

Reinforcement of School-based Management in Indonesia

Hadiyanto

Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education,
Universitas Negeri Padang
Padang, Indonesia
hadiyanto@fip.unp.ac.id

Abstract— More Experts of management acknowledge that school-based management (SBM) can spur all the potential to become a school that performs better in improving the quality of graduates, increasing the opportunity for local governments to participate in decision making, improving the quality of teachers who in turn can improve student achievement. However, the implementation in schools shows that SBM in Indonesia still contains negative signs both in the levels of education managers in districts/cities, principals and teachers, and even stakeholders in the community. The implementation of school-based management is not yet fully in accordance with the mandate of existing laws, namely autonomy, cooperation, participatory, transparency, and accountability. In accordance with the direction and spirit of education reform and the implementation of a more democratic and decentralized education to schools, more fundamental efforts are needed in accordance with the demands of the development of science and technology to sharpen leadership and supervision carried out by principals, and increase the role of school committees and the local government in implementing SBM consistently.

Keywords—*reinforcement; school-based management; autonomy; community participation*

I. INTRODUCTION

The improvement of the quality of human resources in education is an effort implemented by the Indonesian government continuously. However, these efforts to date are still reaping criticism. Based on the UNDP record, the Human Development Index (HDI) of Indonesia is still fluctuative compare to other country such as Thailand (0.740), Malaysia (0.789), Brunei Darussalam (0.865), and Singapore (0.925) (UNDP, 2016). Based on that information, it is understood that the HDI of Indonesia from 1980 continues to rise above Vietnam and Philipine, nevertheless it reminds below Thailand, Malaysia and Singapore.

There are some problems and challenges facing the Indonesian government in the implementation of education, including: 1) low quality and accountability of governments, 2) educational management has not been effective and efficient, and 3) the educational budget is not yet adequately available [1]. In addition, the quality of education is strongly influenced by the cost of education provided by the government [2].

Several efforts actually have been made by the Indonesian Government, such as improving legislation in education, updating national curriculum, increasing the educational budget, improving and complementing educational facilities, improving the quality of educator and educational staff. In addition, the Indonesia government has also improved the quality of educational management, especially in the autonomy and decentralization of education management to education unit [1].

Some experts argued that SBM has long effect to teacher commitment [3], effective school-support system, regular information, and motivational element of the school principal[4], and other requirements [5], it was actually implemented in Canada, Australia in 1970 [6], Hongkong [7], Chile, China, Germany, Poland, Russia, Uganda, and Zimbabwe [8], and in the USA, New Zealand began in the 1980s[9]. SBM is also believed as a way to improve student achievement[10], and takes at least administrative control, professional, community, and equal control[11]. SBM is also believed as a way to increase of involvement of teachers, students, officials, principals, parents. In addition, it also increases the independency, responsibility and accountability of school [12]. In Indonesia, SBM was introduced in 1999, on quality based management improvement using national subsidy of quality management operational assistance [13] called MPMBS, as a forerunner of SBM implementation in Indonesia [14].

Implementation of school-based management in Indonesia was juridically implemented in 2003 based on article 51 of constitution No. 20 of 2003 and Article 49 of the Government Regulation No. 19 of 2005 [13], [15]. The policy expects to spur schools to improve academic achievement and non-academic learners by utilizing all the potential owned stakeholders. The approach used in the implementation of this SBM is through a school (community approach), and through the District Education Office/City (district approach) [16]. Implementation of this SBM has actually shown positive indications because of SBM can spur the potential schools to become better performing school [17]. Most (56.28%) of piloting implementation of SBM are known to be implemented with good management despite the poor economic conditions and 30.34% implemented with good management even in economic conditions [18]. There was no different perception about the importance of school-based management between junior and senior school principals [19].

In the international context, that SBM can: 1) improve the quality of graduates, 2) increase the opportunity for local decision [20], 3) improving the effectiveness and efficiency of financing [21], thus according [22], [23], can increase the quality of educators, which will turn improve the achievement of learners. When the school principal is given more authority or autonomy to manage a school, he/she will manage better school later [24].

Eventhough some argues positively to support the implementation of SBM, some others such as ERIC Development Team [25], and Caldwell still show findings that have not fully support the SBM [26]. At individual school level, the readiness of school principals, teachers and parents seems to be the core of the question [7] and lacked clarity [27]. Some findings show that SBM in Indonesia is need further improvement such as Bandur pointed out that the implementation of SBM in Indonesia still creates problems [28], the role of school committees is still limited to community relations, school facilities [29]. Furthermore, some school principals reported that they had the autonomy to make decisions, however they did not make significant changes [30]. In addition, autonomy is measured only as perceived by principals, without attention to the perspectives of stakeholders [31].

Since the year of 2003, the Indonesian government actually has introduced and developed school-based management through several efforts, for example the program of International Standard School (*Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional*), National Standard School (*Sekolah Standard Nasional*) and the Program of School-Based Quality Improvement Program (*Program Peningkatan Mutu Berbasis Sekolah*) [32]. The Directorate of Junior Secondary School, Ministry of National Education has also implemented school-based quality improvement program (*Program Peningkatan Mutu Berbasis Sekolah/PPMBS*) since 2005 to 2015. It was adapted from Regional Education Development and Improvement Program (REDIP) preceded by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) PPMBS involved the public and private Junior Secondary Schools in several cities around Jakarta [33]. Unfortunately, almost all program initiated by the central government do not have sustainable programs and finished when the grand disconnected.

The implementation of School-Based Management in Indonesia is actually based on mandate of constitution No. 20 of 2003, and the other derivative regulations. The command to implement SBM is for all Indonesian public and private schools. This also means that all schools in Indonesia have to implement the principles of School Based Management as mandated in legislation.

Based on the phenomenon and the regulation on educational management arised above, it is necessary to study develop and find out the strategy to implement School-Based Management from the role of education managers at central or national, provincial, district/sub district, foundation, and school or institutional levels, and the of community board, and school committee and other agents to help better educational management.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Law Reinforcement

The Indonesian government has actually regulated the implementation of education with the school-based management model officially since 2003 with the issuance of Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the national education system in article 51. From this article it is known that the management of education in Indonesia is carried out based on minimum service standards with Principles of school / madrasah-based management (SBM), based on the principles of autonomy, accountability, quality assurance, and transparent evaluation. Furthermore, Government Regulation number 19 of 2005 concerning Article 49 of the National Education Standards mandates that SBM is indicated by the existence of independence, partnership, participation, openness and accountability in the implementation of education in schools.

Government Regulation Number 17 of 2010 is a derivative regulation that regulates further the implementation of education in Indonesia. This regulation describes the tasks and functions played by the central government, provincial government, district / city government, education providers established by the community, as well as the tasks carried out by each level of the education unit.

Furthermore, the Minister of Education and Culture Regulation No. 75 of 2016 concerning the school committee regulates further about the participation that can be carried out by stakeholders and the community in the implementation of education in Indonesia.

These regulations actually have been clear, and the tasks assigned by each level in organizing education in accordance with the spirit of school-based management are divided. However, in practice, the issuance of the national education system law and its derivatives to regulate school-based management does not necessarily mean that SBM can be implemented optimally, and even impressed that there is a lack of consistency between the regulations of the central government and regional governments in administering education.

For example, not all regions provide additional BOS funds from the local government, which is even more alarming, Ministry of Education and Culture's Regulation No. 44 of 2012 which regulates the difference between fees and contributions to education costs at the primary level is not popular, because then all the funds provided by the community to schools considered and even charged as levies. These facts make people confused to participate in the implementation of education, so that the principal takes a safe path not to move the community to participate in the implementation of education. The Ministry of Education and Culture's Regulation No. 75 of 2016 concerning the School Committee further regulates the duties of the school committee to become a partner of the principal in the implementation of education in schools.

B. School Leadership

Principal leadership is the main factor that can drive all the potential of the school to carry out school management in achieving educational goals. With regard to school-based management, the effective leadership of the principal is with a participative leadership model. It assumes that the process of group decision-making as the central focus of the group. This model is underpinned by three assumptions that: 1) Participation of the group members will increase school effectiveness. 2) Participation of the group is justified by democratic decision. 3) School leadership is potentially available to any legitimate stakeholders [34]. This means that the participatory leadership of principals will always get the support of stakeholders who have taken the same decision to implement school-based management.

Participatory leadership is demonstrated by persuasive steps, creating cooperation, growing loyalty and participation of subordinates. The leader motivates the subordinates to have a school institution, so that school residents are asked to participate in the decision-making process by providing information, suggestions and considerations, as well as being open to subordinates [35].

By implementing participatory leadership, it is expected that principals can get support from various parties involved in the school or stakeholders because they have jointly participated in the decision-making process, and they will implement it optimally. The results of the study [36] show that participatory leadership has a very strong influence (56%) and is significant both partially and simultaneously towards the implementation of management in schools. In addition, it also influences employee performance [35]. It can be interpreted that the better participatory leadership, the more effective implementation of school management. Optimal leadership will improve the performance of principals, and the performance of principals will also influence the success of SBM in schools [37].

To carry out participatory leadership certainly must be supported by the condition that the principal must be able to become a central figure that ensures the success of the organization in achieving the expected goals. As a leader, the principal must be able to be an example or role model for subordinates in every work activity and interaction that is carried out. The principal must be able to be a role model for school citizens if they want active involvement of all components in the school.

C. Improving the Community Participation

Indonesian society is a society that has good character to jointly build education. The role of the community in the implementation of education is an indicator that always exists [38] and is enhanced in school-based management. In other countries such as Iran, increasing involvement of parents, students, teachers, employees, principals and groups with an interest in the community is claimed to be able to increase the independence, responsibility and accountability of the school [12]. However, it should be emphasized that principals must carry out the task transparently and accountably [39].

In Indonesia, community participation in the administration of education has actually been regulated in the Article 54 of the National Education System Law which states that individuals, groups, families, professional organizations, employers, and community organizations can participate in the implementation and quality control of educational services [40]. The community is also represented in the Board of Education and the School Committee, so that Ministry of Education and Culture Number 75 of 2016 concerning the school committee article 3 states that the school committee is tasked with raising funds and other educational resources from the community, both individuals / organizations / businesses / industries and other stakeholders through creative and innovative efforts [41]. The role of the school committee is still lacking and needs to be improved by improving the institutional committee of the school [42].

Although the laws and regulations clearly regulate the participation of the community in the administration of education, excessive campaigns about free education cause the community to be passive and do not even want to know to succeed in the implementation of optimal education. As a result, the principal has become apathetic to mobilize the community to contribute to the implementation of education.

Community participation is not all in the form of funds, but can be in the form of expertise, energy, thoughts, supervision or other diverse contributions. For example, Wiratno's research shows that community participation can take the form of financial / material ideas, ideas or ideas for people who have more levels of education thinking and insight, and participation in forms of prayer [43]. For this reason, several efforts can be made by school principals to mobilize community participation in the implementation of school-based education or management, namely: (1) offering the imposition of sanctions on people who do not participate in school administration; (2) offering prizes to the people who participate in the implementation of the school; (3) conducting persuasion that the participation of the community in the implementation of education will benefit the community itself; (4) inviting the community to participate in the management of schools through various activities offered by the school; (5) promising community participation with better school services; (6) mobilizing community leaders who have many followers to participate in school activities; (7) convincing the public that there are many interests they get well if they participate in the implementation of education in schools [43]. For example, parents of students can build mosques in a school to reach a value of 3.9 billion rupiah (https://megapolitan.kompas.com/read/2016/08/04/12554161/masjid_sekolah.senilai.rp.3.9.miliar.dibangun.dari.sumbangan.orang.tua.siswa).

In addition to various types of participation, community participation in the management of education can also be tiered, such as stairs from the bottom up. The classification was put forward by Arnstein, named "The Ladder of Citizen Participation" or popular with "The Arnstein's Ladder". At Nonparticipation level is Manipulation, and Therapy. At the tokenism level there are Informing, Consultation, Placation. While the next level includes: Partnership, Delegated Power and Citizen Control [44]. The classification is a popular role

model for experts about community participation in the field of education to date [45].

In its implementation in schools, community members must have variations in giving optimal participation to the school. For this reason, the principal's job is to collaborate with school committees so that community members or parents of students can increase their level of participation in assisting in the provision of education in schools.

III. CONCLUSION

The conclusion of the discussion that needs to be emphasized in this article is as follows. Although the Indonesian government has begun implementing school-based management since the issuance of the national education system law, this implementation compared to other developed countries is still relatively new. Therefore, the implementation of SBM in Indonesia is not as optimal as in other countries that have implemented SBM earlier.

The problems that arise in the implementation of SBM in Indonesia are not solely due to the inability of the principal in the implementation of education, but also because not all laws and policy-making officials have the same vision about SBM.

There are at least three efforts that can be done to uphold the implementation of SBM in Indonesia, namely: 1) synchronizing derivative regulations and local government policies related to education with legislation from the central government; 2) Improve participatory leadership in schools by empowering school committees; and 3) Increasing community participation from non-participatory levels to the level of providing control over the implementation of education in schools.

Acknowledgment

In writing this article the author got some kindly services from various parties, for this reason the author needs to thank Yulianto Santoso, S.Pd. M.Pd, Dr. Suryadi, Dr. Siti Zulaikha, M.Pd. on their approval the author gets a very relevant source to the substance of this article. The author also thanks Dr. Umaedi, and Siswantari, M.Pd. because the book that we wrote can be used as the main reference in writing this article. Hopefully their inspiring ideas will get rewards worthy of Allah SWT. Amien.

References

- [1] D. Nandika, *Pendidikan di tengah gelombang perubahan*. Jakarta: LP3ES, 2007.
- [2] Supriyoko, *Pendidikan manusia Indonesia*. Jakarta: Kompas, 2004.
- [3] A. E. Nir, "School-based management and its effect on teacher commitment," *Int. J. Leadersh. Educ.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 323–341, 2002.
- [4] A. De Grauwe, "Improving the quality of education through school-based management: Learning from international experiences," *Int. Rev. Educ.*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 269–287, 2005.
- [5] P. Wohlstetter and A. Odden, "Rethinking school-based management policy and research," *Educ. Adm. Q.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 529–549, 1992.

- [6] I. Abu-Duhou, *School based management*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1999.
- [7] H. Yu, "Implementation of school-based management in Hong Kong: Recent development and future challenges," *J. Educ. Chang.*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 253–275, 2005.
- [8] Y.-C. Cheng, *School Effectiveness & School-based Management, a Mechanisme for Development*. London: Falmer Press, 1996.
- [9] L. Brady, *Curriculum development*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1992.
- [10] N. Khattri, C. Ling, and S. Jha, "No Title," *J. Dev. Eff.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 277–295, 2012.
- [11] K. Leithwood and T. Menzies, "Forms and effects of school-based management: A review," *Educ. policy*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 325–346, 1998.
- [12] S. Moradi, S. Bin Hussin, and N. Barzegar, "School-Based Management (SBM), Opportunity or Threat (Education systems of Iran)," *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 69, no. Iceepsy, pp. 2143–2150, 2012.
- [13] Umaedi, Hadiyanto, and Siswantari, *Manajemen berbasis sekolah*. Jakarta: Universitas Terbuka, 2015.
- [14] Kemdiknas, *Era mutu sekolah menengah pertama*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional, 2010.
- [15] Hadiyanto, *Mencari sosok desentralisasi manajemen pendidikan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2004.
- [16] B. Indriyanto, "School-based management: issues and hopes toward decentralisation in education in Indonesia," in *the Third International Forum on Education Reform: Education Decentralization Revised: School Based Management*, 2003, pp. 1–20.
- [17] I. Arifin, *Strategi dan implementasi desentralisasi pendidikan di sekolah dasar: studi kasus MI Jenderal Sudirman Malang*. Malang: Dinas Pendidikan Kota Malang, 2002.
- [18] Umaedi, *Manajemen mutu berbasis sekolah/madrasah (MMBS/M), mengelola pendidikan dalam era masyarakat berubah*. Jakarta: Center for Education Quality Management, 2004.
- [19] J. F. Kaunang, "Persepsi Kepala Sekolah tentang Pelaksanaan Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah pada Sekolah Dasar Negeri di Kecamatan Dimembe Kabupaten Minahasa Utara," *J. Forum Pendidik.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 26–36, 2018.
- [20] H. Watson, *Report on evaluation of school based management*. ACT Department of Education and Training.
- [21] P. Coleman, "Improving schools by school-based management," *McGill J. Educ.*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1984.
- [22] T. A. Rodriguez and J. R. Slate, *Site-Based Management: A Review of the Literature*. Kansas City: University of Missouri.
- [23] Ogundele J. A. and M. A. Adelabu, "Improving pupils quality through community advocacy: the role of school-based management committee," *J. Int. Soc. Res.*, vol. 2, no. 8, 2009.
- [24] S. Ghavifekr, S. Hussin, and M. F. A. Ghani, "The process of Malaysian smart school policy cycle: a qualitative analysis," *J. Res. Reflections Educ.*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2011.
- [25] E. D. Team, "School-Based Management and Student Performance," *ERIC Digest*.
- [26] B. J. Caldwell, *School-based Management*. Paris: The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), 2005.
- [27] B. Sumintono, "School-Based Management Policy and Its Practices at District Level in the Post New order Indonesia," *J. Indones. Soc. Sci. Humanit.*, vol. 2, pp. 41–67, 2009.

- [28] A. Bandur, "The implementation of school-based management in Indonesia: creating conflicts in regional levels," *J. NTT Stud.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 16–27, 2009.
- [29] D. Chen, *School-based management, school decision-making and education outcomes in Indonesian primary schools*. 2011.
- [30] G. Vernez, R. Karam, and J. H. Marshall, *Implementation of School-Based Management in Indonesia*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2012.
- [31] Y. C. Cheng, J. Ko, and T. T. H. Lee, "School autonomy, leadership and learning: a reconceptualisation," *Int. J. Educ. Manag.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 177–196, 2016.
- [32] Kemdiknas, *Pembangunan pendidikan dasar di Indonesia: menuju pendidikan untuk semua*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional, 2011.
- [33] Direktorat-Pembinaan-SMP, *Informasi program*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud, 2015.
- [34] T. Bush, *Leadership and Management Development in Education*. Los Angeles: Sage, 2008.
- [35] P. D. Insan and A. Yuniawan, "Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Partisipatif, Lingkungan Kerja, Kompensasi dan Budaya Organisasi terhadap Kinerja Karyawan," *J. Manage.*, vol. 5, no. 2007, pp. 1–13, 2016.
- [36] A. Lestari, "Pengaruh kepemimpinan partisipatif dan komitmen organisasi terhadap efektifitas implementasi rencana strategik pada madrasah aliyah di kabupaten sukabumi jawa barat," *J. Adm. Pendidik.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 114–129, 2016.
- [37] N. H. Putri and U. B. Wibowo, "Pengaruh Kinerja Kepala Sekolah terhadap Keberhasilan Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah melalui Partisipasi Masyarakat di SMP," *J. Akuntabilitas Manaj. Pendidik.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 45–59, 2018.
- [38] Hadiyanto, Y. Santoso, Suryadi, and S. Zulaikha, "Autonomy And Community Participation On The Implementation Of School- Based Management In The City Of South Tangerang," *Adv. Soc. Sci. Educ. Humanit. Res.*, vol. 118, pp. 1126–1131, 2017.
- [39] D. Boy and H. Siringoringo, "Analisis Pengaruh Akuntabilitas Dan Transparansi Pengelolaan Anggaran Pendapatan Dan Belanja Sekolah (APBS) Terhadap Partisipasi Orang Tua Murid," *J. Ekon. Bisnis*, vol. 14, no. 12, pp. 79–87, 2009.
- [40] Republik-Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*. 2003.
- [41] Kemendikbud, *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan No. 75 Tahun 2016 Tentang Komite Sekolah*. Indonesia, 2016.
- [42] M. P. Pradhan, D. Suryadarma, A. Beatty, M. Wong, A. Alishjabana, A. Gaduh, and R. Prama Artha, "Improving Educational Quality Through Enhancing Community Participation: Results from a Randomized Field Experiment in Indonesia," *Am. Econ. J. Appl. Econ.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 105–126, 2014.
- [43] B. Wiratno, "Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pendidikan," *J. Pendidik. Ilmu Sos.*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 28–34, 2016.
- [44] S. R. Arnstein, "A Ladder Of Citizen Participation," *J. Am. Plan. Assoc.*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 216–224, 1969.
- [45] B. M. Theyyan, "Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation a Critical Discussion," *Asian Acad. Res. J. Multidiscip.*, vol. 2, no. 7, 2018.