

Implementation of School Based Management in Creating Effective Schools

Teguh Sihono

Faculty of Economics

Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia

Email: sihonoteguh@yahoo.com

Rohaila Yusof

Faculty of Management and Economics

University Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia

Abstract

School effectiveness refers to the capacity of the schools to maximize its function. It reflects the extent to which the schools can perform their core functions such as technical and economics, human and social, political, culture, and educational. The effectiveness of the schools shows effective school performance in order to improve the quality of education. There are eight models of school effectiveness that places emphasis on each different aspect to the dynamic process of the school in an effective struggle for survival. School Based Management is a form of some formal decision making authority in planning for the schools' main functional areas such as budget planning, personnel and programs. The decision making in these areas is delegated to and often distributed among site-level actors. Some formal structure (council, committee, team, board) often composed of principals, teachers, parents and at time, students, and community residents is created so that site participants can be directly involves in wide school decision making. School-based management with sufficient autonomy, ownership and flexibility in functioning schools can provide the conditions necessary and the dynamic to facilitate the schools to achieve their goals and maximize the effectiveness in the long run.

Keywords: School effectiveness, school management, school performance.

1. Introduction

There have been many efforts to improve the quality of education at the primary level but the results are not so encouraging. From various studies and direct observations in the field, the analysis shows (i.e. Abrar et al., 2010) that there are at least three factors that lead to quality education have not improved equally. First, the policy of national education-oriented educational output (output) is too focused on inputs (input) and less attention on the educational process. Second, the provision of education is done centrally. This leads to high dependency on the decision of the central bureaucracy and policy often too general and lack of touches or less according to circumstances and conditions of local schools. In addition, anything that is too regulated lead organizer of school loss of independence, initiative, and creativity. This caused the effort and resources to develop or enhance service quality and outcomes of education become less motivated. Third, the role of the community, especially parents of students in educational administration had only limited financial support. Yet their participation is crucial in the processes of education, among others, decision making, monitoring, evaluation, and accountability. On the basis of these considerations, there should be a reorientation of the provision of education through School-Based Management.

This working paper aims primarily at describing how the implementation of SBM policies and program in creating effective school. This working paper, then first of all provides the theoretical concepts of school based management and effective school. Like so many term in the educational lesion, school based management has a variety of definitions. In some instances, SBM documents note that such ambiguity is intentional based on the belief that school level actors should determine how SBM program will operate.

School Based Management means that school management task are set according to the characteristic and needs of the school itself and therefore school members (including board of directors, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents and students, etc.) have a much greater autonomy and responsibility for the use a resources to solve problem and carry out effective education activities, for the long term development of the school” (Cheng, 2000)

According to the opinion of Wohlstetter and Mohrman (1996) “School Based Management can be viewed conceptually as formal alterations of governance structures, as a form of decentralization that identifies the individual school as the primary unit of improvement and relies on the redistribution of decision-making authority as the primary means through which improvements might be stimulated and sustained.

School-based management can be viewed conceptually as a formal alteration of governance structures, as a form of decentralization that identifies the individual school as the primary unit of improvement and relies on the redistribution of decision-making authority as the primary means through which improvement might be stimulated and sustained (Fullan and Watson, 2000). Some formal authority to make decisions in the domains of budget, personnel and program is delegated to and often distributed among site-level actors (Bauch and Goldring, 1998). Some formal structure (council, committee, team, board) often composed of principals, teachers, parents, and at times, students and community residents is created so that site participants can be directly involved in school wide decisions making (Wohlstetter and Mohrman, 1994).

2. School Based Management an Overview

American public education has of late been involved in reform efforts of unprecedented scope. Where previous reform sought simply to improve the existing structure and operation of public school systems, this wave is aimed at overhauling, or restructuring, public schools. School-based management (SBM) is one form of restructuring that has gained widespread attention. Like others, it seeks to change the way school system conduct business. It is aimed squarely at improving the academic performance of schools by changing their organizational design. Drawing on the experiences of existing programs, this chapter describes how SBM is being implemented.

2.1 Efficacy of school-based management.

Evidence on the efficacy of SBM program is not compelling. A comprehensive literature review (Malen et al., 1990) concluded that there is little evidence that SBM has significantly enhanced conditions in schools and districts or improved students’ academic performance.

A recently published evaluation of the school-based management /shared decision making program in the Dade County, Florida public school district, which began piloting the program in 1987 in thirty-two schools (by 1989 all school participated), is not any more encouraging. On the one hand, evaluators reported statistically significant differences between project schools and non-project school for the overall district on some measures. Project schools had higher scores on more than half of the ten factors assessed by the Purdue School Climate Evaluation. Student attendance in project schools was somewhat better than in non-project schools. In addition, the evaluation showed that suspension rates in project school were lower than the district in general. Also dropout rates in project high schools declined over the three-year period of the project.

On the other hand, the evaluation showed that little or no difference existed between project schools and non-project schools on other important measures. Project schools fared no better than non-project school on school report cards, staff attendance was no better, and student performance on standardizes achievement test did not change during the project.

The lack of evidence of SBM’s capacity to enhance the performance of students, schools, and school districts provides an important focal point for this chapter. It is our hope that this chapter will provide an initial step toward understanding how school-based management can serve as an effective approach to

educational reform. By systematically describing and analyzing the practices of existing programs, we identify their strengths and weakness. If the strengths are reinforced and the deficiencies are corrected, the SBM may finally provide an effective approach to educational reform and the improvement of academic achievement.

2.2 A popular reform

The popularity of school-based management as a reform is evident in how widespread it is. Approximately one-third of the nation's school districts located in every corner of the United States---from Maine to California and from Washington to Florida---have SBM programs (Hill and Bonan, 1991).

2.3 Diversity of forms

While literally thousands of school district has decentralized decision making under the banner of school-based management or other closely related labels, decentralization takes many different forms. Malen et al., (1990) conclude that SBM programs vary on several dimensions: the level of authority delegated to schools, the domains over which school-level decision makers have discretion, the groups of stakeholders involved on decision making bodies, and the purposes served by school-level decision making bodies.

The popularity and diversity of SBM provide a frame of reference for this working paper. The large number of programs also reveals that the limitations of current practice are widespread.

2.4 Participatory Management A Conceptual Framework

The perspective adopted in this section is based largely on framework of participatory management developed by Lawler (1986) and expanded upon by Mohrman et al., (1992) claim that participation is positively associated with organizational effectiveness. They identify four elements of participatory management: power, information, reward, and knowledge and skills. They advise that the presence or absence of these features at lower levels in the organization is essential in determining the effectiveness of participatory management program. According to this framework, then, each of these four elements must be present for participatory management program to be effective.

2.4.1 Decentralizing power

Power, according to Mohrman et al., (1992) framework, is a key element of participatory management. Thus, it is fitting that power and its delegation lie at the heart of school-based management. In a centrally organized school district, the source of most administrative decisions is the central office. Decentralized school districts, in contrast, implement SBM with the expressed purpose of improving schools' academic performance by delegating decision-making authority to the school-level actors, namely principals, teachers, and parents.

According to this reasoning, teachers, principals, and parents better understand the needs of the students and communities served by their schools. Moreover, teachers possess the professional knowledge to make decisions about curriculum and instruction.

The emphasis on the decentralization of power is reflected in definitions of school-based management. The definition cited earlier is both a compilation and clarification of other published definitions. The focus is clearly on decentralizing decision-making power, the point at which SBM is initiated.

There issues, then, arise in the distribution of power in SBM programs: the vehicles for distributing power, the domains in which power is distributed, and the removal of constraints that can limit power. The vehicle for distributing power in most SBM programs is the school-level council. Numerous school districts delegate decision-making power to school councils, which vary widely in their composition and delegated powers.

Little published documentation exists on the varieties of school councils in districts where schools have the authority to devise their own governance system. The sizes of school councils in these districts may vary widely.

2.4.2 Decentralizing information

Information, the second element of participative management, has two dimensions: flow and type. Information can flow in several directions throughout an organization. Conventional approaches to management tend to emphasize the downward flow of information from top management to other

employees. For example, in a traditionally governed school district, decisions are made at the top and implemented down through the chain of command (Tucker and Ziegler, 1980; Campbell et al., 1985). This downward flow gives the central office a clearly defined role in the control of a school's budget, curriculum, and personnel. However, as Lawler (1986) notes, the upward flow on information is the other half of the story. In participatory management, both the downward and upward flow of information are crucial.

The types of information that flow through organizations are an important consideration in decentralizing authority. Lawler (1986) identifies two important types: information concerning ideas and information concerning performance.

SBM programs have focused less on information than on power. Consequently we know little about the strategies used to channel information. The little evidence that exists suggests that SBM facilitates the flow of information both downward from districts to schools and upward from schools to districts.

Information strategies vary markedly across SBM programs. During the meetings, information is shared by district administrators and principals and decisions about district wide issues are made. The school board and district administrators are largely responsible for the flow of information between schools and the district.

In the decentralization of decision making, the flow of information within schools is as important as the flow of information among schools. SBM councils create opportunities for interaction within and among schools as well as across grade levels and subject areas. The most successful schools appear to be those where school staff frequently exchanges ideas about teaching. The SBM councils provided a communication link that teachers never had before.

SBM program provide only scattered and sketchy descriptions of the content of information transmitted through school systems. They tend to emphasize information about whether the school council's decisions comply with district and state policies. In that same system, district officials monitor budgets and school plans adopted by school councils for compliance with state regulations. Less evidence is available on the transmission of other types of information. SBM programs in a few districts communicate information about school or district performance.

2.4.3 Decentralizing rewards

Rewards, the third element of participatory decision-making programs, are important because they can affect the motivation of organizational members. As with information, Lawler (1986) identifies two dimensions of rewards: type and distribution. Two types of rewards are generally acknowledged in the organizational behavior literature: extrinsic, or external, rewards. The way rewards are distributed across organizations is an important issue, particularly where participatory management practices are employed.

In centrally managed systems, district typically does not reward successful school with more resources and school receives services regardless of their performance (Wohlstetter and Buffett, 1992; Mohrman et al., 1992). In decentralized school district, individuals at the school site may expect increased rewards when they exert greater power and have more information, especially if they believe that their participation has positively affected organizational performance.

Thus far, SBM programs generally have not focused on rewards. However, when they do it they use a variety of methods and are met with varying responses. SBM programs have introduced monetary incentives such as career ladders, lead teacher programs, and peer appraisal systems. Another approach is rewarding with budgetary flexibility, which allows school to save in one budget area and use the savings in another area. Detroit's SBM program provides financial awards to participating school that demonstrate improved performance (Wohlstetter and Buffett, 1992).

Efforts to reward school for high performance have met with resistance from teacher unions and parent organizations. Firestone (1991), in a study of merit programs reward systems, suggested that reward systems that are school-based rather than district-based will allow individual schools to develop system compatible with their own needs.

Mohrman et al., (1992) framework, Firestone (1991) findings indicate that to improve school performance, the decentralization of rewards must be accompanied by decentralization of power, information, and knowledge and skills—the next element of participatory management to be discussed.

2.4.4 Decentralizing knowledge and skills

Knowledge and skills constitute the fourth element of participatory management. This element has received less attention in SBM programs than information or rewards. In centrally organized school district, some kinds of knowledge and skills are concentrated at the top, and school staffs are expected to comply with directives from above (Mohrman et al., 1992) With the decentralization of knowledge and skills, teachers and administrators share knowledge and skills on new instruction strategies, on planning and organizing meeting, in developing school goals, and in designing staff development plans.

Lawler (1986) defines three types of knowledge and skills: work that employees engage in, the process of sharing in decision making, and the overall operation of organizations. For employees to participate fully in decision making, they should process all three types. The importance of information, as Lawler (1986) indicates, raises the related issue of training provided to employees by the organization. SBM programs emphasize two of the three types of knowledge---instruction and decision-making process---and tend to ignore the third, knowledge about the overall operation of districts. In regards to the first type, SBM program emphasize contrasting aspects of knowledge about teaching and learning.

The second type of knowledge, to which some SBM programs attend, concerns the process of shared decision making. This type receives the most attention in SBM programs, but unfortunately descriptions are often vague about the specific aspects in which participants need to be knowledgeable. Most reports on SBM programs mention a training component. Schools with school-based budgeting have diverted money to staff development by conserving costs in other areas.

Some school districts sponsor district wide workshops for teachers and other SBM participants. Dade County provide of fund each school with to train staff on shared decision making, including school-based budgeting and conflict resolution.

As part of its professional development offerings, school district gives teachers mini sabbaticals. The sabbaticals run for nine weeks and enable teachers to attend seminars and clinics, participate in internships, or conduct research. The district school also offers a conference during which teams teachers and principals develop shared decision-making skills

SBM programs vary in the amount of discretion schools have in selecting or designing training programs.

2.4.5 Extent to which the organization is involved

Issue final that can bear on the effectiveness of shared management: the extent to which an entire organization is actually involved. They note that a great deal of variation exists in degree to which organizations engage in participatory management. Some program involve only a few individuals or groups, shared management system is more likely to be successful if a large proportion of the organization is involved.

The extent to which the school district is involved in its SBM program varies across district. In some school districts SBM has been a joint effort, with central-office administrators, the school board, teachers' union, and external consultants involved to varying degrees. .

The degree of grassroots involvement is not ordinarily given much attention by school district considering school-based management. Parents and teachers are often left out of process to develop procedures and goals in the initial SBM planning stages. Top-down implementation of a reform to have decentralized decision making is less likely to acquire grassroots support than when the movement has grown from the bottom up

School district often incorporates both methods 2 and 3, initiating SBM in several schools on a volunteer basis with the intention of eventually phasing the program into all schools. The first method was used by school district, which implemented SBM. The second method: only a portion of the schools began piloting SBM. The third method was used where only a small percentage of schools volunteered to participate in school-based management, and the rest continued to operate under district direction (Hall and Brown, 1990).

Having described and assessed SBM strategies to distribute crucial elements, we arrive at three general conclusions. First, descriptions of SBM programs remain ill-defined and ambiguous. Second, they use a wide variety of strategies. Third, they emphasize one element of participatory management and the degree to which a school district is involved.

3. Implementing School Based Management

The transition to school-based management is a large-scale change. It is intended to fundamentally change the capacity of the school by increasing the involvement of school-level stakeholders in managing the school and improving its performance. When successful, the transition is both pervasive and deep. It is pervasive because it requires change in almost all aspects of the organization: structures, roles, systems, instructional practices, human resource practices, and the skills and knowledge of participants. It entails change in school and in the district offices.

Implementing such change is not a straightforward adoption process. Rather, it is gradual iterative process of introducing and refining changes until all aspects of the organization support this new way of function. Successful schools had been at it for several years, and were learning and gradually putting in place the elements of effective school-based management and educational improvement. Likewise, the districts we studied were gradually introducing changes in the information, accountability and control systems to enable schools to be self-improving entities and to able to more effectively manage themselves, as well as changes to the district-level organization to support and stimulate school-level improvement.

Principals in the restructuring school had received change management training. They described the change dynamics in their schools, and their plans for helping the school move through the stage of change. Actively restructuring schools learned new ways to involve parent and created new relationships to community organizations. The stakeholders developed a shared understanding of what the school was trying to accomplish and how. School personnel developed a realization that would have to be effective in meeting the needs of their clientele and their communities, and that to do so would require introducing new approaches. The introduction of instructional change was not an automatic consequence of establishing school-based management. Successful school laid the foundation for change.

School-based management has profound implications for how and where decisions are made: however, effective decision making is not an automatic consequence of decentralizing decisions to be school. Schools that were successful introducing change in instructional practice had developed effective decision making processes. Decision making was not confined to a narrow group of people who composed the council. Staff, parent, and sometimes students gave input and got involved. These types of barriers to effective decision-making were observed: (1) principals who were autocratic or who failed to utilize input; (2) staff factionalism, including competition between departments or divisiveness between those in favor of reform and those opposed; and (3) staff apathy and unwillingness to get involved.

One element of effective school level decision-making was the existence of multiple decision-making teams and a clear sense of how they related to one another. In many cases, the constellation of teams changed over time as the school developed a sense of what decision-making forums were needed, such as in Victoria where successful school typically had grade-level and school-wide teams with overlapping memberships. Other element present in the school with effective decision-making were: the training of all participants in team skills and decision-making skills; joint diagnoses of the problem teams were working on; allowing team to make decisions with to principal override; providing teams with good information upon which to make data-based decisions; and finding ways to broaden the perspectives of participants through such approaches as visiting and seeing effective practices at other schools.

Leaders played important roles in the implementation of SBM and the application of school efforts toward the accomplishment of school improvements. The principals in the successful schools were generally seen as effective leaders, but were generally strong teachers leaders as well. Principals often were active in managing the change process, including a participative process for determining a shared vision, and communication and support for that vision at every opportunity. Much of the hands-on work of designing and implementing change was delegated to participants throughout the school.

It is clear that school improvement is a process. It is also clear that process take time, and is not easily predictable. School decisions have to improve and new practices have to be put in place and behaviors

altered before students begin learning more. Implementing effective school-based management involves establishing effective decision-making forums and designing the organization to make it possible and likely for these to generate and implement new and more effective approaches to teaching and learning. It involves new information system, increased skills and knowledge development, and aligning rewards and motivation with the new performances that are required.

This complex change process needs to be monitored and assessed, so that the organization can discover where its implementation has fallen short, and its approaches need to be modified. In each of the district we studied school, community, district and association leaders were on the learning curve, gradually discovering what is required for SBM to work effectively and to contribute to improvement in teaching and learning.

4. Creating High Performance and Effective School

4.1 Establishing the conditions for high performance

This section we consolidate findings with a twofold purpose: first, to examine where school-based management (SBM) fits into an overall model of high performance for schools, and second, to propose ideas for how schools can expand the boundaries of SBM beyond the transfer of power to include the other elements necessary for achieving and sustaining high performance.

Underlying the concept of school-based management is the redistribution of decision-making authority from the central district office to individual schools. The hope is that with this shift in authority, schools will have the power and tools to make decisions that will lead to improved school performance. The mechanism for bringing this capacity to bear on school-level decisions is most often a school site council that consists of some combination of the principal, teachers, students, parents, and the community. However, if school-based management is to affect the outcomes of schools, including student learning, more than a simple shift in governance is required.

Underlying the concept of school-based management is the redistribution of decision-making authority from the central district office to individual schools. The hope is that with this shift in authority, schools will have the power and tools to make decisions that will lead to improved school performance. The mechanism for bringing this capacity to bear on school-level decisions is most often a school site council that consists of some combination of the principal, teachers, students, parents, and the community.

In addition to the power to make decisions, schools need the wherewithal to make good decisions. The resources that provide the underpinnings for this include access to extensive information to make well-informed decisions and to develop school plans that take into account goals, performance, trends, and various aspects of the school organization including resource constraints and concerns from the community.

Knowledge and skills are also needed. People in SBM schools need to learn how to plan and deliver curriculum using new and innovative approaches. They also need to have the skills necessary to participate effectively in group decision-making processes and management functions that are essential to this form of governance. The high-involvement framework also stresses performance based rewards. This is the motivation piece, and it includes intrinsic as well as extrinsic elements. The manners in which rewards are distributed has to high-involvement management and of school-based management are similar: to improve performance by giving those closest to the production process or to influence over and a personal stake in how well the organization functions. To accomplish these goals, school personnel need to be rewarded for the way they perform and what they contribute to the organization's success.

If defined merely as devolution of authority, SBM may not have a place in the creation of high-performing schools. Defined broadly, however, SBM may be a requirement for creating the conditions that have been shown to contribute to the success of high-performing schools. They expand the number of stakeholders involved in managing the school to include groups that traditionally have been excluded, such as parents and members of the business community. The focus on goals is an aspect to high-performing schools that is facilitated by engaging different constituencies in shared decision making. In addition, most of these schools are given control over at least a portion of the budget, enabling them to concentrate resources on high-priority issues.

Creating this conditions and learning how to work effectively within them take time. This is not surprising. The opinion refers Mohrman et al., (1992) makes the point that studies of private-sector high-involvement organizations found that companies that have been at in the longest have experienced the most significant impact on organizational outcomes.

In the longer term, SBM can enable schools to redesign curriculum and instruction. Through staff-development activities school-level educators can gain new knowledge to supplement what they observe in classrooms about what works with their own students.

Where does SBM fit in to the model of a high-performing school? It creates the conditions where school-site participants can bring about changes in performance, SBM, by itself, will not improve the process of teaching and learning. Nor will it necessarily change the way educators organize themselves and apply resources to accomplish their goals. It depends on what school-site members do with the power that is developed. The other three resources; information, knowledge and skills, and rewards—are required to create the capacity and the motivation to make the kinds of fundamental changes in how educators go about their tasks that are implied in “teaching for understanding” and other strands of education reform.

All four models of high-performing schools, described in section four, rely on local will to create a more effective school. The question is how to implement SBM in way that leads school-level actors to focus on teaching and learning. The high-involvement management model requires mechanisms that decentralize power, information, knowledge and skills, and rewards.

4.2 Strategies for enhancing school-based management

The literature on the local change process provides insights are discussed using Mohrman et al., (1992) four elements (power, knowledge, information, and reward). As the organizing framework and the operational definition

4.2.1 Enhancing power

The powers should be decentralized also has several strategies to enhance the School-Based Management.

1. Changes in the locus of decision-making within SBM should be designed and implemented as part of a systemic reform—not as an innovation in and of itself. Conversely, avoid implementing SBM as an isolated innovation.
2. Design and implement power arrangements within SBM based on view of the new learning outcome for students.
3. Implementing new power arrangements within SBM will require new models of collaboration across schools and district.
4. Implementing new power arrangements within SBM will require building a strong teacher professional culture.
5. Implementing new power arrangements within SBM will require viewing the change process as a journey, yet managing the change itself carefully.

4.2.2 Enhancing knowledge

In Mohrman et al., (1992), knowledge includes the knowledge and skills “that enables employees to understand and contribute to organizational performance”. It is important to consider knowledge and skills in the context of three aspects of work in school setting that are reported to be “critical in influencing the appropriateness of different involvement approaches: 1) the degree of interdependence; 2) the degree of complexity; and 3) the amount of uncertainty that has to be reduced. Education is arguably high on all these factors, although the organization design and technology that are currently employed do not necessarily acknowledge that fact”. Strategies for Enhancing Knowledge and Skills

1. Use knowledge informed by the new of schooling and the diverse nature of student.
2. Use narrative and paradigmatic, knowledge about schooling.
3. Implementation strategies must build both programmatic specificity and conceptual clarity a knowledge base for SBM.
4. Use network and cross-role teams to build knowledge of both schooling and school change.
5. School leads need a deep understanding of the purposes and “connectedness”.
6. Develop knowledge through appropriate use training.

7. Provide multiple forms of assistance to enhance knowledge.

4.2.3 Enhancing information

Strategies for implementing SBM need to include specific ways that the availability and use of information can be decentralized and improved within the organization. In this context, the redesign of the information element will involve helping the organization become more outcomes driven. Moving from a rule-and input-driven organization to one focused on outcomes will be a major shift for most school districts, and the decentralization and improvement of the use of information must be set in this new organizational orientation.

Redesigning the availability and use of information in the organization must also be done in light of the new reforms themselves. The organization will need to know about newly emphasized types of student outcome, such as how students think and solve problem or how well they are prepared to participate meaningfully as citizens in a complex society. The organization will also need to know about teaching and learning that has new features, and how this teaching and learning are contributing to achieving these outcomes. Finally, the new organization will need not only to shift information from the top to the bottom, but also to connect the top and bottom through the redesigned use of this information. The local change literature suggests four strategies for using information in these new ways. Strategies for enhancing information;

1. Focus on teacher-centered collaborative development of new information use.
2. Strengthen the way information is shared and used within the school and district.
3. Launch an evolving systemic redesign of information use.
4. Use information about the change process itself in new ways.

4.2.4 Enhancing rewards

Focusing SBM decision making on achieving various student outcome and the rewards for achieving them will be a difficult and major transformation of the school, as the literature on local change process shows. The literature, however, has a number of insights that would help this aspect of decision making become effective in school setting

1. Use a range of meaningful rewards.
2. Focus on balancing teacher empowerment and accountability as a cultural, political, and technical issue.

5. Creating Effective School

The effective Schools movement began in the late 1970s and early 1980s with studies by Ronald Edmonds of Harvard University. Edmonds defined Effective Schools as schools in which student achievement scores (and other indicators of student success) did not vary by socioeconomic status.

Effective School defined as "The Quality Education as to be effective, everyone involved must agree that what they are asked to learn is useful and enjoyable either immediately or a little later". (Glasser, 1992).

"School Effectiveness as the capacity on the school to maximize school function or the degree to which the school can perform school function, when given a fixed amount of school input". (Cheng, 1996).

He associated five characteristics with effective schools which include strong leadership by the principal, high expectations of student performance, emphasis on basic skills, orderly and controlled atmosphere, and frequent testing of student performance.

School Effectiveness as the capacity of the school to maximize school functions or the degree to which the school can perform school functions, when given a fixed amount of school input (Ahmad, 2012). Literature suggested five types of school effectiveness including technical/economic effectiveness, human/social effectiveness, political effectiveness, cultural effectiveness, and educational effectiveness.

Much of the subsequent research on Effective Schools, conducted largely in inner-city schools (Eubanks and Levine, 1983), examined the extent to which these characteristics were present and suggested various ways they could be implemented in school setting. The few additional characteristics that were uncovered in later studies served mainly to embellish Edmonds' original research by refining the nature of an Effective School.

School leadership was an important aspect of the Effective School. Power often was centralized in the principal, who served as the instructional leader for the school, but leadership also could include teachers and community members (Gamage, 2008). The person in the leadership role communicated goals, such as achievement test scores for student performance, to staff; identified problems that were present in the school; and motivated both teachers and students.

Effective Schools also tended to have school climates similar to one another, with school staff who were devoted to student learning and students who knew what was expected of them. Effective Schools exhibited a professional work environment with staff development, collaborative planning, excellent teaching, and low staff turnover. The effective school climate also featured commonly shared goals and high expectations for the students (Purkey and Smith, 1983; Wilson and Corcoran, 1988).

Another facet of the Effective School climate was that schools emphasized basic skills instruction and closely monitored student progress in order to promote student learning. In addition, the learning environment of Effective Schools was characterized by curriculum articulation and an organizational structure that maximized learning time, in a setting that was both orderly and disciplined. Finally, Effective School made an effort to recognize academic success (Purkey and Smith, 1983; Wilson and Corcoran, 1988).

Effective Schools also had positive relations with the communities they served. The parents especially were knowledgeable about and involved in the functioning of the school (Purkey and Smith, 1983; Wilson and Corcoran, 1988). In addition, each school was regarded as a member of the community it served. That sense of community helped to reduce alienation between the school and the community and to increase student achievement.

Because much of the research on Effective Schools was conducted in inner-city schools, the student populations tended to be minority or disadvantaged. Two of the three remaining high-performance models also focused on creating a challenging learning environment for disadvantaged students: the Comer holl Development Program and Levin's Accelerated Schools.

Conclusion

School-based management as one form of restructuring that received wide attention among educational institutions in order to improve academic performance in school. SBM implemented because it has the strength and ability as a form of education management reform to participative management. MBS is identical to the decentralization of government and education; therefore it is also accompanied by a decentralization of power, decentralization of information, decentralization of knowledge and skills, and decentralization of the rewards. MBS implementation is the implementation of on large-scale changes in the organization of almost all aspects (structure, roles, systems, practice teaching, politics, human resources, knowledge and skills). Head of the perpetrators are very vital and dominant in leading the school toward improvement and enhancement school performance. The school principal will determine the success or not in school improvement and performance, as are the teachers, staff, students, parents, and stakeholders.

MBS implementation will create improved schools and school performance effectively, because the MBS will be a motivator to all citizens of the school and the community in improving student achievement, and effective schools.

References

- Abrar, N., Baloch, A. G., & Ghouri, A. M. (2010). Attitude of secondary schools' principles & teachers toward inclusive education: Evidence from Karachi, Pakistan. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(4), 573-582.
- Ahmad, S. (2012). The Influence of Management Capabilities to the Effectiveness of School Implementation. *International Journal of Economics Business and Management Studies*, 1(3), 104-113.
- Bauch, P. A., & Goldring, E. B. (1998). Parent-Teacher Participation in the Context of School Governance. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73(1), 5-35.
- Campbell, R. F., Cunningham, L. L., Nystrand, R. O., & Usdan, M. D. (1985). *The organization and control of American schools*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

- Cheng, Y. C. (1996). Total teacher effectiveness: new conception and improvement. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 10(6), 7-17.
- Cheng, Y. C. (2000). *School effectiveness & school-based management; A mechanism for Development*. London. Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis Inc.
- Eubanks, E., & Levine, D. (1983). A first look at effective school projects at inner-city elementary schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.
- Fullan, M., & Watson, N. (2000). School-based management: Re-conceptualizing to improve learning outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11(4), 453-474.
- Gamage, D. T. (2008). How did School-Based Governance Lead to Distributed Leadership, Partnership and Improved Student Learning? *Journal of the Centre for Research in Secondary Schools*, 7 (2), 27-41.
- Glasser, W. (1992). *The Quality School: Managing Students Without Coercion*. Harpercollins, Scranton, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.
- Hill, P. T., & Bonan, J. (1991). *Decentralization and accountability in public Education*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Lawler, E. E. (1986). *High Involvement Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Malen, B., Ogawa, R. T., & Kranz, J. (1990). What Do We Know about Site-Based Management: A Case Study of the Literature—A Call for Research. In *Choice and Control in American Education: The Practice of Choice, Decentralization and School Restructuring*, Volume 2, ed. William H. Clune and John F. White, 289–342. London: Falmer Press.
- Mohrman, S. A., Mohrman, A. M. & Lawler, E. E. (1992). Applying employee involvement in schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14, 347-360.
- Mohrman, S. A., & Wohlstetter, P. (1994). *School-Based Management: Organizing for high performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers
- Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective Schools: A Review. *Elementary School Journal* 83(4), 427-452.
- Tucker, H. J., & Zeigler, L. H. (1980). *Professionals versus the public attitudes, communication, and response in school districts*. New York: Longman.
- Wilson, B. L., & Corcoran, T. B. (1988). *Successful Secondary Schools: Visions of Excellence in American Public Education*. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Wohlstetter, P., & Buffett, T. (1992). Decentralizing Dollars under school-based management: Have policies changed? *Educational Policy*, 6(1), 35-54.
- Wohlstetter, P., & Mohrman, S. A. (1996). Assessment of school Based Management Studies of Education Reform. US Department of Education Office of Education Research and Improvement. [Online]. Tersedia: <http://www.ed.gov.pubs/SER/SchBasedMgmt>
- Wohlstetters, P., & Mohrman, S. A. (1994). School-Based Management: Promise and Process. *Consortium For Research In Education*. Rutgers, 1-8.