

Decentralized supervision of schools in Kigali City: Issues and challenges

IMANIRIHO Dan

School of Education, Université Catholique de Louvain

1348 Louvain-la-Neuve/Belgique

Tel : +32483004140

E-mail: irihodan@yahoo.fr

Abstract

Decentralization in education is one of current issues worldwide. It has received a great recognition in the sense that it is expected to contribute to the realization of educational objectives. Hence, it is included among the requirements of Breton Wood institutions for developing countries which are seeking financial aid. Therefore, the main purpose of this study was to find out the issues and challenges of the decentralized supervision in schools of Kigali City, through a systematic analysis of perceptions from teachers, head teachers and educational officers. Findings show a significant positive relationship between the years of experience of respondents and their perception on implementation of decentralization in supervision of schools. However, the difference between perceptions of teachers, head teachers and educational officers towards implementation of decentralization in educational supervision was proved to be insignificant. They also indicate different challenges and constraints encountered while implementing decentralization in schools.

Key Words: Education, Supervision, Decentralization, delegation, deconcentration, devolution, Educational supervision.

1. Introduction

Since early ages, practices of education have known evolutions and changes. From offering of education following an apprenticeship and learning-by-doing model controlled by individual «masters», it has evolved to an educational model controlled by the community. Meanwhile, the instruction program was based on each community needs and limited only on basic skills (poetry, literacy, household skills.) and precious trades (military and war skills, iron smith and foundry) (Erny, 2005, Njoroge et *al.*, 2003). The nineteenth and twentieth century have brought great changes in education due to the impact of urbanization and science reasoning (Welsh et *al.*, 1999). Consequently the educational models have been more expanded and centralized than before. Nevertheless by the 1970s, practices and concepts of education have undergone, once again, substantial changes. Reasons for these changes are numerous. Welsh et *al.* (1999) have given some of them such as:

- i) The political-economic debates of the 1970s resulted in the disintegration of the western “Keynesian consensus” that had favored strong centralized government;
- ii) Economical and financial globalization have further weakened central government with the supranational organizations which have reduced national sovereignty; and a shift towards market-based decision making which has strengthened local groups;
- iii) From 1970s, enrollment in education around the world has doubled and tripled. The increases in teachers and students strained the capacity of centralized bureaucracy to maintain quality;

iv) The emergence of new information and communication technology has made it possible to achieve high level of control over systems with decentralized management.

Within this context, the 21st century has seen the centralized system being proven to be inappropriate, and replaced by the decentralized system that is “arguably one of the important phenomena to come on to the educational objectives” (Welsh et *al.*, 1999). The World Bank (2006) holds that this movement towards the emergent system is observed in different ways. In some cases, it is either a deconcentration system which is a redistribution of decision making authority and financial management responsibility among different levels of central government, or delegation system defined as transfer of responsibility for decision making and administration of public functions to semi-autonomous organizations not wholly controlled by the central government but ultimately accountable to it. In many cases, it is in form of devolution system which is a transfer of authority and responsibility for decision making from a higher to a lower level quasi autonomous with corporate status and with powers to sue and be sued.

From 26 may 2000, the Rwandan government followed this new movement in adopting a decentralization policy and in implementing strategies for national decentralization policy (Ndahimana et *al.*, 2002). The statement of Rwandan ministry of local government, community development and social affair (MINALOC: 2001) holds that this change emanates from the fundamental laws of the country as well as in the political and administrative pre-dispositions the government had already taken as follows: acceptance of the principle of power sharing as expressed in the “Arusha Peace Agreement” between the Government of Rwanda and the Rwandan Patriotic Front which was signed in August 1993, seven months before the Rwandan genocide; constitutional provision that all power emanates from the people and that the national sovereignty belongs to Rwandan people (Université National du Rwanda: 1995:23); presidential consultations held from May 1998 to March 1999, which resolved that decentralization and democratization would be one of the policies to reconcile Rwandan people after the genocide of 1994 and to help in poverty reduction process. Meanwhile, the World Bank (2003) holds that the overall objective of implementation of this new policy of Rwandan schools was the improvement of enrollment, retention, and achievement indicators, as well as the improvement of education quality and equity. Implicit in the implementation of decentralized planning in education was the assumption that the devolution of responsibility and duties to community members will naturally engender improvements in the above cited education indicators.

However, empirical researches show that Rwanda is not an exception when it comes to implementation of decentralization especially in terms of constraints and challenges. The reports of MINALOC (2004), the Association of Netherlands Municipalities (VNG:2003) and Ndahimana et *al.*, (2002), revealed that different constraints limit the achievement of decentralization implementation in Rwanda. Although studies were conducted on the decentralization implementation process in other Rwanda administration sectors, the analysis of Rwandan education supervision dimension has not yet occurred. Therefore, there is a need for the community members to be enlightened on what is being done and what needs to be done in decentralization of educational supervision especially at the level of school, sector (commonly known as «Umurenge») and district (commonly known as «Akarere»).

2. Objectives of the study

The main objective of this study was to determine – through a systematic analysis of perceptions from teachers, headmasters and educational officers – the extent to which decentralization of supervision of schools is implemented in Kigali City. More specifically, the objective includes the following:

1. Determine whether teachers, head teachers and educational supervisors are trained in dealing with the

recent system of supervision in schools.

2. Find out whether educational stakeholders implement the decentralization system according to their role in a decentralized educational supervision encompasses in the following twelve dimensions: Communication, instructional program, motivating and organizing, curriculum, problem solving and decision making, personnel development, research and program evaluation, community relations, staff development, planning changes, service to teachers, observation and conferences.
3. Determine if there is a significant difference in the perception of teachers, head teachers and educational supervisors in the implementation of decentralization.
4. Examine the relationship between perceptions on implementation of decentralization and the demographic characteristics such as type of school, location of school, experience, level of education attained, and in-service training attended.
5. Find out whether the contribution of government, districts and parents, is adequate.
6. Find out whether teachers, head teachers and educational supervisors are satisfied with the innovation in supervision of education from centralized to decentralized system.
7. Identify the challenges and constraints in the implementation of decentralization in schools of Kigali City.

3. Hypothesizes

Due to lack of diversity in trainings and other channels or sources of information, there is no significant difference in the perception of teachers, head teachers and educational supervision officers on the implementation of decentralization in supervision of schools.

There is no significant relationship between the perception of implementation of decentralization in schools and the demographic characteristics such as years of experience, educational level attained, type of school, location, and in-service training attended.

4. Decentralization in educational supervision

4.1 Decentralization process and dimensions of educational supervision

Considering «decentralization» as the systematic efforts to delegate all authority to the lowest level except that which can only be exercised at the central level and considering «decentralization in educational supervision» as the implication of teachers, head teachers, schools' stakeholders, educational supervisors and elected local authorities in educational supervisory activities which include “general supervision” that resumes activities which take place principally outside the classroom and “instructional supervision” concerned with student learning process in classroom; this study was mainly based on the concept of dimension of supervisory practices identified by Okumbe (1998), the perspective of decentralization in educational supervision process developed by Pajak (1992) and the perspective of three complementary ways developed by De Grauwe (2004).

In his study, Pajak (1992) identified twelve dimensions of supervisory practices that can serve as model and reference in implementing changes from centralized to decentralized system in supervision of schools, such as community relations (establish and maintain an open and productive relations between the school and its community), staff development (develop and facilitate meaningful opportunities for professional growth), planning and change (initiate and implement collaborative strategies for continuous improvement in schools), communication (ensure an open and clear channel of information among individuals and groups through the organization), curriculum (involvement of all actors in the process of curriculum development

and implementation), instructional program (support and coordinate teachers' efforts and initiatives to improve the instructional program), service to teachers (provide necessary materials, resources and assistance to support teaching and learning process), observation and conferences (involve teachers in peer-supervision/coaching and always provide feedback after classroom observation), problem solving and decision making (use a variety of strategies to involve teachers, parents and students in problems analysis and decision making process), research and program evaluation (encourage experimentation from micro level and assess their outcomes), motivating and organizing (help all education actors to develop a shared vision and achieve collective aims), personnel development (recognize stakeholders' achievements and develop rules and norms that reflect upon actors personal and professional beliefs, abilities and action).

Likewise, Okumbe (1998) summarized the role of supervisors in three dimensions: (a) administrative dimension, (b) curricular dimension, (c) instructional dimension. In the same perspective, De Grauwe (2004) showed that the introduction and implementation of these different roles of supervisors encompassed in different dimensions can be shared in what he called three complementary ways: (a) the involvement of elected local authorities in taking charge of education in their area, (b) the strengthening of the role of regional and district officers in education and (c) the increase of schools' autonomy in management of education.

The perspective of dimensions of supervisory practices and three complementary ways are fitted as a framework for this study as long as they refer to the way implementation of decentralization in supervision of schools should be carried out. They are considered as a cognitive reference and model which determine what should be done in implementing decentralization of educational supervision and in adjusting interventions in this domain. In this research, *administrative dimensions* such as communication, community relation, problem solving and decision making were used as guidelines in order to assess how schools are implementing collaborative strategies for continuous improvement and how productive relations are implemented and maintained between all school's stakeholders. *Curricular dimensions* such as curriculum and staff development were used in order to assess the participation of local people (teachers, headmasters and education supervisors) in development and implementation of curriculum or schools programs. *Instructional dimensions* such as observation and conference, service to teachers, program evaluation and instructional program were used in order to assess the implication of teachers, headmasters and educational supervisors in the development and implementation of a variety of strategies that improve the instructional activities in schools. Indeed, the role of all these dimensions was to help in answering the questions "What is being done and what needs to be done" in implementation of a decentralized educational supervision process in Kigali City.

4.2 Historical background of decentralization process in Rwandan education system

The government of Rwanda decided to join the worldwide movement from centralized to decentralized system through three phases (MINALOC, 2004: 2-3) as follows:

- From May 2000 to December 2001, the decision making authority and financial management responsibility have been redistributed among different levels of central government especially in different ministry unities and directions.
- From January 2002 to December 2004, responsibility for decision making was transferred to province and district which were not wholly controlled by the central government but accountable to it.
- From January 2006, local government (districts) created by law as legal entities with powers to sue and be sued received the whole responsibility for decision making and financial management. Since then,

they assumed responsibility over secondary, primary and nursery schools. Below the district level, other entities were created such as «Sector» (Umurenge), «Cell» (Akagari) and «Village» (Umudugudu).

However, the decentralization process in Rwanda education system was strengthened with the coming into force of different legislations such as: the organic law n° 20/2003 of 03 august 2003, the organic law n°29/2003 of 30 august 2003, prime minister order n°05/2003 of 15 mars 2003 and presidential order n°48/01 of 10/8/2009. According to these documents, communities do not directly participate in policy formulation. However, their wishes are sought and considered by the national policy formulators through the local administration channels and they are supposed to be actively involved in implementation of education policy through province educational council, district education council, school general assemblies and school parents-teachers associations (PTAs). Elected authorities are also involved in supervision of schools as follows: at province, district and sector level they are in charge of supervision of special education, secondary, primary and nursery schools while the cell level is in charge of supervision of only nursery schools (Republic of Rwanda, 2009). Parents must also participate in developing education and in controlling the financial and administrative management of schools in which, their children are studying (Republic of Rwanda, 2003a).

5. Research Methods

5.1 Participants

Respondents of the questionnaire were comprised of 295 teachers, 37 head teacher and 26 educational supervisors at district and sector levels selected from a population of 1500 teachers of secondary and primary schools, 163 head teachers of private and public primary and secondary schools and 38 educational supervisors of sectors and districts.

These head teachers were targeted because they are the ones who facilitate decision making process in schools. They have the responsibility of implementation and control of school activities. In consultation with schools' parents committees, they make final decisions concerning the running of schools. They greatly affect the level of success or failure of objectives and goals of schools. Thus, their contribution in this study was paramount because they are the key element in the implementation of decentralization in schools.

The reason for choosing educational officers (at district and sector level), and teachers is based on the fact that they are directly involved in the implementation of decentralization system in educational supervision. Teachers were targeted especially because they form an important source of data for the implementation of decentralization in schools. In fact, with the increase of school's autonomy, teachers play an important role in supervision of education (MINEDUC, 2006). Therefore, they can provide very useful information about implementation of decentralization system in their schools.

5.2 Instruments and measurement

Data-gathering tools used in this study were, a questionnaire based on Likert five-point slating scale and interview schedule. Their development process was based on objectives of this study combined with the work of Okumbe (1998), De Grauwe(2004) and Pajak(1992) who carried out studies on decentralization in supervision of education.

The validity of these instruments was determined through face validity methods. The researcher solicited opinions from five lecturers of the School of Education at University of Eastern Africa-Baraton/Kenya and one lecturer at Adventist University of Central Africa/Rwanda (the inclusive criterion for these lecturers was at least a Ph.D degree and being involved in different researches). They judged the appropriateness of items on research instrument and they assessed the suitability and relevance of research instruments to

objectives of the study. According to their judgments and assessments, amendments were carried out and two of them were asked to reexamine the research instrument in order to establish its validity.

The instruments reliability was determined by administering the instruments to a small selected sample of respondents. After gathering information from this selected sample, instrument reliability was determined using internal consistency method. In this study, a minimum of 0.7 and above was taken as reliability for the instrument to be acceptable. The instrument yielded a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.7793.

6. Analysis and interpretation of data

Collected data from written questionnaire was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Results were interpreted through the following statistical procedures: standard deviation (used in order to measure the degree of dispersion – homogeneity or heterogeneity – of given responses); arithmetic Mean (used in order to measure the central tendencies); analysis of variance (used in order to determine if there is a significant difference in the perception of teachers, headmasters and educational officers in the implementation of decentralization); Pearson product-moment correlation (used to examine the relationship between the perception of implementation of decentralization and the demographic characteristics such as type of school, location, years of experience, education attained, and training attended).

All selected head teachers (37) and educational supervisors at sector and district level (26) were involved in interview which responses were analyzed using the content-analysis method. The researcher recorded only responses at least given by 50% of the respondents. After recording the answers, the researcher compared results from interview with results from questionnaire and they matched up except for very rarely occasions.

6.1. Results

Data collected on in-service trainings attended by respondents revealed that 97 % of teachers, 91.9% of head teachers and 92.3% of educational supervisors have never received any in-service training on principals and values of decentralization in educational supervision. Therefore 12.2% of teachers, 100% of head teachers and 30.8% of educational supervisors attended at least one session of in-service training on educational management. On this matter, results from interview show that all head teachers and district educational supervisors (those from sector level were excluded) attended at least one in service training on school management through a ministry of education's program known as «VVOB». Curiously, though most of documents used in this program implicitly contain information on some elements of a decentralized system, respondents seem not to be able to point out any link between the acquired knowledge and decentralization aspects in supervision of their schools.

Respondents hold that they gather information on decentralization process from meetings with local elected authorities especially during the community works known as «Umuganda» which take place – every last Saturday of each month – in each village (37.3% of teachers, 54.1% of head teachers and 57.7% of educational supervisors), from media (36.9% of teachers, 21.6% of head teachers and 26.9% of educational supervisors), from colleagues and friends (23.4% of teachers, 16.2% of head teachers and 7.7% of educational supervisors) but rarely from trainings (3.0% of teachers, 8.1% of head teachers and 7.7% of educational supervisors) and very rarely from official documents(1.4% of teachers, 8.1% of head teachers). Meanwhile, all educational supervisors at district and sector levels did not mention any gathering of information from official documents. During interview process, they pointed out that they hardly get access to official documents related to education.

Data on implementation of decentralization in schools of Kigali City revealed that the decentralized supervision in schools is implemented on average level with a mean score (MS) of 2.9007 and a standard

deviation (SD) of 0.32316. Meanwhile, the overall perception of respondents indicates that even though there is progress in implementation of decentralization in many dimensions of supervisory practices; there is stagnation in some others. For example in *administrative activities* ($MS=3.05$; $SD=0.56$), community relations dimensions scored the highest mean score ($MS=3.63$; $SD=1.15$) followed by the problem solving and decision making dimensions ($MS=3.53$; $SD=1.01$), communication dimension ($MS=3.21$; $SD=1.15$) personnel development ($MS=3.13$; $SD=1.31$) motivating and organizing dimensions ($MS=2.77$; $SD=1.05$). Indeed, all these dimensions were ranked by respondents on the average level of implementation while the dimension of planning and changes was ranked by respondents on a low level of implementation ($MS=2.29$; $SD=1.04$). In *curricular activities* ($MS=3.16$; $SD=0.90$), the staff development dimension scored the highest mean score ($MS=3.31$; $SD=1.13$) followed by curriculum dimension ($MS=3.01$, $SD=1.21$). Those two dimensions of curricular activities were ranked by respondents on average level of implementation. In *instructional activities* ($MS=2.33$; $SD=0.58$), the dimension of service to teachers was ranked on average level of implementation ($MS=2.63$; $SD=1.22$). The rest of dimensions of instructional activities were ranked on a low level of implementation as follows: instructional program ($MS=2.45$; $SD=1.02$), observation and conferences ($MS=2.18$; $SD=1.26$), research and evaluation ($MS=2.13$; $SD=0.38$).

Results show that, despite the VVOB trainings attended only by head teacher and district education officers, there is no significant difference among group respondents in the perception of implementation of decentralization in supervision of schools ($F=1.039$; $P=0.355$). Meanwhile, perception on the implementation of decentralization in Rwandan schools was proved to be significantly related to years of experience of teachers, head teachers and educational supervisors ($r=0.136$). However, results revealed that correlation between the rest of variables (type of school, location, level of education attained, and in-service training attended) and the implementation of decentralization in supervision of schools was not significant.

It was also revealed that parents ($MS=4.04$; $SD=0.98$) and national government ($MS=3.26$; $SD=1.55$) significantly contribute in funding schools. The overall perception of respondents however indicates that participation of districts in funding schools is not significant ($MS=2.97$; $SD=1.37$) and all respondents stated that considering the material and financial requirements for effective implementation of decentralization, the contribution is not sufficient ($MS=2.78$, $SD=1.11$). Nevertheless, they mentioned a great improvement in decision making process since the beginning of implementation of decentralization in their schools ($MS=3.45$ and $SD=0.65$ for teachers; $MS=3.32$ and $SD=0.57$ for head teachers; $MS=4.00$ and $SD=0.00$ for educational supervisors).

Challenges and constraints advanced by all three groups of respondents are ineffective management, lack of knowledge related to principles and values of decentralization, incapacity and incompetence of some stakeholders, limited resources and funding, unclear demarcation of responsibilities, weak coordination of institutions and untrained staff. However, educational supervisors mentioned poor monitoring and evaluation process, work overload and powerlessness as challenges that they encounter while majority of teachers and headmasters did not consider these as big challenges in their schools. On the other hand, teachers and headmasters pointed out the abuse of power of some stakeholders as a challenge which is not considered as such by educational supervisors.

6.2 Discussion of results

From the analysis of data and findings, it was observed that there is a lack of in-service training relevant to implementation of decentralization in supervision of schools in Kigali City which is still on average level. Teachers, head teachers and educational supervisors do not significantly differ in their perception on

implementation of decentralization in supervision of schools. This phenomenon may be related to the isomorphism of sources of information (umuganda activities, media, colleagues and friends) which are not efficient when it comes to decentralized educational supervision issues that require a minimum level of specialization from those who explain them. When the responsibility for explanation of such issues to population is carried out by only the elected local authorities whom many of them have not attended at least the secondary school education level and have not attended any other special training related to the matter, it necessary leads to unpredicted consequences.

Teachers, head teachers and educational supervisors are relatively satisfied with the financial contribution of the government of Rwanda and parents of students. However, resources for implementation of a decentralized educational supervision at school, sector and district levels are surprisingly considered by respondents as insufficient. Considering the school capital grant transferred to each public primary school by the government of Rwanda on the basis of number of student enrolled through the program of «free-fees policy», this respondent's consideration seems to be related, not to the lack of funds, but to the fact that those who develop the performance contract «imihigo» do not dispose sufficient and accuracy experience and skills on the effective planning process in a decentralized education system. Therefore, their performance contracts are likely based on felt needs rather than real or documented needs identified from hard empirical data collected from the school community. For example, in february 2012, eight head teachers from Gakenke district were forced to resign since their performances were very far below the indicators of success included in their contract of performance. They had defined objectives which are beyond their financial and material capacities (Muhirwa, 2012).

In general, results show that respondents are satisfied with changes made in supervision of education from centralized to decentralized system even though teachers, head teachers and educational supervisors stated that they encounter different challenges and constraints which limit their action of implementing decentralization process in supervision of schools the way it is stipulated in its cognitive referential. The ranking and influence level of these challenges and constraints differ according to the position occupied by respondent in the education system. Meanwhile, those who served longer in the education system tend to have a better perception on decentralization in supervision of schools.

6.3 Conclusion

Since seminars on principles and values of a decentralized educational supervision system can help teachers, headmasters, educational supervisors at sector and district level or parents in dealing with problems encountered in supervision of education, the government through the Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Culture (MINEDUC), is encouraged to organize trainings for teachers, head teachers and educational supervisors in areas such as interpersonal communication, classroom observation, problem solving and decision making, decentralized supervision of education process, values and principles of decentralization and other areas that are relevant to implementation of decentralization in education. The MINEDUC is also encouraged to evaluate the impact of in-service trainings provided through VVOB program since they seem not to have a significant influence on education officers and head teachers' cognitive representation towards decentralization process in education.

Local elected authorities and local education administrators are encouraged to consult education official documents and visit their schools more often. This is very important for the enhancement of education standards in schools and encouragement of teachers, headmasters and parents. In the same perspective, headmasters and the educational officers should try as much as possible to involve teachers and parents in location of school's needs and supervision of education whenever possible. This can reduce misunderstanding between teachers, head teachers and educational supervisors as long as teachers, parents

and head teachers feel ownership for the decisions made in their schools. In this case, there is a need of change in communication system and restructure the mechanism for sharing functions especially during the development of contracts of performance «Imihigo» that should precise which aspect of supervision will be coordinated by the district and sector and which one will be handled by schools.

In order to achieve an effective decentralization process in Rwandan education, schools and classrooms should be the center of inquiry. Therefore, multiple indicators of schools' success should be prepared by a team of teachers, head teachers and educational supervisors taking into account of what works best in each district. These indicators should be consistent with the objectives stipulated in performance contracts (commonly known as "Imihigo") signed by educational administrators in each district. Meanwhile, experience should be included among the requirements in selecting educational supervisors and head teachers since it seems to be positively related to the understanding of decentralization process in schools.

The National Council for Curriculum Development should provide opportunities for teachers and head teachers' participation in the development of curriculum in order to encourage ownership and facilitate the instructional supervision based on peer coaching approach.

References

- Bloomer, K. (1991). Decentralizing the education system. *The Commonwealth Secretariat report of the fifth meeting*, Kadoma, Zimbabwe, 28 April- 3 May 1991
- Charlier, J.,E. & Pierrard, J., F. (2001). *Systèmes d'enseignement décentralisés : analyse des discours et des enjeux dans l'Éducation sénégalaise, burkinabé et malienne. Autrepart*, n° 17, Des écoles pour le Sud, 29-48.
- Erny, P.(2005). *L'Education au Rwanda au temps des rois*. Paris : L'Harmattan
- Harrison, C. R., & Killion, J.P & Mitchell, J.E (1989). *Site based management: the realities of implementation*, Educational Leadership,
- Lugaz, C. (2004). *Barriers to decentralization: Examples from West Africa*, In IIEP Newsletter, Vol. 22, N°4.
- MINALOC, (2001). *National Decentralization Policy*, Kigali, May 2001
- MINEDUC. (2006). *Program in support of the education sector strategic plan(ESSP)2006-2010: Appraisal report*. Kigali: ADF/MINEDUC.
- Muhirwa, O. (2012). Abayobozi b'ibigo by'amashuri 8 kudahigura ibyo bahize bibakozeho. Retrieved on 21st march 2012.
<http://www.igihe.com/amakuru/abayobozi-b-ibigo-by-amashuri-8-kudahigura-ibyo-bahize-bibakozeho.html>
- Ndahimana, E., & Twahirwa, D.,& Nyabutsitsi G. & Musoni, N.(2002). *Rwanda Decentralization Assessment*. Kigali:MINALOC/ USAID
- Njoroge, G, K. & Rubagiza, J. (2003). *History of education*. Module 5. Kigali:KIE
- Okumbe, J. A (1998): *Educational Management, Theory and Practice*. Nairobi: Nairobi University Press
- Pajak E. (1992). *A view from the center office, Supervision in Transition*. In ASCD 1992 Year book.USA: ASCD.

Republic of Rwanda(2003a). *Organic law n° 20/2003 of 03 august 2003 organizing education. in Official Gazette of Republic of Rwanda*, Year 42, N° 21 of 1st November 2003, p2

Republic of Rwanda,(2003b). *Organic law organizing education N° 20/2003 of03/08/2003*, in Official Gazette of Republic of Rwanda, Year 42, N° 21 of1st November 2003

Republic of Rwanda,(2003). *Primer Minister's order N°05/03 of 15/03/2003 on establishment, organization and functioning of the general inspectorate of education*, in official gazette of republic of Rwanda N° 12 of 15/06/2003

Republic of Rwanda (2009). *Presidential order n°48/01 of 10/8/2009 establishing quality standards in education for nursery, primary and secondary schools in Rwanda*. Kigali: General inspectorate of education

Richardson, M. D.,&Kenneth, C. B.&J., Flanigan, L (1998). *School Empowerment*. Pennsylvania: Technomic Publications

Université National du Rwanda (1995). *Codes et Lois du Rwanda*. Volume I, 2^{ème} Edition

VNG. (2003): *Appraisal of the Decentralization Process in Rwanda*, Kigali, Septembre 2003

Welsh, T.&MacGinn, F. N. (1999): *Decentralization of education: Why, when, what and how?* Paris:UNESCO/IEEP.

World Bank, (2006). *What is Decentralization?* New york: World Bank Decentralization Thematic Team. Retrieved on 12th September 2006

http://www.ciesin.columbia.edu/decentralization/English/General/Different_forms.html

Tables

Table 1. Analysis of differences in teachers, principals and educational supervision officers perceptions toward the implementation of decentralization process

Descriptives

IMPLMEAN								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Teachers	295	2.9119	.33305	.01939	2.8737	2.9500	2.22	4.00
Headmasters	37	2.8566	.31501	.05179	2.7516	2.9617	2.35	3.65
Supervisors	26	2.8361	.18784	.03684	2.7603	2.9120	2.35	3.00
Total	358	2.9007	.32316	.01708	2.8671	2.9342	2.22	4.00

ANOVA

IMPLMEAN					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.217	2	.109	1.039	.355
Within Groups	37.066	355	.104		
Total	37.283	357			

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: IMPLMEAN

LSD

(I) Category of Respondents	(J) Category of Respondents	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Teachers	Headmasters	.0552	.05636	.328	-.0556	.1661
	Supervisors	.0757	.06610	.253	-.0543	.2057
Headmasters	Teachers	-.0552	.05636	.328	-.1661	.0556
	Supervisors	.0205	.08269	.804	-.1421	.1831
Supervisors	Teachers	-.0757	.06610	.253	-.2057	.0543
	Headmasters	-.0205	.08269	.804	-.1831	.1421

Table 2: Analysis of relationship between the perceptions of implementation of decentralization and the demographic characteristics such as type and location of school, years of experience, education attained, and in-service training attended

Correlations

		IMPLSUM	Years of Experience	Professional Qualification Level	Location of school before January 2006	Trained in School Management	Trained in Supervision of Education	Trained in Principles and values of decentralization in education
IMPLSUM	Pearson Correlation	1	.136*	.067	-.099	-.052	-.027	-.073
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.010	.204	.060	.331	.612	.166
	N	358	358	358	358	358	358	358
Years of Experience	Pearson Correlation	.136*	1	-.360**	.015	-.027	-.064	-.214**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.	.000	.774	.605	.226	.000
	N	358	358	358	358	358	358	358
Professional Qualification Level	Pearson Correlation	.067	-.360**	1	-.072	.092	-.019	.183**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.204	.000	.	.175	.081	.717	.001
	N	358	358	358	358	358	358	358
Location of school before January 2006	Pearson Correlation	-.099	.015	-.072	1	-.038	.069	-.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.060	.774	.175	.	.472	.191	.766
	N	358	358	358	358	358	358	358
Trained in School Management	Pearson Correlation	-.052	-.027	.092	-.038	1	.650**	.191**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.331	.605	.081	.472	.	.000	.000
	N	358	358	358	358	358	358	358
Trained in Supervision of Education	Pearson Correlation	-.027	-.064	-.019	.069	.650**	1	.300**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.612	.226	.717	.191	.000	.	.000
	N	358	358	358	358	358	358	358
Trained in Principles and values of decentralization in education	Pearson Correlation	-.073	-.214**	.183**	-.016	.191**	.300**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.166	.000	.001	.766	.000	.000	.
	N	358	358	358	358	358	358	358

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3: Challenges and Constraints encountered while implementing a decentralized education system

	View of Teachers		View of Headmasters		View of Educational supervisors	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Ineffective management	3.1051	8	3.0270	9	3.5385	5
Poor monitoring and evaluation process	2.9288	11	2.6486	12	3.0769	7
Lack of knowledge of some stakeholders on principles and values of decentralization	3.3458	4	3.4595	3	3.4231	6
Incapacity and incompetence of some stakeholders	3.4576	3	3.2162	8	3.1538	7
Limited resources and funding	3.7898	1	3.8108	1	4.0769	2
Unclear demarcation of responsibilities	3.3186	5	3.4054	4	3.9615	3
Work overload for principals and education supervisors	3.1254	7	2.9189	6	4.6538	1
Weak institution coordination	3.2983	6	3.3514	5	3.0769	7
Powerlessness of some headmasters/ educational supervisors	2.5932	12	2.8378	11	3.0769	7
Abuse of power of some stakeholders of education	3.0644	10	3.2973	6	2.7308	12
Untrained staff	3.5932	2	3.4595	2	3.9615	3
Resistance to change	3.0814	9	3.2162	7	2.8017	11