practical issues re: SBMCs

- Do you know what the SBMC is? How long has it been established?
- Is the SBMC more active now that the ESSPIN project has been involved?
- Have you or a friend attended/been involved in a SBMC meeting?
- If so, what was it like, what did you say, has anything changed as a consequence, etc.
- If not, why not?
- Do you now get asked questions to be raised at the SBMC/by your representative at the SBMC?

- How do you think your views should be represented at a SBMC meeting?
- How has school life changed since SBMC was started/became more active due to ESSPIN input? Are there any changes to the school/any changes for you personally?
- Before the SBMC was created, how did the parents, etc, consult with the school/how did the school consult you?
- What do you think are the main tasks of the SBMCs?
- Who consults the parents; when and through what mechanisms, before the SBMC meets?
- What challenges have they encountered? Have these been solved by the SBMC?
- What challenges are still outstanding? What ideas do they have for solutions?
- Who will they talk to, to try to solve these problems? [Does the SBMC listen? If not why not?]
- Do they feel that they are **all** able to join the SBMC?
- If not, why not?
- What challenges have they faced in sending their children to school and ensuring the children receive a good education? [did their children go to school before or not, etc]
- How did they overcome these problems, and who helped them?
- How did the schools encourage out-of-school children to attend before the SBMCs were set up? [Or did they?]
- Has improving quality education helped them to overcome these problems? If so how and who helped them?
- [If it is not yet present] do they think that making education more inclusive would help them to overcome these problems? Give reasons.
- Are they/their children still facing problems in receiving an inclusive quality education? If so, what ideas do they have for solving these problems? Who will they talk to, to help them solve these problems?

Conceptual understanding of making education more inclusive for all

- What do they think education is for?
- How do they perceive their role in this process?
- What is quality education?
- What is the situation at present in their school of helping all children come to, participate in, and achieve their full potential at, school??
- How do they help all children come to, participate in, and achieve their full potential at, school?

Attitudes

- How did they feel about **all**/children with disabilities/nomadic/other out of school groups attending mainstream schools?
- How do they feel about beginning/supporting this type of teaching in schools [if it hasn't started]?

- If it has begun, how do they feel now?
- What has helped them to change their view, if it has changed?
- What would change their views?
- How has school attendance changed during the setting up and initial running of the SBMCs/making existing ones more active?
- What has changed? [examples of groups of children, e.g., nomadic, hard to reach, children with disabilities, girls, street and working children, etc, and numbers if possible]
- How has your children's learning changed?

3. How have the SBMCs played a role in:

Strengthening government response to the demands made by communities and civil society [working with others]

- What relationship do they have with, and what mechanisms are there for interacting with:
 - teachers
 - other parents/carers
 - SBMC
 - the CSO delivering the mentoring and training of the SBMC
 - other CSO/NGO/grassroots organisations
 - the government departments and local education desk officers?
- What relationships do they have with the SBMC members? What mechanisms do they use for interacting with them and for what purpose?
- Did they have disagreements with government officers or the school staff before the SBMC existed? [Give examples and how they were solved].
- During the creation of the SBMCs, how have you worked together the government officials and CSO workers during the planning, development and training/mentoring phases of the SBMCs?
- What has worked well?
- What challenges have you had?
- What solutions/improvements could be made to the existing SBMC set up?
- How else could you work with the government officials/CSO staff to support school improvement and inclusive education?
- What relationship, if any, do they have directly with CSOs/NGOs/grassroots organisations' staff, or others involved in making education more inclusive for all?

Improving links between communities and civil society in making demands for better quality, inclusive education through the SBMC

- At present, what links occur between yourselves – the parents, local communities, CSOs/other grassroots organisations, etc – and the SBMCs?

- What has worked well?
- What challenges have you had?
- What improvements/changes could be made to make the existing links better?

Increasing the availability of information on education quality and inclusion at the school and community level

- Before the ESSPIN project began, what types of information were available to schools/communities about quality inclusive education?
- Now that the project has begun and SBMCs have been set up/existing ones are more active, what types of quality inclusive education information are given to:
 - the schools?
 - the SBMCs?
 - parents and community members?
 - partner CSOs/other community members/organisations [if any]?
- How useful do you think this information has been to yourselves/schools/SBMCs/children? [Give examples]

Enhancing community participation (including women and children) in school governance and the preparation and implementation of school development plans

- Before ESSPIN, how were you and the wider community involved in the running of schools? [Give examples]
- How have you encouraged the wider community, especially women and children, to take part in the SBMCs? [Give examples]
- What have the results been?
- Are there community members who are still reluctant or hard to reach? [If any, why?]
- In what other ways could you and your community be involved in school issues?

Future

- What would they most like to see achieved through making education more inclusive for all? Give one example?
- How do they see this happening?
- How could they build on existing practices to help them support schools and deliver a more quality inclusive education for all children?
- How do you see the SBMC assisting with this?
- What further assistance do you see yourself giving the SBMCs?

Children

Ice-breakers – use drawing, photography, etc

- What do you like about school?
- What makes you feel happy/unhappy about coming to school?
- Who makes you feel welcome/ unwelcome in the school?

Practical issues re: SBMCs

- Do you know what the SBMC is? How long has it been established?
- Do you know if the SBMC is more active now that the ESSPIN project has been involved?
- Have you or a friend attended/been involved in a SBMC meeting?
- If so, what was it like, what did you say, has anything changed as a consequence, etc.
- If not, why not?
- Do you now get asked questions to be raised at the SBMC/by your representative at the SBMC? [e.g., at a school council meeting, etc]
- How do you think your views should be represented at a SBMC meeting?

Reflecting on changes after the establishment of the SBMCs

- How has school life changed since the SBMC was started at your school/became more active? Are there any changes to the school/any changes for you personally?

4. Aim to facilitate discussions so they cover issues like:

- physical access and safe/unsafe places
- getting to/from school
- teachers/parents and their attitudes and behaviour
- teaching/learning practices – which types of activities help them learn better
- attitude and behaviour of peers
- levels of participation in class activities (which activities do they participate in most?)
- levels of achievement (in ongoing class activities or in more formal assessments, etc)
- attendance of all children

ESSPIN and Save the Children employees

Ice-breakers

- Tell me what you do.
- What is your relationship between, LEA desk officers, CSOs, schools, etc

Practical issues re: SBMCs

- What are their main tasks working with the SBMCs? Were the SBMCs established before/after ESSPIN project?
- If yes, do you think that the SBMCs are more active now that you are involved?
- Who consults them, when and through what mechanisms?
- What challenges have they encountered? How have these been solved?
- What challenges are still outstanding? What ideas do they have for solutions?
- Who will they talk to, to try to solve these problems?
- Who else is engaged in the communities?

- How has school life changed since SBMCs were started/became more active due to ESSPIN input? Are there any changes to the schools you work with/any changes for you personally?

Conceptual understanding of making education more inclusive for all

- What do they think education is for, in terms of their country? (e.g. is it about developing the economy by having academically clever people or is it for building the social elements of their country as well – inclusive society, understanding, collaboration etc]
- How do they perceive their role in this process?
- What is quality education?
- What is the situation at present of helping all children come to, participate in, and achieve their full potential at, school?
- How do they help all children come to, participate in, and achieve their full potential at, school?

Attitudes

- How did they feel about helping all children come to and participate in school
- How did they feel about quality inclusive education at the start [if it has begun]?
- How do they feel about beginning/supporting this type of teaching in schools [if it hasn't started]?
- How do they feel now?
- What has helped them to change their view, if it has changed?
- What would change their views?
- How has school attendance changed during the setting up and initial running of the SBMCs/making existing ones more active?
- What has changed? [examples of groups of children, e.g., nomadic, hard to reach, children with disabilities, girls, street and working children, etc, and numbers if possible]
- How has the children's learning changed?

5. How have the SBMCs played a role in:

Strengthening government response to the demands made by communities and civil society [working with others]

- What relationship do they have with, and what mechanisms are there for interacting with:
 - teachers
 - parents and the local community
 - the CSO delivering the mentoring and training of the SBMC
 - other CSO/NGO/grassroots organisations

- the government departments and local education desk officers?
- Do they have disagreements with government officers/CSO staff delivering training and mentoring SBMCs over their work and the practical solutions to any problems raised. If so, how do they deal with this?
- During the creation of the SBMCs, how have you worked together the government officials and CSO workers during the planning, development and training/mentoring phases of the SBMCs?
- What has worked well?
- What challenges have you had?
- What solutions/improvements could be made to the existing SBMC set up?
- How else could you work with the government officials/CSO staff to support school improvement and inclusive education?

Improving linkages between communities and civil society in making demands for better quality, inclusive education through the SBMC

- At present, what links occur between the local communities, CSOs/other grassroots organisations and the SBMCs?
- What has worked well?
- What challenges have you had?
- What improvements/changes could be made to make the existing links better?

Increasing the availability of information on education quality and inclusion at the school and community level

- Before the ESSPIN project began, what types of information were available to schools/communities about quality inclusive education?
- Now that the project has begun and SBMCs have been set up/existing ones are more active, what types of quality inclusive education information do you give to:
 - the schools?
 - the SBMCs?
 - parents and community members?
 - partner CSOs/other community members/organisations [if any]?
- How useful do you think this information has been to the schools/SBMCs/CSOs/local communities? [Give examples]

Enhancing community participation (including women and children) in school governance and the preparation and implementation of school development plans

- Before ESSPIN, how was the wider community involved in the running of schools? [Give examples]
- How have you encouraged the wider community, especially women and children, to take part in the SBMCs? [Give examples]
- What has the results been?

- Are there community members who are still reluctant or hard to reach? [If any, why]
- In what other ways could you involve the whole community in school issues?

Future

- What would they most like to see achieved through making education more inclusive for all? Give one example?
- How do they see this happening?
- How could they build on existing practices to help them support schools and deliver a more quality inclusive education for all children?
- How do you see the SBMC assisting with this?
- What further assistance do you see yourself giving the SBMCs?

ESSPIN's CSOs (that helped roll out the SBMC training and mentoring)

Ice-breakers

- Tell me what you do.
- What is your relationship between, ESSPIN, LEA desk officers, schools, etc

Practical issues re: training and mentoring SBMCs

- What are their main tasks working with the SBMCs? Were the SBMCs established before/after ESSPIN project?
- If yes, do you think that the SBMCs are more active now that you are involved?
- What challenges have they encountered? How have these been solved?
- What challenges are still outstanding? What ideas do they have for solutions?
- Who will they talk to, to try to solve these problems?
- How has school life changed since SBMCs were started/became more active due to ESSPIN input? Are there any changes to the schools you work with/any changes for you personally?

Conceptual understanding of making education more inclusive for all

- What do they think education is for, in terms of the country? (e.g. is it about developing the economy by having academically clever people or is it for building the social elements of their country too – inclusive society, understanding, collaboration etc)
- What is quality education?
- How do they perceive their role in this process?
- What is the situation at present in their school of helping all children come to, participate in, and achieve their full potential at, school?
- How do they help all children come to, participate in, and achieve their full potential at, school?

Attitudes

- How did they feel about helping all children come to and participate in school?

- How do they feel about beginning/supporting this type of teaching in schools [if it hasn't started]?
- How do they feel now?
- What has helped them to change their view, if it has changed?
- What would change their views?
- How did they feel about the idea of all children have access to school?

6. Additional Qs that the CSOs may have some knowledge about:

- How has school attendance changed during the setting up and initial running of the SBMCs/making existing ones more active?
- What has changed? [examples of groups of children, e.g., nomadic, hard to reach, children with disabilities, girls, street and working children, etc, and numbers if possible]
- How has the children's learning changed?

7. How have the SBMCs played a role in:

Strengthening government response to the demands made by communities and civil society [working with others]

- What relationship do they have with, and what mechanisms are there for interacting with:
 - teachers
 - parents and the local community
 - the government education officials (desk officers) continuing with the mentoring and training of the SBMC
 - other CSO/NGO/grassroots organisations?
- Do they have disagreements with parents/teachers/the community over their work and the practical solutions to any problems raised? If so, how do they deal with this?
- How have you worked together with the government education officials during the SBMC training/mentoring phases?
- What has worked well?
- What challenges have you had?
- What solutions/improvements could be made to the existing SBMC set up?
- How else could you work with the CSOs/grassroots organisations/community members to support school improvement and inclusive education?

Improving linkages between communities and civil society in making demands for better quality, inclusive education through the SBMC

- At present, what links occur between the local communities, CSOs/other grassroots organisations and the SBMCs?
- What has worked well?

- What challenges have you had?
- What improvements/changes could be made to make the existing links better?

Increasing the availability of information on education quality and inclusion at the school and community level

- Before the ESSPIN project began, what types of information did you give/send out to schools/communities about quality inclusive education?
- Now that the project has begun and SBMCs have been set up/existing ones are more active, what types of quality inclusive education information do you give to:
 - the schools?
 - the SBMCs?
 - parents and community members?
 - other community members/organisations [if any]?
- How useful do you think this information has been to the schools/SBMCs/local communities? [Give examples]

Enhancing community participation (including women and children) in school governance and the preparation and implementation of school development plans

- Before ESSPIN, how was the wider community involved in the running of schools? [Give examples]
- How have you encouraged the wider community, especially women and children, to take part in the SBMCs? [Give examples]
- What has the results been?
- Are there community members who are still reluctant or hard to reach? [If any, why]
- In what other ways could you involve the whole community in school issues?

Future

- What would they most like to see achieved through making education more inclusive? Give one example?
- How do they see this happening?
- How could they build on existing practices to help them support schools and deliver a more quality inclusive education for all children?
- How do you see the SBMC assisting with this?
- What further assistance do you see yourself giving the SBMCs?

Government partners – LEA desk officers in CGP maintaining the SBMCs now training is completed

Ice-breakers

- Tell me what you do.
- What is your relationship between, ESSPIN, CSOs, schools, etc

Practical issues re: SBMCs

- What are their main tasks working with the SBMCs? Were the SBMCs established before/after ESSPIN project?
- If yes, do you think that the SBMCs are more active now that you are involved?
- Who consults them, when and through what mechanisms?
- What challenges have they encountered? How have these been solved?
- What challenges are still outstanding? What ideas do they have for solutions?
- Who will they talk to, to try to solve these problems?
- How do you think school life has changed since SBMCs were started/became more active due to ESSPIN input? Are there any changes to the schools you work with/any changes for you personally?

Conceptual understanding of making education more inclusive for all

- What do they think education is for, in terms of the country? (e.g. is it about developing the economy by having academically clever people or is it for building the social elements of their country as well – inclusive society, understanding, collaboration etc)
- How do they perceive their role in this process?
- What is quality education?
- What is the situation at present of helping all children come to, participate in, and achieve their full potential at, school?
- How do they help all children come to, participate in, and achieve their full potential at, school?

Attitudes

- How did they feel about helping all children come to and participate in school?
- How do they feel about beginning/supporting this type of teaching in schools [if it hasn't started]?
- How do they feel now?
- What has helped them to change their view, if it has changed?
- What would change their views?
- How has school attendance changed during the setting up and initial running of the SBMCs/making existing ones more active?
- What has changed? [examples of groups of children, e.g. nomadic, hard to reach, children with disabilities, girls, street and working children, etc, and numbers if possible]
- How has the children's learning changed?

8. How have the SBMCs played a role in:

Strengthening government response to the demands made by communities and civil society [working with others]

- What relationship do they have with, and what mechanisms are there for interacting with:
 - teachers

- parents and the local community
- the CSO delivering the mentoring and training of the SBMC
- other CSO/NGO/grassroots organisations?
- Do they have disagreements with parents/teachers/the community over their work and the practical solutions to any problems raised. If so, how do they deal with this?
- How have you worked together with the CSOs during the training/mentoring phases?
- What has worked well?
- What challenges have you had?
- What solutions/improvements could be made to the existing SBMC set up?
- How else could you work with the CSOs to support school improvement and inclusive education?

Improving linkages between communities and civil society in making demands for better quality, inclusive education through the SBMC

- At present, what links occur between the local communities, CSOs/other grassroots organisations and the SBMCs?
- What has worked well?
- What challenges have you had?
- What improvements/changes could be made to make the existing links better?

Increasing the availability of information on education quality and inclusion at the school and community level

- Before the ESSPIN project began, what types of information did you give/send out to schools/communities about quality inclusive education?
- Now that the project has begun and SBMCs have been set up/existing ones are more active, what types of quality inclusive education information do you give to:
 - the schools?
 - the SBMCs?
 - parents and community members?
 - other community members/organisations [if any]?
- How useful do you think this information has been to the schools/SBMCs/local communities? [Give examples]

Enhancing community participation (including women and children) in school governance and the preparation and implementation of school development plans

- Before ESSPIN, how was the wider community involved in the running of schools? [Give examples]
- How have you encouraged the wider community, especially women and children, to take part in the SBMCs? [Give examples]
- What has the results been?
- Are there community members who are still reluctant or hard to reach? [If any, why]
- In what other ways could you involve the whole community in school issues?

Future

- What would they most like to see achieved through making education more inclusive?
Give one example?
- How do they see this happening?
- How could they build on existing practices to help them support schools and deliver a more quality inclusive education for all children?
- How do you see the SBMC assisting with this?
- What further assistance do you see yourself giving the SBMCs?

Annex 5: Research participants

State	District	Sites visited	Groups/individuals met	Number of people met
Kwara State	Ilorin East	Alokolaro Afara School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.30
			Pupil focus group	c.20
		Budo Oyo LGEA School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.30
			Pupil focus group	c.20
			Teacher focus group	c.10
		OkeOyi 1 LGEA School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.30
			Pupil focus group	c.20
		Hilltop Foundation (CSO)		1
		LGEA	Social Mobility Officers (SMOs)	6
	Odo Owa District	Muslim Community School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.30
			Pupil focus group	c.20
			Teacher focus group	c.10
		Christian School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.30
			Pupil focus group	c.20
			Teacher focus group	c.10
		Agent for Change (CSO)		3
		LGEA	SMOs	3
	Offa/Ojoku District	Nomadic Ojoku School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.50
			Pupil focus group	c.15
		Ipee School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.30
			Pupil focus group	c.15
		Federation of Muslim Women's Associations in Nigeria – FOMWAN (CSO)		3
		Womankind (CSO)		3
		Ojokwu's Palace	officials	c.30
		LGEA	Education Secretary (ES) and SMOs	5
State total				c.444
Kaduna State	Gazara Town District	Gazara Primary School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.20
			Pupil focus group	c.20
		Lifeline Education Development Centre (CSO)		3
	Kajuru Town District	Kajuru Town School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.30
			Pupil focus group	c.20
		Hope for the Village Child (CSO)		3
		LGEA	ES, SMO officer, inclusive officer, IQTE officer	4
	Kaduna North	Hayin Banki LGEA School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.30
		Youth in Support of Communal Development – YOTASCID (CSO)		3

State	District	Sites visited	Groups/individuals met	Number of people met
State total				c.133
Lagos State	Ikeja LGEA		SBMC, teachers and community members	c.20
	Lagos SBMC Cluster 4 – 13 schools making up the SBMC	Government Reservation Area (GRA) Primary School	Pupil focus group	c.30
	SBMC Cluster 5 – 7 schools making up the SBMC	Central Primary School	SBMC, teachers, police officers and community members	c.30
		Female Leader Forum – FLF (CSO)		1
		LGEA	SMO	1
	Apapa LGEA Cluster of 4 schools	St Theresa Primary School, Marine Beach	SBMC, teachers, pupils (c.20) and community members	c.50
		Defence for Children International – DCI (CSO)		1
		LGEA	ES and SMO	2
			Director of Department of Social Mobilisation, at SUBEB	1
	Ojo LGEA Meeting of Cluster2: 14 schools	Ayekoto Community Primary School, Imude	SBMC, teachers, pupils (c.25) and community members	c.50
		Talent Plus International – TPI (CSO)		1
State total				c.187
Jigawa State	Dulse Town LGEA	Madobi Primary School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.30
			Pupil focus group	c. 20
		Gadawur Development Initiative – GDI (CS))		1
		LGEA	Director, Dept. Social Mobilisation, SUBEB	1
			SMO	1
			Enlightenment Officer (EO)	1
	Gumel LGEA	Bariki Primary School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.30
			Pupil focus group	c.20
		Adolescent Health and Information Projects – AHIP (CSO)		1
		LGEA	ES and staff	3
	Ringim LGEA	Sabon Gari Primary School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.30
		Kamala Community Health Development Initiative – Kahdev (CSO)		1
		LGEA	ES and staff	5

State	District	Sites visited	Groups/individuals met	Number of people met
State total				c.144
Kano State	Kumbotso LGEA	Limawa Primary School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.40
			Pupil focus group	c.25
			Teacher focus group	c.10
		Aminu Kano Centre for Democratic Research and Training – Akcdrt (CSO)		2
		LGEA	ES, SMO, SBMC desk officer (DO)	3
	Albasu LGEA	Albasu Central Primary School	SBMC, teachers and community members	c.20
			Pupil focus group	c.35
		Turaki Education Service – TES (CSO)		1
		LGEA and others	ES, SSO and deputy SSO, SMO,SBMC DO	5
			Albasu Town District Head (Traditional Leader)	c.30
State total				c.171
Overall total				c.1179