

## School Committee Strategies to Improve the Quality of Primary School Learning

Novalia Nurlaela\* and Deti Rostini

Nusantara Islamic University, Bandung, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: [novalianurlaela@uninus.ac.id](mailto:novalianurlaela@uninus.ac.id)

**Abstract.** This study examines the strategies employed by school committees to enhance the quality of learning at the primary school level within the context of the implementation of the Merdeka Curriculum. Using a qualitative case study approach, the research was conducted at SDN 170 Dian in Bandung City and SDN Menger 02 in Bandung Regency, involving principals, teachers, committee members, and parents. Data were collected through participatory observations, in-depth interviews, and document analysis, and were analyzed using the interactive model by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña. The findings indicate that school committee strategies include data-driven planning, participatory program implementation, and monitoring through documentation and reporting. However, the committee's involvement remains largely administrative and has not fully assumed a strategic role. This role gap is attributed to the committee's limited human resource capacity, lack of training, and weak synergy among stakeholders. The study concludes that the effectiveness of school committee strategies in supporting learning quality hinges on three key factors: adaptive policy support, institutional capacity building, and the application of a community-based collaborative approach. These findings underscore the importance of transforming school committees from symbols of administrative participation into strategic actors in school-based quality education management.

**Keywords:** Community Participation, Education Management, Learning Quality, Merdeka Curriculum, School Committee.

### 1 Introduction

Basic education plays a strategic role in shaping the foundational competencies of students [1]. In the era of the Merdeka Curriculum, which emphasizes flexibility, differentiation, and character development, the challenge of improving the quality of learning is no longer solely the responsibility of teachers and school principals. It also involves all stakeholders, including school committees [2]. As strategic partners of educational institutions, school committees hold a crucial position in designing, supporting, and evaluating programs that impact the quality of teaching and learning processes [3].

Within the context of implementing the Merdeka Curriculum, which demands student-centered learning and multi-stakeholder collaboration, the role of school committees becomes increasingly significant. Committees are expected not only to fulfill administrative roles but also to actively identify needs, design strategic support, and foster strong communication between schools and communities [4]. This role requires targeted strategies and a comprehensive awareness of the committee's function as an integral part of holistic learning quality improvement efforts [5].

Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 75 of 2016 emphasizes that school committees should not be merely formal institutions but must serve as drivers of community participation in education. Their roles include advisory, supporting, controlling, and mediating functions. However, in practice, the contributions of school committees to improving learning quality vary significantly across schools. At SDN 170 Dian in Bandung City, for instance, the school committee plays an active role in supporting teacher training and engaging parents in a structured manner. In contrast, at SDN Menger 02 in Bandung Regency, committee participation remains limited, particularly in strategic aspects and in strengthening student character.

Further research underscores the importance of active school committee involvement. Alarabi found that community involvement in developing 21st-century teacher competencies communication, collaboration, creativity, and critical thinking positively impacts learning quality [6]. Phuangsuan also showed that high community participation in developing learning resources in Bangkok supports improvements in education quality [7]. Previously, the "Community Collaboration Model" by O'Neill, as elaborated by Anderson-Butcher et al, emphasized that partnerships among committees, schools, and communities directly improve the effectiveness of both classroom and community-based education programs [8]. Nevertheless, these studies still tend to focus on technical aspects such as resource development or teacher training, and pay less attention to the strategic, long-term role of school committees in comprehensive learning improvement.

Meanwhile, learning quality is influenced not only by internal factors like teacher competence and student motivation, but also by external ones such as the availability of facilities, community engagement, and effective institutional management. School committees hold great potential to contribute in these three areas if they have the right strategies and clear policy support. Learning quality as a combination of effective teaching processes, meaningful classroom management, and inclusive stakeholder involvement requires a systemic rather than merely technical approach [9].

The observed disparity between two elementary schools in Bandung Regency reflects a significant opportunity to optimize school committee strategies. The lack of a collaborative and adaptive strategy model tailored to local contexts hinders efforts to achieve ideal learning quality. These challenges are compounded by limited resources, ineffective stakeholder communication, and the low capacity of some committee members to fully understand their roles and responsibilities.

This study is relevant and important as it offers a systematic approach to assessing and developing school committee strategies for improving learning quality. The research focuses not only on incidental or administrative activities, but also on strategic planning, sustained partnerships, and tangible contributions to student learning. By

examining two case studies SDN 170 Dian in Bandung City and SDN Menger 02 in Bandung Regency this research explores how school committees design, implement, and evaluate strategies for improving learning quality, and how these strategies contribute to the implementation of the Merdeka Curriculum.

The novelty of this research lies in its focus on the functional strategies of school committees as part of a community-based education management system. It goes beyond assessing committee activity effectiveness and highlights how committees can transform into agents of change in improving learning quality at the primary school level through cross-sector collaboration, parental involvement, and data-driven planning.

## 2 Method

This study employs a qualitative approach with a case study design. The qualitative approach was chosen because it allows the researcher to deeply understand phenomena within their natural and social contexts, as well as to explore the subjective meanings of informants' experiences [10]. The case study design enables an in depth exploration of school committee strategies within real life contexts, particularly when the boundaries between the phenomenon and its context are not clearly defined [11], [12]. The research was conducted at two public primary schools SDN 170 Dian in Bandung City and SDN Menger 02 in Bandung Regency selected purposively due to their differing characteristics in applying school committee strategies to improve learning quality.

The research subjects included school principals, school committee members, teachers, parents, and students. These participants were selected due to their direct involvement in the planning, implementation, supervision, and evaluation of school committee strategies. The aim was to obtain descriptive data regarding strategic patterns used by school committees in efforts to enhance learning quality.

Data were collected using method triangulation techniques: participatory observation, in-depth interviews, and document analysis. Observations were conducted at the research sites to capture real-time interactions between school and committee stakeholders [13]. Semi-structured interviews were carried out to explore informants' perceptions, experiences, and evaluations regarding the roles and strategies of school committees. Document analysis was used to review curriculum documents, school vision and mission statements, committee work programs, organizational structures, and archives of relevant activities [14].

In this approach, the researcher acts as the primary instrument [15], orchestrating interaction strategies, data elicitation, and interpretation of field findings. To support validity and systematic procedures, auxiliary instruments such as interview guides, observation sheets, and document analysis formats were used.

Data validity was tested using the four criteria proposed by [15]: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility was ensured through source triangulation and member checking. Transferability was addressed by providing thick, contextual descriptions. Dependability and confirmability were reinforced through the use of audit trail documentation and systematic reflective journaling [16].

Data were analyzed using the interactive model by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña, which includes three stages: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. Analysis was carried out concurrently with data collection to maintain sensitivity to field dynamics[17].

The research was conducted from February to April 2025, encompassing preparation, data collection, analysis, and reporting phases. Through this approach, the study aims to contribute meaningful insights into contextually relevant and applicable school committee strategies for improving primary education quality.

### **3 Results**

#### **3.1 School Committee Strategy Planning to Improve Learning Quality**

Based on the findings from SDN 170 Dian in Bandung City and SDN Menger 02 in Bandung Regency, the strategy planning process by school committees to improve learning quality is carried out through a collaborative approach involving principals, teachers, and committee administrators. The planning process begins with an analysis of the education report card as the basis for formulating the Annual Work Plan (RKT) and the School Activity and Budget Plan (RKAS). This step demonstrates the schools' effort to design programs based on actual needs and contextual data relevant to the educational unit.

Documentation obtained by the researcher shows meeting minutes from joint planning sessions between the school and committee, drafts of committee work programs, and need-based budgeting documents. One committee member stated:

“We join meetings with the school to discuss programs, but we still have a lot to learn to become more involved in the planning process.” (Chairperson of the SDN Menger 02 Committee, interview excerpt, March 22, 2025)

These findings highlight participatory efforts in planning, although the substantive involvement of the school committee remains limited. This indicates that committee participation has yet to be optimized as a strategic partner in educational planning. This planning approach can be analyzed through the PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) cycle from Deming's Total Quality Management theory, which emphasizes continuous improvement. The "Plan" stage in this context includes: Needs analysis through internal surveys and stakeholder discussions, Development of committee programs responsive to learning quality demands, Strategic collaboration with teachers, school leaders, and local communities[18].

However, challenges arise in the form of limited human resource capacity and insufficient supporting facilities. This aligns with Sallis's assertion that a good plan will be ineffective if those implementing it lack competence and resources[19].

Field findings further confirm that the school committee's role remains predominantly administrative. Their involvement as advisors, controllers, supporters, and mediators as outlined in Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation No. 75 of 2016 has not been implemented in a balanced manner. Observations indicate that some

committee members lack a full understanding of their strategic duties and functions in supporting learning quality.

From the perspective of Education Decentralization Theory, these findings reflect that the delegation of authority to the school level has not been matched with participatory readiness from the community. The committee's role as a community representative is still largely symbolic and has yet to address substantive aspects of educational decision-making. This contradicts the spirit of decentralization, which encourages active public participation in educational governance [20].

Linked to the concept of Community-Based Participation, which stresses the importance of collaboration between schools and communities to achieve contextually relevant educational quality, these findings reveal a gap between theory and practice. While mechanisms for meetings between schools and parents exist, community participation levels remain low particularly in planning and evaluating learning processes [8].

From a management standpoint, the strategic planning conducted at SDN 170 Dian and SDN Menger 02 still shows a dominance of principals and teachers in decision-making, while school committees tend to serve a supplementary administrative function. Their involvement does not yet reflect the capacity of strategic partners in the school management cycle. This underscores the need to build committee capacity in interpreting educational data, designing need-based programs, and conducting rational and systematic analysis and planning. Such an approach aligns with the principle of data-driven decision making (DDDM) in educational management, where evidence-based decisions enhance the effectiveness of programs and policies [21].

In this context, strategic logic is critical to ensure that each program plan is grounded in solid analysis, measurable objectives, and clear success indicators. Without such capacity development, school committees risk remaining symbolic entities with limited leverage to improve learning quality[22].

In other words, while current planning efforts indicate a move in the right direction, they do not yet fully reflect the empowerment of school committees as community-based decision-makers. A collaborative and transparent organizational culture must be fostered to ensure that school committees can meaningfully and sustainably drive improvements in learning quality[23].

### **3.2 Implementation of School Committee Strategies in Improving Learning Quality**

The implementation of school committee strategies to improve learning quality at SDN 170 Dian in Bandung City and SDN Menger 02 in Bandung Regency indicates that while practices are in place, they are not yet fully optimized. Based on interviews and observations, the jointly designed programs between schools and committees are often not followed by consistent execution. Several teacher training initiatives and collaborative activities with parents planned in the Annual Work Plan (RKT) and the School Activity and Budget Plan (RKAS) were not entirely carried out as intended.

At SDN 170 Dian, the school committee appears to be more active in implementing character-based learning activities and teacher training programs. The committee also assists in providing supplementary learning facilities. One teacher remarked:

"The committee here supports training procurement and occasionally helps during major school events, but not all committee members are actively involved." (Grade 4 teacher, interview excerpt, March 19, 2025)

In contrast, at SDN Menger 02, the committee's role is more limited to logistical or administrative support, such as fundraising for operational needs. Participation in strategic forums for learning quality development is not held regularly. One committee member stated:

"We are invited to meetings, but there are many technical school matters we don't understand, so we mostly just listen." (Committee member, interview excerpt, March 21, 2025)

These findings reveal a gap between planning and implementation. Committee involvement in executing activities does not yet reflect an active role as a strategic partner. Internal monitoring of program implementation is also not systematic, weakening the assessment of their impact on learning quality.

Within the framework of School-Based Management (SBM) theory which emphasizes autonomy, participation, and local accountability in educational decision-making these findings point to challenges in fully applying SBM principles. Institutional autonomy is not matched by active community participation, particularly from the school committee. This undermines the effective management of resources and the implementation of locally driven learning innovations[24].

Furthermore, Education Decentralization Theory posits that effective school management relies heavily on community engagement in the decision-making process [25]. However, field data suggest that parental involvement in learning activities and committee forums remains low. This indicates a gap between the spirit of decentralization and actual participation practices at the primary school level [26].

From the perspective of ethical governance values in education, the implementation of school committee strategies should be grounded in transparency, accountability, and responsibility. However, the study reveals that information sharing between schools and committees remains largely formal, and decision-making often excludes full participation from all committee members. This weakness contributes to poor coordination and reduced effectiveness in quality improvement strategies[27].

The suboptimal implementation also relates to the lack of training and capacity-building for committee members. Without empowerment through training or mentoring, many committee members feel unprepared to contribute meaningfully to discussions about learning quality. Yet, harmonious collaboration between the committee, school, and broader community is vital for fostering an inclusive and sustainable learning environment.

In conclusion, the implementation of school committee strategies in supporting learning quality at both schools faces structural and cultural challenges. While the intent to engage exists, the actualization of committee roles remains limited due to low policy literacy, insufficient internal capacity, and weak collaborative relationships between schools and communities.

### 3.3 Evaluation of School Committee Strategies in Improving Learning Quality

The evaluation of school committee strategies at SDN 170 Dian and SDN Menger 02 was conducted to assess the effectiveness of program implementation in improving learning quality. This evaluation focused on four main indicators: (1) achievement of program objectives, (2) quality of implementation, (3) impact on the learning process, and (4) documentation and reporting of activities [28].

First, Achievement of Program Objectives. In general, the achievement of school committee program objectives at both schools falls into the “fair” category, although not yet optimal. Several flagship programs planned during the strategic planning phase were not fully realized. Budget constraints and time limitations were the primary barriers at both schools. This suggests that while planning documents were developed through participatory processes, a gap remains between planning and realization, especially in terms of resource availability. This situation aligns with Deming’s view that discrepancies between planning and implementation must be systematically evaluated in the PDCA cycle to allow for improvement in the next iteration [29].

Second, Quality of Program Implementation. The quality of implementation varied across the two schools. At SDN 170 Dian, teacher training programs facilitated by the school committee were well-structured and involved university lecturers as trainers. The training was designed with a hands-on approach, allowing teachers to directly apply the material in the classroom. This indicates a high level of implementation quality, aligned with principles of professional teacher development.

In contrast, SDN Menger 02 excelled in participatory programs, such as outdoor activities and thematic classes involving parents. However, technical shortcomings were noted: activities were often not supported by implementation guidelines or clearly defined success indicators. This made internal evaluation challenging and created ambiguity in assessing program effectiveness. These findings underscore the need for developing Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) as technical guides for systematically implementing school committee programs.

Third, Impact of Programs on Learning. Observations showed improved classroom interactions, particularly in terms of student engagement in discussions and group work. Teachers also began to adopt more active learning approaches as a result of the training programs.

However, further examination revealed that there is no quantitatively designed impact evaluation system in place. Current evaluations remain descriptive and qualitative, lacking numerical data to demonstrate improvements in students’ academic achievements. This limits the ability to empirically and measurably verify the effectiveness of the programs. According to Darling-Hammond, data-driven evaluation is crucial to determine whether educational interventions genuinely affect student learning outcomes. Therefore, the development of systematic evaluation instruments should be prioritized in the next program cycle [30].

Fourth, Documentation and Reporting. At SDN 170 Dian, documentation practices were well-structured and accountable. The school committee produced activity reports that included background, objectives, processes, outcomes, and visual evidence such as

photo documentation. These reports were not only kept administratively but also presented in formal forums to parents, strengthening public transparency.

In contrast, SDN Menger 02 exhibited weaknesses in documentation. Most activities were only visually documented on social media, without systematic written reports. Reporting was typically done verbally in informal settings, complicating audit processes or formal evaluations of committee activities.

These findings indicate that the managerial capacity of school committees in documentation and reporting needs improvement. In addition to technical training, the use of simple information technology such as digital reporting templates and cloud-based storage could serve as a medium-term solution to strengthen accountability.

### **3.4 Follow-Up on School Committee Strategies to Improve Learning Quality**

The follow-up on school committee strategies to improve learning quality at SDN 170 Dian in Bandung City and SDN Menger 02 in Bandung Regency reflects a response to previous program evaluations that revealed suboptimal implementation. Based on observations and reflections on existing programs, school committees at both institutions have begun to formulate structured and strategic improvement measures, though implementation still faces capacity and coordination challenges.

At SDN 170 Dian, programs such as “inspirational classes” and numeracy strengthening encountered obstacles due to limited resources and lack of technical supervision. In response, the school and committee agreed on the need to revise implementation strategies, including adjustments to schedules, achievement targets, and execution methods. One initiative proposed was the formation of a sub-team consisting of teachers and parents to redesign the programs to better suit the school's real conditions.

Meanwhile, at SDN Menger 02, it was found that most activities lacked clear technical guidelines, resulting in non-standardized implementation. For example, the “Parents as Teachers” program had no established procedures for activity flow, theme selection, or evaluation tools. Consequently, implementation heavily depended on individual class teachers’ initiatives, leading to inconsistent effectiveness. The main follow-up action here is to develop comprehensive implementation guidelines.

In efforts to improve program quality moving forward, both schools recognize the need to enhance internal capacity both at the committee and teacher levels. At SDN 170 Dian, capacity-building strategies involve collaboration with non-formal educational institutions to provide training aligned with teachers’ needs, particularly in digital learning and project-based assessment. In contrast, SDN Menger 02 focuses on strengthening the committee members’ capabilities. Plans are underway to conduct school program management training for committee members, in collaboration with resource persons from the local Education Office.

These strategic follow-ups are also accompanied by the development of more measurable program success indicators, such as student attendance, parental participation, and learning outcome improvements. These indicators aim to provide a stronger data foundation for assessing program effectiveness objectively.



Socialization is a critical component of successful implementation. At SDN 170 Dian, the committee held open forums involving class teachers and parents to share evaluation results and improvement plans. This participatory model has proven effective in increasing stakeholder ownership and encouraging tangible support from parents. At SDN Menger 02, the socialization approach extends to the community, with the school committee engaging local community leaders and neighborhood administrators (RW/RT) to spread awareness about educational programs. This strategy aims to gain support not only from within the school but also from the broader social environment of students.

However, the success of improvement initiatives hinges on the long-term commitment of the school committee. At SDN 170 Dian, this commitment is shown through the committee's active presence in school meetings and learning activities. The committee has also agreed to conduct quarterly evaluations as a control mechanism. At SDN Menger 02, long-term commitment is demonstrated through efforts to build partnerships with external institutions. The committee recognizes that improving learning quality cannot be the school's sole responsibility and actively reaches out to local CSR programs and educational communities to secure training, facilities, and moral support.

These follow-up actions indicate a shift from passive involvement toward more strategic participation. Nonetheless, field implementation still faces challenges such as limited literacy in educational policy and weak coordination systems among stakeholders. School committees require ongoing support to function effectively as strategic partners in sustainably improving the quality of learning.

### **3.5 Challenges in School Committee Strategies to Improve Learning Quality**

The findings from SDN 170 Dian and SDN Menger 02 reveal several key challenges that hinder the optimal implementation of school committee strategies in supporting learning quality improvement. These challenges are interconnected and closely tied to national policy, the internal capacity of the committees, and local community dynamics surrounding the schools.

One of the primary obstacles is the limited understanding and participation of school committee members regarding their strategic roles. Although Ministerial Regulation No. 75 of 2016 defines school committees as advisory, supporting, controlling, and mediating bodies, in practice, many members still do not fully grasp these functions. Interview results indicated that several members merely attend formal meetings without actively contributing to educational decision-making processes.

Additionally, the lack of ongoing training and mentoring for committee members weakens their capacity to design programs, manage budgets, and evaluate activities effectively. This reinforces the notion that while national policies such as Law No. 20 of 2003 and the Merdeka Belajar (Freedom to Learn) policy formally provide space for community participation, their implementation at the primary education level remains limited and ineffective.

Resource limitations and insufficient community support also pose tangible challenges. In socioeconomically disadvantaged areas like SDN Menger 02, school

committees face difficulties in fundraising and in engaging parents in educational programs. The absence of practical guidelines and context-specific implementation models from the government further widens the gap between national policies and local realities.

From the perspective of the Education Systems Theory, these obstacles indicate that interactions among system components (schools, committees, communities, government) are not functioning optimally [31]. Weak coordination, unstructured communication, and the lack of systematic feedback mechanisms constitute latent barriers to achieving sustained educational quality [32].

Moreover, when analyzed through the lens of Empowerment Theory, it becomes evident that no systematic process currently exists to transform school committees into independent and autonomous actors. Dependence on school principals and a lack of confidence in making decisions show that true empowerment has yet to take place. Yet the core principle of empowerment lies in enhancing the capacity and autonomy of groups to define and implement educational programs [33].

### **3.6 Solutions to Overcome Challenges**

The first solution involves aligning the implementation of national policies such as Ministerial Regulation No. 75 of 2016 and the Merdeka Belajar (Freedom to Learn) policy with realities on the ground. Local governments and educational institutions must develop technical guidelines and operational models tailored to local contexts, based on the specific needs of schools and the capacities of surrounding communities. This is crucial to bridge the gap between broad national regulations and practical needs at the primary school level.

The second solution emphasizes strengthening the capacity of school committee members through regular training, technical mentoring, and experiential learning. Training content should include strategic topics such as school management, resource mobilization, program development, monitoring and evaluation, and effective stakeholder communication. This approach aligns with Empowerment Theory, which seeks to develop school committees that can think critically, make independent decisions, and act effectively.

The third solution is to promote the application of Participatory Management Theory in educational governance. This involves full engagement of school committees in the school management cycle from strategic planning and monitoring implementation to evaluating outcomes. Committees should not be involved merely symbolically; they must be given the space to contribute ideas, provide feedback, and participate in oversight and evaluation of school performance.

Implementing participatory management must also consider local conditions. A collaborative approach that connects schools, committees, community leaders, and local businesses can expand support for programs aimed at improving learning quality.

## 4 Discussion

The findings indicate that the planning of school committee strategies to enhance learning quality has been oriented toward a collaborative approach. The involvement of principals, teachers, and committees in formulating the Annual Work Plan (RKT) and School Activity and Budget Plan (RKAS) reflects a collective awareness of the importance of needs-based local planning. This aligns with the principles of Total Quality Management (TQM), which emphasize continuous improvement through the PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) cycle [18], [19]. However, the committee's involvement in the planning process remains largely administrative and has not yet reached a strategic dimension.

In the context of Education Decentralization Theory, the delegation of authority to schools is not always accompanied by sufficient local capacity, especially from the community side. Committee participation often remains symbolic, indicating asymmetrical engagement between schools and communities [34], [35]. This underscores the need for capacity building as a foundational step toward effective and democratic decentralization [36].

In terms of implementation, SDN 170 Dian showed relatively active involvement in supporting teacher training and character-based activities. This suggests the application of School-Based Management values, particularly local accountability and participatory decision-making [37]. In contrast, at SDN Menger 02, committee participation was more limited to administrative functions, with minimal engagement in strategic forums and decision-making processes.

The gap between planning and implementation highlights the suboptimal application of Participatory Governance principles in primary education. According to Grote, meaningful participation is not merely about physical presence but also involves critical discussion, decision-making, and policy monitoring [38].

Program evaluations at both schools revealed an absence of standardized impact assessment systems. Evaluations were mostly qualitative and lacked quantitative instruments to demonstrate the linkage between committee programs and student learning outcomes. Yet, as emphasized by Darling-Hammond, data-driven evaluation is essential for measuring the effectiveness of educational interventions on academic performance.

The absence of consistent documentation systems also hampers the establishment of an accountability culture. In schools with weak documentation practices, such as SDN Menger 02, reporting is still conducted informally and verbally. Research by Mukred highlights that systematic documentation and reporting are crucial elements in ensuring transparency and building public trust in educational institutions [39].

The main challenges faced by school committees include limited managerial capacity, lack of training, and low confidence in managing educational programs. This reflects that Empowerment Theory has not yet been fully operationalized at the grassroots level. The theory assumes that all community actors, including school committees, have the potential to become change agents when provided with sufficient access, information, and training [40].

Structurally, national policies such as Ministerial Regulation No. 75 of 2016 have provided school committees with a strategic role. However, in practice, this regulation has not been supported by operational implementation models that are adaptable to local contexts. According to Glewwe and Muralidharan, effective education policies depend not only on design but also on how they are adaptively interpreted and executed by local actors through support mechanisms, training, and supervision [41].

## 5 Conclusion

This study analyzed school committee strategies in improving learning quality at SDN 170 Dian in Bandung City and SDN Menger 02 in Bandung Regency. The findings reveal that the implementation of school committee strategies involves data-driven planning based on education report cards, collaborative program execution with teachers and parents, and review through activity evaluations and documentation reports. However, school committee involvement remains largely administrative, constrained by limited capacity, minimal active participation, and weak impact evaluation systems. These challenges highlight a disconnect between national policies such as Ministerial Regulation No. 75 of 2016 and practical realities at the school level. The study underscores the importance of strengthening committee capacity through training, implementing participatory approaches, and ensuring adaptive policy support that reflects local contexts. A community-based collaborative empowerment strategy is key to enhancing the effectiveness of education quality management in primary schools.

## References

- [1] A. Widodo and M. Raffi, "Urgensi Dasar-Dasar Kependidikan dalam Membangun Karakter Peserta Didik di Era Digita," *J. Teknol. Pendidik. Dan Pembelajaran* | E-ISSN 3026-6629, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 644–649, 2024.
- [2] R. Asparingga, E. Harapan, and N. Kesumawati, "Mutu Pendidikan Sekolah Dasar Ditinjau Dari Persepsi Guru Pada Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah Penggerak Dan Komite Sekolah: Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah Penggerak," *Pendas J. Ilm. Pendidik. Dasar*, vol. 10, no. 02, pp. 375–391, 2025.
- [3] D. J. Wulan, S. Mustoip, and N. Hidayati, "Strategi Komunikasi Dalam Pembentukan Organisasi Komite Sekolah di TK Negeri Sendang Kabupaten Cirebon," *TUTURAN J. Ilmu Komunikasi, Sos. dan Hum.*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 177–195, 2023.
- [4] M. F. Amirudin, "Rekonstruksi Pengelolaan Komite Sekolah Sebagai Mitra Dalam Peningkatan Mutu Sekolah," *Edif. J. Pendidik. Agama Islam*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1–15, 2020.
- [5] I. Ismail, Z. Hanim, and Y. Dwiyono, "Peran Komite Sekolah dalam Peningkatkan Mutu Pendidikan di SD Negeri Kongbeng, Kutim," *J. Ilmu Manaj. Dan Pendidik.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 16–20, 2021.
- [6] K. Alarabi, B. AlSadrani, H. Tairab, O. Abu Khurma, and N. Kasasbeh, "Does Community Engagement Boost Pre-and In-Service Teachers' 21st-Century Skills? A

- Mixed-Method Study,” *Soc. Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 7, p. 410, 2025.
- [7] P. Phuansuwan, S. Siripipattanakul, S. Siripipattanakul, and P. Jaipong, “The Impact of Community Participation in Sustainable Learning Resource Development: A Case of Bangkok, Thailand,” *Sustainability*, vol. 17, no. 10, p. 4620, 2025.
- [8] D. Anderson-Butcher, S. Bates, H. A. Lawson, T. M. Childs, and A. L. Iachini, “The community collaboration model for school improvement: A scoping review,” *Educ. Sci.*, vol. 12, no. 12, p. 918, 2022.
- [9] M. Noprika, N. Yusro, and S. Sagiman, “Strategi kepala sekolah dalam peningkatan mutu pendidikan,” *Andragogi J. Pendidik. Islam Dan Manaj. Pendidik. Islam*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 224–243, 2020.
- [10] J. W. Creswell and V. L. P. Clark, *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications, 2017.
- [11] R. K. Yin, *Case study research and applications*. SAGE Publications US., 2017.
- [12] Adrias and A. Ruswandi, *Desain Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Mix Method*. Depok: Rajawali Pers, 2025.
- [13] M. Q. Patton, *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage publications, 2014.
- [14] A. Tashakkori and J. W. Creswell, “The new era of mixed methods,” *J. Mix. Methods Res.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3–7, 2007, doi: 10.1177/2345678906293042.
- [15] Y. Lincoln and B. Guba, “Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.” Inc, 1985.
- [16] A. K. Shenton, “Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects,” *Educ. Inf.*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 63–75, 2004.
- [17] M. B. Miles, A. M. Huberman, and J. Saldana, *Qualitative Data Analysis A Methods Sourcebook*, Third Edit. United States of America: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2014.
- [18] W. E. Deming, *Guide to Quality Control*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute Of Technology, 1982.
- [19] E. Sallis, *Total Quality Education in Education, Manajemen Mutu Pendidikan, Terj. Ahmad Ali Riyadi dan Fahrurrozi*. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta: IRCiSoD, 2010.
- [20] S. Subijanto, “Prinsip-Prinsip dan Efektivitas Desentralisasi Pendidikan Dalam Rangka Meningkatkan Mutu dan Relevansi Pendidikan,” *J. Pendidik. dan Kebud.*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 532–549, 2010.
- [21] A. Datnow and V. Park, *Data-driven leadership*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- [22] K. Schildkamp, “Data-based decision-making for school improvement: Research insights and gaps,” *Educ. Res.*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 257–273, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1080/00131881.2019.1625716.
- [23] E. Fabillar and A. Wang, “Building a culture of continuous improvement: Guidebook and toolkit,” *Educ. Dev. Center*. <https://www.edc.org/sites/default/files/uploads/EDC-Building-Culture-Continuous-Improvement.pdf>, 2019.
- [24] G. E. V. Walewangko, J. S. J. Lengkong, and E. J. Usuh, “Implementation of School-Based Management at SD GMIM KOHA,” *J. Soc. Res.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 275–288, 2023.
- [25] K. K. Kameshwara, R. Shields, and A. Sandoval-Hernandez, “Decentralisation in school management and student achievement: Evidence from India,” *J. Dev. Stud.*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 67–82, 2024.
- [26] R. Zilfa and N. Bali, “Desentralisasi Pendidikan,” *JOIES J. Islam. Educ. Stud.*, vol. 1,

- no. 1, pp. 171–183, 2016.
- [27] D. Supriadi, H. Usman, and C. Jabar, “Good school governance: An approach to principal’s decision-making quality in Indonesian vocational school,” *Res. Educ. Adm. Leadersh.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 796–831, 2021.
- [28] I. Istianah, “Implementasi Program Supervisi Akademik Kepala Sekolah Dalam Meningkatkan Profesionalisme Guru di SMAN 1 Cikarang Utara dan MAN Kabupaten Bekasi,” *J. Adm. Pendidik.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 72–87, 2019.
- [29] T. Maruyama and M. Inoue, “Continuous quality improvement of leadership education program through PDCA cycle,” *China-USA Bus. Rev.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 42–49, 2016.
- [30] L. Darling-Hammond, “Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice?,” *Eur. J. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 291–309, 2017.
- [31] B. Prabawani, S. P. Hadi, I. S. Zen, N. R. Hapsari, and I. Ainuddin, “Systems Thinking and Leadership of Teachers in Education for Sustainable Development: A Scale Development,” *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 6, 2022, doi: 10.3390/su14063151.
- [32] L. K. Mayger and C. D. Hochbein, “Spanning Boundaries and Balancing Tensions: A Systems Perspective on Community School Coordinators,” *Sch. Community J.*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 225–254, 2019.
- [33] M. Zimmerman, “Empowerment Theory,” Oct. 2012, doi: 10.1007/978-1-4615-4193-6\_2.
- [34] H. E. Mulyasa, *Menjadi guru penggerak merdeka belajar*. Bumi Aksara, 2021.
- [35] U. K. Abonyi, “Headteachers’ leadership practices in Ghana: Does a formal qualification in educational leadership and management programme matter?,” *Educ. Manag. Adm. Leadersh.*, p. 17411432241257044, 2024.
- [36] G. Biesta, J. Allan, and R. Edwards, “The theory question in research capacity building in education: Towards an agenda for research and practice,” *Br. J. Educ. Stud.*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 225–239, 2011.
- [37] B. J. Caldwell, *School-based management*, vol. 3. International Institute for Educational Planning Paris, 2005.
- [38] J. R. Grote and B. Gbikpi, “Participatory governance,” *Polit. Soc. Implic. Opladen Leske+ Budrich*, 2002.
- [39] M. Mukred, Z. M. Yusof, W. A. Al-Moallemi, U. A. Mokhtar, and B. Hawash, “Electronic records management systems and the competency of educational institutions: Evidence from Yemen,” *Inf. Dev.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 125–148, 2022.
- [40] A. Cilek, A. Ç. Kılınç, O. Erdoğan, K. Arslan, and F. Sezgin, “Linking principal support and teacher resilience to teacher leadership in Türkiye: The mediating role of teacher work engagement,” *Educ. Manag. Adm. Leadersh.*, p. 17411432241308680, 2025.
- [41] P. Glewwe and K. Muralidharan, “Improving School Education Outcomes in Developing Countries,” 2022.