School Based Management

By Hasan Hariri

School-Based Management in Indonesia: Decision-Making, Problems, and Problem-Solving Strategy

Riswanti Rini
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Universitas Lampung
Bandar Lampung, Lampung, Indonesia
riswanti.rini@gmail.com

Ismu Sukamto
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Universitas Lampung
Bandar Lampung, Lampung, Indonesia

Ridwan Ridwan
SMP Negeri 3 Way Pengubuan
Lampung Tengah, Lampung, Indonesia

Hasan Hariri
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,
Universitas Lampung,
Bandar Lampung, Lampung, Indonesia

Abstract--- This paper seeks to answer the questions 1) What decision making is practiced in School Based Management (SBM) in Indonesia ?, 2) What problems are faced in implementing SBM in Indonesia?, 3) What strategies do practitioners do in dealing with problems? SBM can facilitate practitioners in terms of school committee involvement in strategic decision making in term of school missions, vision, objectives, repairmen of building, funds, new classroom, programs and teaching and learning process, facilities preservation, student conduct policies, canteen management, governing of fund income, choosing educator, choosing teachers, choosing principals, choosing administrative staff, choosing textbooks, curriculum development. Problems encountered include inadequate parental participation, weakness in self-governing, coordination handicap, principal and school committee role overlap, weakness in school leaders and professional improvement for, school appliances constrain, SBM understanding constrain, inadequate school finance. The strategies or creativity used in resolving problems include: seeking advice and support from other school stakeholders, the principal and staff discussing and agreeing on strategies to implement change collaboratively, principals consider themselves to be team members, delegate authority. There is an agreement between the school and the school committee on reducing workload.

Keywords: school-based management, SBM problems, problem solving, schools, Indonesia

I. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia still faces the problem of the quality of education at the elementary and middle school levels. The government has sought improvements in national and local curriculum, teacher training, printing books and learning aids, adding educational facilities and infrastructure. Some schools show results, but generally have not [1].

Government Regulation No. 47 of 2008 concerning the new 9-year compulsory education is able to provide access to quality. Access and quality should be a package. Access is not followed by quality in vain because goals are not achieved [2].

The government prioritizes School Based Management (SBM) as a complete package of efforts to improve the quality of educational facilities and infrastructure. Education management through the application of School Based Management (SBM) is believed to be able to replace the old centralized pattern. Centralized management is identified as the cause of the rate of achievement of the quality of education [3].

School Based Management (SBM) is the practice of educational autonomy so that schools are able to plan, organize, implement, and control real needs so that schools are able to become independent schools [4].

Regarding the explanation above, in detail, this paper aims to find out:

1) What decision-making is practiced in School-Based Management (SBM) in Indonesia?
2) What problems are encountered in implementing SBM in Indonesia?
3) What strategies do practitioners do in dealing with the problems?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Understanding School Based Management (SBM)

School-based management (SBM) is a school management pattern where students and quality are the focus. Schools are given authority with flexibility to strengthen self-govern to the resources and operations to make school develop so that schools are able to foster an environment that encourages sustainable development. SBM enables schools to develop accountability because schools involve the participation of all stakeholders in government policy frames. The final objective of SBM is to make the better learning grade and results [5].

School based management is an educational system entity. School-based management runs in a pattern established by the central government as a party that has responsibilities and authority.

B. Background of the Emergence of School Based Management (SBM)

The background to the emergence of School Based Management (SBM) is inseparable from the performance of education in America based on the existing education system. Between the 1960s and 1970s, various innovations were carried out through the introduction new curricula and new teaching methods approaches to improve the quality of education, but the results are not satisfactory. It is likewise in many other countries such as Canada, Australia, United Kingdom, France and New Zealand.

Prior to the various innovations applied to improve the quality of education focused on the scope of the class, such as curriculum improvement, teacher professionalism, teaching methods, and evaluation systems, and all of them did not give satisfactory results. Along with these efforts, in the 1980s there were encouraging developments in the field of modern management, namely successful applications in industry and commercial organizations. The success of this modern management application was then adopted to be applied in the world of education. Since that time the community began to realize that to improve the quality of education it was necessary to jump or get out of the scope of teaching in the classroom narrowly to the scope of school organizations. Therefore, structural system reform and school management styles are needed [1].

In Indonesia, the background to the emergence of School Based Management is not much different from developed countries that first applied it. A striking difference is the slow awareness of education policy makers in Indonesia. Just imagine in many countries the SBM model of the education reform movement had taken place in the 1970s and was followed by many countries in the 1980s, but in Indonesia, it only began 30 years later. This cannot be separated from the authoritarian system during the new order. All are arranged from the center both in determining the school curriculum, education budget, teacher appointment, learning methods, textbooks, teaching aids up to school hours and the types of ceremonies that must be performed at school.

The National Education System explicitly mandates that every citizen has the right to receive quality education services. Quality education is not only measured by product (output) but related to the input and process of providing education. Efforts to improve the quality of education services must involve education stakeholders, especially the community and parents of students [6].

The Indonesian government through the Ministry of Education, has made efforts to improve the quality of education, which so far has been lacking, including by establishing a operational assistance fund program. The programs are expected to be able to uphold the quality and quantity of education in Indonesia that can have a positive impact. What is expected by all is a new idea in education management that provides policies for each school to regulate and implement various policies from the government. This thinking is called school-based management (SBM).

The authority that relies on schools is the core of SBM which is considered to have a high level of effectiveness and provides several advantages are: School policies and authority have a direct influence on students, parents, and teachers, Aiming at how to utilize local resources, Effective in training participants, students such as attendance, learning outcomes, repetition rates, dropout rates, teacher morale, and school climate, and shared attention to decision making, teacher empowerment, school management, school redesign, and planning changes.

The benefits of School Based Management (SBM) provide several benefits including 1) schools can improve the welfare of teachers so that they focus more on teaching based on the real abilities of the school, 2) freedom in managing and inviting people to participate, 3) stimulate the principal skills in their roles as managers and, 4) encourage teachers to innovate, and 5) improve school sensitiveness to actual education services demands and assurance in line with community expectations.

Meanwhile, management principles that must be understood so that the SBM journey is for fluency: 1) openness, namely management is carried out openness (transparency), 2) togetherness, i.e. management is carried out jointly by schools and communities, 3) sustainability, namely management carried out continuously and sustainably without being influenced by changes in the principal, 4) completeness, meaning that management is carried out thoroughly on all components that uphold and influence the achievement of objectives, 6) responsibility, meaning that it can be accountable to parents/guardians of students, community, government and other interested parties, 7) democracy, namely decisions taken based on deliberation between the components of the school and the community, 8) independence, where the school has the initiative or initiative, and innovation to achieve goals, oriented to quality, which means that the efforts made by school always based on pe increasing educational quality, 9) Achievement of Minimum Service Standards (MSS) which means that school management is to achieve total, gradual and ongoing school service standards (MSS) and Education for All, which means that all children have the right to receive the same service education [1].

C. School-Based Management Concepts

School Based Management (SBM) is one model of a school administration system that gives broader authority and more power to school institutions to manage school activities according to the potential, demands, and needs of the school concerned without conflicting with applicable regulations. Giving authority in decision making is seen as a form of autonomy at the school level in terms of empowering resources so that schools can independently investigate, budget, determine scale of priorities, employ, supervise, and figure out their schools targets, a program for all education stakeholders [7].

In general, the shift in the educational dimension from central-based management to school-based management has been explained. More specifically, the question is: "What needs be the authority and responsibility of the school"? Government Regulation No. 38 of 2007 concerning the

Division of Rules between the Government, Provincial Governments and Regency / City Governments must be used as a reference in the administration of education. Thus, the decentralization of education affairs must be in the corridor of applicable laws and regulations. It should be noted that decentralization does not mean that all problems are delegated to schools. This means that not all functions are fully decentralized to schools, some functions are still the authority and responsibility of the Government, provincial governments, district/city governments, and some other functions are handed over to schools [7].

The following are the problems 29 education which are partly the authority and responsibility of the school.

1) Teaching and Learning Management
The teaching and learning process is the core of the school. Schools are free to choose effective learning needs, based on the traits of the subject, learners, educators, and the real condition of the resources that the school has. In general, the chosen learning / teaching strategies / methods / techniques must be able to foster and develop students' creativity, innovation and experimentation to find new possibilities. Contextual learning and teaching, quantum learning, cooperative learning, are examples of what is meant.

2) Planning and Assessment
The school has the authority to prepare school development plans (RPS) or school-based plans as needed, for example, the need to improve school equality, quality, relevance, and efficiency. Therefore, schools must analyze the need for equity, quality, relevance, and efficiency of schools. Based on the analysis of these needs, the school plans to improve the equity, quality, relevance and efficiency of the school.

For this reason, schools must conduct evaluations, especially evaluations conducted internally. Internal evaluations or self-evaluations are carried out by school residents to monitor the implementation process and to evaluate the results of programs that have been implemented. Schools must carry out self-evaluations to be honest and transparent in order to truly reveal true information.

3) Curriculum Management
The government gives a portion to schools in the form of partial decentralization of curriculum management from the central government to schools through the Minister of Education Regulation 22/2006, 23/2006, and 24/2006. The intended curriculum management is the education unit level curriculum. The Central Government sets the standards and schools operate the set standards. Schools must choose the method that best suits their individual conditions. Schools can develop (deepen, enrich, strengthen, expand, diversify) the curriculum, but they must not reduce the content standards set out in Minister of Education Regulation 22/2006. Schools have the right to develop curricula into syllabi, subject matter, learning processes, key performance indicators, assessment systems, and learning implementation plans [8], [9].

The government allows schools to enrich, expand and deepen the lessons of what they should. Likewise, schools are permitted to diversify the curriculum, that is, what is taught can be developed so that it is more contextual and aligned with

student characteristics. In addition, schools are also given the freedom to develop local content and develop themselves.

4) Workforce Management (Educators and Education Personnel)
Workforce management includes planning, recruitment, development, rewards and punishment, work relationships, to evaluating the performance of school workforce (teachers, administrative staff, laboratory assistants, etc.) except those involving remuneration and recruitment of PNS (Civil Servant) teachers, which are still handled by the bureaucracy in on.

5) Facility Management (Equipment and Supplies)
The school manages facilities from procurement, maintenance and repairs to development. This is based on the fact that schools are the most aware of the needs of facilities, both adequacies, suitability, and their latest abilities, especially tools which are directly concerned to the educational process.

6) Financial Management
It is the school that best understands its needs. Therefore, the management of the allocation of funds must be delegated to schools. Schools must also be given the freedom to carry out "income-generating activities" so that financial resources are not solely dependent on the government.

7) Student Services
Schools must provide student services ranging from admission of new students, development, coaching, and placement so that students can further school or work, including administration of graduate. Therefore, what schools need is an increase in intensity and extensity.

8) School-Community Relations
The essence of school-community relations is that the community is supportive so that they want to increase involvement, care, and a sense of ownership, especially moral and financial support.

9) School Culture Management
The school strives for a friendly atmosphere of academic (physical and non-physical) because it is a prerequisite for an active, creative, innovative, effective and enjoyable teaching and learning process. High school culture is formed from the behavior of its inhabitants for the maintenance of a safe and orderly school environment, optimism and high expectations, school health which is all student-centered. Such a school culture can foster student enthusiasm for learning. School culture is the authority and responsibility of the school so what is needed is a more intensive and extensive effort.

III. METHOD

This paper utilizes the study of pure literature on school-based management (SBM) in Indonesian schools, especially those that focus on decision making, problems encountered, and problem solving strategies or creativity. A single database, namely Google scholar, is carried out to search relevant literature. Only relevant literature is selected and included for this literature review based on certain criteria: decision making, problems or obstacles, and problem solving strategies or creativity in implementing SBM in Indonesia.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

After the text edit has been completed, the paper is ready for the template. Duplicate the template file by using the Save As command, and use the naming convention prescribed by your conference for the name of your paper. In this newly created file, highlight all of the contents and import your prepared text file. You are now ready to style your paper; use the scroll down window on the left of the MS Word Formatting toolbar.

A. Findings Regarding Research questions 1

Based on a literature review of SBM in Indonesian schools, the implementation of school based management covers areas of decision-making in schools focuses on the areas of decision-making authority in the hands of schools, the schools decision-making style in general, the decision-making process procedures in general, and the decision-making processes quality.

1) The field of decision-making authority in the hands of schools.

The author looks at how decision makers at the school level make partnerships and participatory decision making. In this regard, the writer needs to find out about the type of authority and responsibility that the school board does.

Respondents stated that they were involved to prepare the mission (96%), vision (96.2%), and objectives (95%). More than 85% of respondents stated that schools have empowered them in making decisions for renovating school buildings (91.5%), preparing school budgets (90.7%), planning added classroom (88.1%), and curriculum programs and other courses (86.7%). More than 70% think they have been involved in making decisions in terms of maintaining school buildings (77.0%), student discipline policies (76.8%), canteen regulation (73.6%), and fundraising planning and regulation (57, 4%). However, only 46.1% of respondents were involved in the selection of teachers, election of school leader (44.3%), staff (43.6%), books (41.6%), and curriculum improvement (22.2%) [1].

Data shows that SBM in Indonesia had an influence to strategic of the making decision made by the authority from the government to the school, specifically, concerning to administration of funds. This finding is contrary to some practices that apply in other countries, for example, Heystek who did research relationship principals and supervisors in South Africa Context. Heystek surveyed and interviewed 500 respondent. They consisted of 50 instructors, who were members of the school's governing body and non-school's governing body, school's governing body 150 students from all over the country, and 300 school leaders from both African-speaking and African-English (double secondary school). Six principals were chosen deliberately from low, middle and high socioeconomic schools [10].

Heystek reckoned that principal and parents still did not work in a harmony. The School Regulatory Body is in charge of the management of all about such as school budget, and school properties, instead, they did not involve the headmaster of the daily implementation of the school. Unluckily, the school board that comes from the parents was not an expert in managing finances. The principal or staff member manages finances. School principals and staff assume legal risks by the education department if they make mismanagement of funds [10].

2) Decision making style

One important element in this research is the opinion of school board members about how decisions are made (decision making style). The data tells that school board (82.3%) consider consensus as a way of making decisions on the school board. Some respondents stated that the school principal collected recommendations before arriving at a decision made by the committee; they said that the decision made through this mechanism was an ordinary practice (14.3%). The decision by voting was only small numbers (1.4% and 1.8%). This data implies that the principal is not the dominant anymore. Instead, the process of making the decision had been distributed to school stakeholders [1].

This finding shows that advisory and split of styles in making decision had been applied as wide as school stakeholders. Based on the expert's point of view, there are four kinds of making decision categories, (1) autocratic decision making; (2) persuasive decision making; (3) consultative decision making; and (4) determining joint decision making [11-12].

The type of autocratic decision making is the process of making decisions by a leader without involving consultation. The leader informs a decision and the staff executes as the leader wants. The persuasive type of decision making is without consultation, the leader tries to convince staff if the decision is the best possible decision. The consultative type is if a leader tries to get input from influential people through group and personal meetings before coming to a decision [1].

Types of shared decisions are decisions that are jointly decided between people who are related to those affected. The decisions are usually based on the most agreements carried out collectively [13]

3) Decision making procedures in schools

The data says that if board members work as partners (54.8%), have open rights in general (40.9%), receive working decisions (1.6%), the results of decisions on the recommendations of principals (2.8%). These show that SBM adjusted on the school runs [1]

The ways in which decisions are made are a reflection of the partnership being the main characteristic of developing schools more effectively. Partnership in balance triggers participation and respect for one another [14]

4) The quality of the decision making process

School committee members assume that they have represented all interests judging good (73.4%), very good (13.1%), thinking very well (8.7%), bad (2.2%) [1].

The results of qualitative and quantitative research are in line. The school committee (95% of the 42 member) explicitly states that decisions made at schools refer to the rules of the central government. The regulation covers the vision, mission, goals, textbooks, building construction, and renovations,

teacher's house, recruitment of teachers who are paid by the school.

Decisions are made based on consensus (88.1% 37 respondents). Before the SBM era, all authority came from the center including staff, curriculum, textbooks, and assets. The district government is responsible for building improvements and maintenance. This has all been delegated to the school. This area of authority has been legally delegated to the school level since the implementation of SBM.

The teacher considers the transfer of authority to the school to manage resources in order to create openness, democratization, transparency, and accountability. It is true that schools have received decentralization with a large amount of power and obligation for the decisions regarding the allotment of the assets in setting objectives, guidelines, benchmark, and accountability [14].

This response shows that the power on the board has initiated changes in the school. Effective SBM schools share authority throughout the school so more elements participate in the decision formulation. At the village elementary schools, parents' representatives said that the school leaders always involved board members to make shared decision [15].

This data shows that the school board has not neglected the formulation of participatory decisions. This further heads on the parents' involvement and the broader citizen through their representation on the school committee. Participation shows ownership of decisions, takes responsibility, and is committed to the actual implementation of those decisions. Together both researchers and policy makers point out that one of the main objectives of SBM application is to increase stakeholder involvement in school governance and management, which leads to increased sense of belonging and engagements [26, 9, 20]. Referring to the interview of the more than 10 years of qualitative research where they involved more than 500 participants in the United States, Canada, and Australia, it was confirmed that the most successful SBM schools showed the system and creativity in their efforts to communicate with parents and the public [18].

B. Findings Regarding Research Questions 2

Based on a brief literature review on SBM in Indonesian schools, the problem faced is the problem in implementing SBM and the problem in accordance with the location of the school.

1) Problems implementing SBM

Concerning to the shortage of professional appropriateness principals development, respondents agreed as many 55.6%, strongly agreed 41.7%. As many 60.5% agree, 36.9% strongly agree, and 23.6% less agreed said that the problem is shortage of facilities. There are 86% of respondents agree (51.4%) or strongly agree (16.9%) if the problem of implementing SBM is the lack of limited knowledge, while 64% of them agree (40.7%) or strongly agree (23.4%)) said insufficient funding was a problem faced in implementing SBM [1].

However, there were 62.5% disagreed, 54.0% strongly disagreed, and 8.5% that parental participation was inadequate. Most of the 72.6% of respondents disagree with 65.9% or

strongly disagree with 6.7% if weaknesses in authority in the decision are a problem. In addition, 63.1% of respondents disagree with 58.3% or strongly disagree with 4.8% coordination difficulties are a problem, while 60.1% disagree 57.1% or strongly disagree 3.0% no clarity of role between the principal and the school committee [1].

2) Problems according to school location

The Chi-Square Test study aimed at looking at differences between urban and rural school committee members differed in opinion on the problem of implementing SBM. This study shows that there are no statistically significant differences.

TABLE I.   CHI-SQUARE STUDY OF SBM PROBLEMS

Problems	Chi-sq.	N	P
Shortage of knowledge in SBM	0.96	440	.80
poorly trained teacher	3,70	439	.29
inadequate finance	5.76	440	.12
Shortage of school facilities	5.51	441	.13
Shortage of professionalism development needs of the principal	5,13	437	.16
Shortage of clarity of role between the principal and the school board	3,76	442	.28
inadequate parental participation	4.15	441	.24
Shortage the need for authority to make decisions	2.83	442	.41

a. Chi-square study of SBM problems [1]

The data shows that the respondents in general agreed or strongly agreed if the constrains encountered in implementing SBM were caused by shortage of knowledge in SBM 70.4% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed, financial incapability of 66.7% agreed or strongly agreed, teachers were poorly trained 65.2% respondents agreed or strongly agreed, shortage of school facilities 60.3% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed), and lack of shortage of professionalism development needs of the principal 57.0% agreed or strongly agreed [1].

However, statistic shows significance in the respondents' opinions on problems related to adjustment difficulties: Chi-Sq. = 8.61, N = 441, p = 0.03. As many as 44.2% of urban respondents agreed 38.0% of strongly agreed 6.2% that difficulty in adjustment was one of the problems faced in implementing SBM, compared to 34.3% of respondents from schools in rural areas agreed (27.1 %) or strongly agree (7.1%). This shows that problems relating to adjustment difficulties are more likely to be faced by school board members in urban areas than school committee in villages.

The data told that in similar study was the problems expressed, such as Cox (2003) [25] ran a meta-analysis in an effort to assess the concepts and practices of SBM in the United States context. He reported that the problems faced by the council were mainly because the council was given responsibility, but they were shortage of confidence or were incompetent to run this responsibility. Therefore, the main hindrances faced are, *first*, the shortage of knowledge about school regulation on the part of the newly council format because of uncertified staff, and the parents and students in school funds, assets, personnel, regulation issues, and others. *Second*, the shortage of community process skills such as skills for group decision making, problems resolution needed in developing effective work community. *Third*, the shortage of

clarity in each roles, it is unclear whether the council's role is as an advisory body and whether they have decision-making power in every aspects of school administration or only some aspects of them [19].

Other experts point out the many problems faced by leaders and school committee in implementing SBM, including lack of schools' resources, limitation of books, limitation professional improvement in leadership and misunderstanding on the part of school committee in the relation to roles and new authority, difficulty in adjustment, limitation in of decision-making power, shortage of knowledge, low parent involvement, shortage of governmental budgeting, reliance on central government, and time shortage [20], [21]. Researchers also report that time is the main hindrance in implementing SBM [22], [23]. Time was a constraint to teachers because they were required to spare extra time to the school board. In contrast to this finding, respondents in this study like to devote extra time with the school board [24].

C. Findings Regarding Research Questions 3

The problem-solving strategy is based on a brief literature review on SBM in Indonesian schools from Google's Scholar search. More than 90% of respondents agreed as much as 31.0% or strongly agreed 59.5% if the respondents had the opportunity to get advice and reinforcement school stakeholders. The principal agreed as much as 33.3% or 66.7% strongly agreed if the school leader and staff needed to discuss to come to an agreement on the ways to implement changes collaboratively, and the school leader considered he was as a part of member team. Likewise, every school leader agreed as much as 42.9% or 57.1% strongly agreed if the skill to delegate power was an important one for principals. Although the work had to be more and more significantly from starting in the implementation of SBM 73.8%, the majority of as many 88.1% agreed, 61.9% or strongly agreed 26.2% that there were quite a number of provisions to be seeking help reduce their workload [1].

Leadership training and management education, workshops on SBM, training of strategic planning, and all principals (100%) needed regular professional development of those four areas. In addition, 85.7% of training to be literate computer and typing skill and 78.6% training of decision-making participation was the most needed by school principals [1].

Scholars stated that in order to exhibit the role of the principals in executing SBM they need to attend to programs of training and professional development [25-28]. It is advantageous for principals to obtain generic skill in human resource management, materials, and finance and information technology, as well as in strategic planning, program administration, marketing, problem-solving, and negotiation. [29].

All principals need leadership training and management education, workshops in SBM, training of comprehensive planning, and timely professional development. School principals also need training support in training of decision-making participation and training to be literate computer and typing skill.

V. CONCLUSION

SBM can facilitate practitioners in 1) involvement of school committees in strategic decisions including mission, vision, goals, building renovations, budgets, new buildings, learning programs, and activities, maintenance of school buildings, student discipline policies, managing canteens, managing fundraising, choosing the teacher, chooses the principal, chooses administrative staff, chooses textbooks, curriculum development. 2) Problems encountered include inadequate parental participation, shortage of power to make decision, difficulties in adjustment, overlapping of roles school principals and school boards, limitation of appropriate professional development for school leaders, shortage of school tools, illiterate of knowledge, school finance. 3) Creativity includes seeking advice and support from other school stakeholders, principals and staff together discussing and agreeing on strategies to implement change collaboratively, principals consider themselves to be team members, delegating authority, and adequate provisions for seeking help to reduce workload.

REFERENCES

[1] Bandur, A. (2012). School-based management developments and partnership: Evidence from Indonesia. International Journal of Educational Development, 32(2), 316-328.

[2] Ulfatin, N., Mukhadis, A., & Imron, A. (2016). Profil Wajib Belajar 9 Tahun dan Alternatif Penuntasannya. Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 17(1).

[3] Hanson, E. M. (1991). School-Based Management and Educational Reform: Cases in the USA and Spain.

[4] Bandur, A. (2007). A Review of Developments in School-Based Management in Indonesia. In: Institute of Indonesia Tenggara Studies, Working Paper.

[5] Tang, S. Y. F. (2011). Teachers' professional identity, educational change and neo-liberal pressures on education in Hong Kong. Teacher Development, 15(3), 363-380.

[6] Undang-Undang RI No. 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional, (2003).

[7] Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 38 Tahun 2007 tentang Pembagian Urusan Pemerintahan antara Pemerintah, Pemerintahan Daerah Provinsi, dan Pemerintahan Daerah Provinsi, dan Pemerintahan Daerah Kabupaten/Kota,

[8] Permendiknas RI Nomor 22 Tahun 2006 tentang Standar Isi untuk Satuan Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, (2006a).

[9] Permendiknas RI Nomor 23 Tahun 2006 tentang Standar Kompetensi Lulusan untuk Satuan

[10] Heystek, J. (2007). Reflecting on principals as managers of moulded leaders in a managerialistic school system. South African Journal of Education, 27(3), 491-506.

[11] Everard, K. B., Morris, G., & Wilson, I. (2004). Effective school management: Sage.

[12] Gamage, D. (2006b). School-based management: shared responsibility and quality in education. Education and society, 24(1), 27-43.

[13] Bandur, A. (2009). The implementation of school-based management in Indonesia: Creating conflicts in regional levels. Journal of NTT studies, 1(1), 16-27.

[14] Caldwell, B. J. (2002). Autonomy and Self-Management: Concepts and Evidence.

[15] Daresh, J. C. (1998). Professional development for school leadership: The impact of US educational reform. International Journal of Educational Research, 29(4), 323-333.

[16] Brown, B. R., & Cooper, G. R. (2000). School-based management: how effective is it? NASSP bulletin, 84(616), 77-85.

[17] Gamage, D. (2005). School-based management leads to shared responsibility and quality in education. Curriculum and Teaching, 20(1), 61-77.

[18]

[19] Gamage, D., Adams, D., & McCormack, A. (2009). How Does a School Leader's Role Influence Student Achievements? A Review of Research Findings and Best Practices. International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 4(1), n1.

[20] Gamage, D. T., & Zajda, J. (2009). Decentralisation and school-based governance: A comparative study of self-governing school models. In Decentralisation, school-based management, and quality (pp. 3-22): Springer.

[21] Maksymjuk, I. (2001). Talking school-based management: Discourses of educational reform.

[22] De Grauwe, A. (2004). School based management (SBM): Does it improve quality? Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005, The Quality Imperative. In: Paris: UNESCO.

[23] Schlegel, J. A. (2000). A Descriptive Case Study of Site-based-management in a Small Urban School District in Southcentral Pennsylvania. Temple University,

[24] Hoque, K. E., Alam, G. M., Ariff, M. R. B. M., Mishra, P. K., & Rabby, T. G. (2011). Site-based management: Impact of leaders roles on institutional improvement. African Journal of Business Management, 5(9), 3623-3629.

[25] Bandur, A., & Gamage, D. T. (2009). SBM policies and programs: Improving teaching-learning environments and student achievements in Indonesia. Education and society, 27(1), 51-75.

[26] Earley, P. (2003). Leaders or followers? Governing bodies and their role in school leadership. Educational management & administration, 31(4), 353-367.

[27] Shoraku, A. (2009). Educational movement toward school-based management in East Asia: Cambodia, Indonesia and Thailand. Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report.

[28] Verhoeven, J. C., & Van Heddegem, I. (1999). Parents' representatives in the new participatory school council in Belgium (Flanders). Educational management & administration, 27(4), 415-429.

[29] Gamage, D. (2006a). Professional development for leaders and managers of self-governing schools: Springer Science & Business Media.

School Based Management

14%

SIMILARITY INDEX

PRIMARY SOURCES

1   www.scribd.com
    Internet   89 words — 2%

2   eprints.uny.ac.id
    Internet   85 words — 2%

3   ro.ecu.edu.au
    Internet   82 words — 2%

4   globaljournals.org
    Internet   81 words — 2%

5   www.edujournal.org
    Internet   38 words — 1%

6   "Professional Development for Leaders and Managers
    of Self-Governing Schools", Springer Science and   28 words — 1%
    Business Media LLC, 2006
    Crossref

7   libdr1.ied.edu.hk
    Internet   27 words — 1%

8   "Decentralisation, School-Based Management, and
    Quality", Springer Science and Business Media   21 words — < 1%
    LLC, 2009
    Crossref

9   Hossein Dargahi, Mandana Shirazi, Seyed Amir
    Yazdanparast. "Interprofessional Learning: the   18 words — < 1%
    Attitudes of Medical, Nursing and Pharmacy Students to Shared
    Learning at Tehran University of Medical Sciences", Thrita Journal

of Medical Sciences, 2012
Crossref

10 unesdoc.unesco.org
    Internet   17 words — < 1%

11 researchonline.jcu.edu.au
    Internet   17 words — < 1%

12 Usman, Ravik Karsidi, Baedhowi, Sajidan. "The
    success of integrated education: Implementation of   16 words — < 1%
    education policies and management in special services", AIP
    Publishing, 2019
    Crossref

13 eprints.uad.ac.id
    Internet   16 words — < 1%

14 Agustinus Bandur. "School-based management
    developments: challenges and impacts", Journal of   14 words — < 1%
    Educational Administration, 2012
    Crossref

15 hdl.handle.net
    Internet   12 words — < 1%

16 www.infodasar.com
    Internet   12 words — < 1%

17 "International Handbook of School Effectiveness
    and Improvement", Springer Science and Business   12 words — < 1%
    Media LLC, 2007
    Crossref

18 www.aua.ac.uk
    Internet   10 words — < 1%

19 www.onderwijssociologie.be
    Internet   10 words — < 1%

20 eprints.mdx.ac.uk
    Internet   9 words — < 1%

21 DHONY PRASTYO NUGROHO, ARI KUNCARA WIDAGDO, PAYAMTA PAYAMTA. "DETEMINANTS OF RELIABILITY OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF SCHOOL OPERATIONAL GRANT: INDONESIAN EVIDENCE", Management and Accounting Review (MAR), 2019
Crossref

9 words — < 1%

22 researchbank.acu.edu.au
Internet

9 words — < 1%

23 www.neliti.com
Internet

8 words — < 1%

24 www.education.wa.edu.au
Internet

8 words — < 1%

25 Hasan Hariri, Richard Monypenny, Murray Prideaux. "Principalship in an Indonesian school context: can principal decision-making styles significantly predict teacher job satisfaction?", School Leadership & Management, 2012
Crossref

8 words — < 1%

26 Ayeni, Adeolu Joshua, and Williams Olusola Ibukun. "A Conceptual Model for School-Based Management Operation and Quality Assurance in Nigerian Secondary Schools", Journal of Education and Learning, 2013.
Crossref

8 words — < 1%

27 studentsrepo.um.edu.my
Internet

8 words — < 1%

28 TUNÇ, Binali, BÜLBÜL, Tuncer and ÖZDEM, Güven. "Okul Temelli yönetim girişimlerinin niteliğini anlamaya yönelik bir çalışma", TUBITAK, 2012.
Publications

8 words — < 1%

29 "Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2002
Crossref

7 words — < 1%

30 "International Handbook of Teachers and Teaching", Springer

Nature, 1997
Crossref

6 words — < 1%

31 Amaliah Fitriah, Bambang Sumintono, Nanang Bagus
Subekti, Zainudin Hassan. "A different result of
community participation in education: an Indonesian case study of
parental participation in public primary schools", Asia Pacific
Education Review, 2013
Crossref

6 words — < 1%