

# The Evaluation of School-Based Management Implementation in the Laboratory School of Universitas Negeri Malang: A Descriptive Examination

Ahmad Nurabadi, Sucipto, Juharyanto, Imam Gunawan

**Abstract:** *This study aims to describe the results of standardized education management through school-based management implementation at the Laboratory of Universitas Negeri Malang (UM) from several components: (1) curriculum and instruction; (2) student components; (3) educators and staff; (4) finance; (5) facilities and infrastructure; (6) school and community relations; and (7) school environment culture. The research method used a descriptive quantitative approach. The results are the: (1) implementation of curriculum management and instruction were in a very high quality; (2) implementation of management of students were in a very high quality; (3) implementation of management of educators and staffs were in high quality; (4) finance management implementation were in a very high quality; (5) implementation of infrastructure management including were in high quality; (6) implementation of school and community relationship management were in medium quality; and (7) implementation of management of school culture and environment was in high quality.*

**Index Terms:** *school-based management, laboratory school, standardized education*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Schools in Indonesia vary in applying school-based management, both in quantity and quality, and there are various problems and constraints to the implementation of school-based management. Therefore, the sustainability of school-based management programs in Indonesia needs to be implemented immediately. The sustainability of school-based management programs in Indonesia is also a mandate of government policy, as in Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning National Education System article 51 paragraph 1 which states that the management of early childhood education, basic education, and secondary education is carried out based on minimum service standards with the principle of school-based management. The use of the Education Unit Level Curriculum as one of the contents of school-based management is mandated in article 38

**Revised Manuscript Received on September 22, 2019.**

**Ahmad Nurabadi**, Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Malang, Jalan Semarang 5 Malang, Indonesia. Email: [ahmad.nurabadi.fip@um.ac.id](mailto:ahmad.nurabadi.fip@um.ac.id)

**Sucipto**, Non-Formal Education, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Malang, Jalan Semarang 5 Malang, Indonesia.

**Juharyanto**, Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Malang, Jalan Semarang 5 Malang, Indonesia.

**Imam Gunawan**, Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Malang, Jalan Semarang 5 Malang, Indonesia.

paragraph 2 and 50 paragraph 1 which states that the primary and secondary education curriculum is developed in accordance with its relevance to each education group or school / madrasah group or unit under coordination and supervision education offices or district / city offices of the Ministry of Religion for basic and provincial education for secondary education and district / city governments managing basic and secondary education as good as education units based on local excellence.

The importance of community participation is mandated in article 9 and article 54 paragraph 1 and paragraph 2 which states that the public is obliged to provide support for resources in the implementation of education; and the participation of the community in education includes the participation of individuals, groups, families, professional organizations, entrepreneurs and community organizations in the implementation and quality control of education services; and forms of participation can be sourced, implemented and users of educational outcomes. The sustainability of school-based management programs is also a mandate from: (1) Government Regulation Number 19 of 2005 concerning National Education Standards; and (2) Minister of National Education Regulation Number 22 the Year 2006 concerning the Content Standards for Primary and Secondary Education Units. In an effort to continue and develop school-based management programs, the 2010 - 2014 Ministry of National Strategic Plan mandates the end of 2014 as many as 90% of schools in Indonesia have implemented school-based management properly. Therefore, strategic steps to improve quantity and quality to implement school-based management properly need to be prepared and implemented immediately.

The Schools, through this school-based management program, are given the authority to make decisions that are closer and in accordance with the interests of school members, students, and the community (1–3). The hope is that programs run by schools are more relevant to needs, accountable, and transparent (4–6). School-based management is used as a school management approach to improving the quality of education in schools as a whole with an emphasis on seven components, they are: (1) curriculum and learning; (2) students; (3) educators and education personnel; (4) financing; (5) facilities and infrastructure; (6) school and community relations; and (7) school culture and environment.

The Laboratory School of Universitas Negeri Malang (UM) is an educational institution that seeks to implement government regulations in the field of education, specifically the established education standards, one of which is the standard of education management. Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System explains that the management of education is carried out using a school-based management approach. The Laboratory School of Universitas Negeri Malang through UPT P2LP (Technical Laboratory Unit for Educational Laboratory Development Center) UM is fully aware that as one of the institutions responsible for education management systems at the university level, especially for schools that are supported (8 schools), it continues to strive to improve the quality of school performance through school-based management. On the basis of these descriptions' educational institutions, especially schools, require evaluation and standardization in the implementation of education management.

The implementation of an evaluation is important to support and at the same time become a foothold in making future institutional development plans (7-9). This research reveals and examines the implementation of management education in accordance with government policies and universities. Decentralization of education management provides an opportunity for relevant parties to develop an education system that is better suited to the needs of each region. In the past, education management was carried out centrally / centrally and the authority of local governments and schools was very limited. Implementing the roles, responsibilities, and resources to schools provides an opportunity for them to identify and meet their own needs. In addition, the commitment to provide and implement these responsibilities will motivate the school and the community to develop things that were previously considered not their business (10).

There are more decisions taken at the school level, utilization of resources including funds, learning is expected to be more in line with the needs of schools and local students. Law Number 20 the Year 2003 concerning National Education System article 48 paragraph 1 states that management of education funds is based on the principles of justice, efficiency, transparency, and public accountability. In line with this mandate, Government Regulation Number 19 of 2005 concerning Education National Standards article 49 paragraph 1 states that the management of education units at the level of primary and secondary education implements school-based management as indicated by independence, partnership, participation, openness, and accountability (11). Based on the two contents of the policy, the principles of school-based management include independence, fairness, openness, partnership, participation, efficiency, and accountability. This study aims to describe the results of the implementation of standardized education management through school-based management at the Laboratory School of Universitas Negeri Malang (UM) with reference to components: curriculum and learning, components of students, educators and education staff, funding, infrastructure, school and community relations and the culture of the school environment.

## II. METHOD

The research method used in this study is to use a quantitative descriptive approach. This study aims to describe the results of the implementation of standardized education management through school-based management at the Laboratory of Universitas Negeri Malang (UM) with reference to the components: (1) curriculum and learning; (2) student components; (3) components of educators and education staff; (4) financing component; (5) facilities and infrastructure components; (6) components of school and community relations; and (7) school environment culture. Descriptive analysis refers to the score of each component (12,13). The instrument used in this study is the format for evaluating the implementation of school-based management. The unit of analysis of this research is five schools under the auspices of the UPT P2LP UM.

## III. RESULTS

### Implementation of Curriculum and Learning Components

Based on research data, the frequency of implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in the curriculum and learning components can be seen in Table 1. Based on Table 1, it can be concluded that the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in curriculum and learning components is in a very good category. Based on research data, curriculum and learning components have 10 indicators. Each indicator in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools have different values according to the conditions in schools in improving the quality of education.

Table 1 Percentage of Management Implementation Based on the Curriculum and Learning Components

No	Classification	Interval	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very Good	34 – 40	4	80
2	Good	26 – 33	1	20
3	Enough	18 – 25	0	0
4	Low	10 – 17	0	0
Total			5	100

Table 2 Percentage of Indicators for Curriculum and Learning Components

No	Indicators	Percentage	Average
1	Scope of activities	85,23	3,41
2	Learning process	88,41	3,54
3	Class management	74,83	2,99
4	Learning resources	79,07	3,16
5	Learning creativity	78,35	3,13
6	Learning outcomes	73,37	2,93
7	Learning supervision	67,21	2,51
8	The stages of learning supervision	73,93	2,99
9	Parents' role	76,07	3,01
10	Evidence book activities	78,05	3,12

Based on Table 2 it is known that the indicator of the learning process in implementing school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools has the highest percentage or average value of 88.41 and an average value of 3.54. While the indicators of learning supervision in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools have the lowest percentage or average value of 67.21 and an average value of 2.51.

### Implementation of Student Components

Based on data obtained during the study, the frequency of implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in the components of students can be seen in Table 3. Based on Table 3, it can be concluded that the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in student components is very good or very high. Based on research data, the components of the students are 9 indicators. Indicators in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools have different values according to the conditions in schools in improving the quality of education (Table 4).

Table 3 Percentage of School-Based Component Management Implementation for Students

No	Classification	Interval	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very Good	34 – 40	4	80
2	Good	26 – 33	1	20
3	Enough	18 – 25	0	0
4	Low	10 – 17	0	0
Jumlah			5	100

Table 4 Percentage of Indicators of Personal Problems Faced by Beginning Principals

No	Indicator	Percentage	Average
1	The scope of activities	82,23	3,32
2	Students admission	88,11	3,51
3	Students' orientation	84,13	3,45
4	Extra-curricular	78,07	3,02
5	Gifted students service	79,15	3,13
6	Special service	73,24	2,91
7	Students' discipline	66,62	2,49
8	Students' attendance	75,98	2,99
9	Books for activities	79,05	3,11

Based on Table 4, it can be seen that the indicator of new student acceptance in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in the components of students has the highest percentage or average value of 88.11 and an average value of 3.51. While the indicators of student discipline development in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools have the lowest percentage or average value of 66.62 and an average value of 2.49.

### Implementation of Educator and Staff

Based on the data obtained during the study, the frequency of implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in the Educator and Staff can be seen in Table 5. Based on Table 5 it can be concluded that the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in the educator and education staff components in the category very good or very high. Based on research data, the Educator and Staff have 9 indicators.

Indicators in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools on the Educator and Staff have different values according to the conditions in schools in improving the quality of education (Table 6).

Table 5 Percentage of School-Based Management Implementation of Educator and Staff

No	Classification	Interval	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very good	31 – 36	3	60
2	Good	24 – 30	2	40
3	Enough	17 – 23	0	0
4	Low	09 – 16	0	0
Total			5	100

Table 6 Percentage of Indicators for Educator and Staff

No	Indicators	Percentage	Average
1	Scope of activities	81,45	3,22
2	Personnel's recruitment	89,91	3,62
3	Personnel's development	66,83	2,49
4	Personnel's supervision	65,07	2,41
5	Academic qualification	92,35	3,73
6	Personnel's attendance	90,37	3,67
7	Personnel's discipline	87,21	3,51
8	Personnel's performance	75,93	3,09
9	Books' on personnel	79,01	3,14

Based on Table 6, it can be seen that the indicators of academic qualifications in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools on the Educator and Staff have the highest percentage or average value of 92.35 and the average value of 3.73. While the indicators of fostering educators and education personnel in the implementation of school-based management in UM laboratory schools have the lowest percentage or average value of 65.07 and an average value of 2.41.

### Implementation of Financing Components

Based on data obtained during the study, the frequency of implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in the financing component can be seen in Table 7. Based on Table 7 it can be concluded that the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in the financing component is in the very good or very high category. Based on the research data, the financing component has 7 indicators. Indicators in the implementation of school-based management in UM laboratory schools in the financing component have different values according to the conditions in schools in improving the quality of education (Table 8).

Table 7 Percentage of School-Based Component Management Implementation

No	Classification	Interval	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very good	24 – 28	4	80
2	Good	18 – 23	1	20
3	Enough	13 – 17	0	0
4	Low	07 – 12	0	0
Total			5	100



Table 8 Percentage of Component Financing Indicators

No	Indicators	Percentage	Average
1	Scope of activities	87,93	3,52
2	Drafting principles	89,31	3,57
3	School planning	74,83	2,99
4	Finance resources excavation	79,17	3,17
5	Short/Middle Planning	72,31	2,91
6	Management principles	78,37	3,18
7	Guiding Books for activities	85,05	3,42

Based on Table 8, it can be seen that the principle indicator of financing arrangements in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools has the highest percentage or average value of 89.31 and an average value of 3.57. While the annual or medium-term work plan indicators in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools have the lowest percentage or average value of 72.31 and an average value of 2.91.

### Implementation of Infrastructure Components

Based on data obtained during the study, the frequency of implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in the infrastructure facilities can be seen in Table 9. Based on Table 9 it can be concluded that the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in school facilities and infrastructure components is in a very good category or very high. Based on research data, the components of school facilities and infrastructure have 8 indicators. Indicators in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in infrastructure components have different values according to the conditions in schools in improving the quality of education (Table 10).

Table 9 Percentage of Infrastructure Components

No	Classification	Interval	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very good	26 – 32	3	60
2	Good	21 – 25	2	40
3	Enough	14 – 20	0	0
4	Low	08– 13	0	0
Total			5	100

Table 10 Percentage of Components of Infrastructure Indicators

No	Indicators	Percentage	Average
1	Scope of activities	81,23	3,24
2	School infrastructure	88,41	3,54
3	School location	92,83	3,69
4	Infrastructure maintenance	79,07	3,16
5	Infrastructure distribution	78,35	3,13
6	Classroom management	75,37	3,08
7	Infrastructure elevation	80,21	3,18
8	Book of activity	84,09	3,32

Based on Table 10, it can be seen that the indicator of school location in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools has the highest percentage or average value of 92.83 and an average value of 3.69. While the indicators of classroom settings in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools have the lowest percentage or average value of 75.37 and an average value of 3.08.

### Implementation of Components of School and Community Relations

Based on data obtained during the study, the frequency of school-based management implementation in UM Laboratory Schools in the components of school and community relations can be seen in Table 11. Based on Table 11 it can be concluded that the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in the school and community relations component in the category good or high. Based on research data, the components of school and community relations are 10 indicators. Indicators in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools have different values according to the conditions in schools in improving the quality of education (Table 12).

Table 11 Percentage of Components of School and Community Relations

No	Classification	Interval	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very good	34 – 40	1	20
2	Good	26 – 33	2	40
3	Enough	18 – 25	2	40
4	Low	10 – 17	0	0
Total			5	100

Table 12 Percentage of Component Indicators for School and Community Relations

No	Indicators	Percentage	Average
1	Scope of activities	85,23	3,41
2	The objective of cooperation	82,42	3,24
3	Public relations duty implementation	74,83	2,99
4	Public relations activities	79,07	3,16
5	Public relations techniques	78,35	3,13
6	Methods of communication	73,37	2,93
7	Roles of school committee	66,11	2,43
8	The empowerment of class's association	71,33	2,86
9	Public relations' type	72,09	2,91
10	Book for activities	76,26	3,04

Based on Table 12, it can be seen that the public relations scope indicator in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools has the highest percentage or average value of 85.23 and an average value of 3.41. As for the indicators of the role of school committees in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools on the components of the relationship between schools and the community they have the lowest percentage or average value of 66.11 and an average value of 2.43.

### Implementation of the School Environment Culture Component

Based on the data obtained during the study, the frequency of the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in the components of the school culture and environment can be seen in Table 13. Based on Table 13 it can be concluded that the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in the school's cultural and environmental components in the category very good or very high. Based on research data, the components of the culture and school environment are 9 indicators. Indicators in the

implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools in the cultural component and school environment have different values according to the conditions in schools in improving the quality of education (Table 14).

Table 13 Percentage of Components of School Environment Culture Indicators

No	Classification	Interval	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very good	30 – 36	2	40
2	Good	23 – 29	3	60
3	Enough	16 – 22	0	0
4	Low	10 – 17	0	0
Total			5	100

Table 14 Percentage of Components of School Environment Culture Indicators

No	Indicator	Percentage	Average
1	Scope of activities	81,23	3,23
2	Program socialization	80,41	3,17
3	Types of exemplary	76,83	3,09
4	Cultural seeding	79,02	3,16
5	Culture development	78,36	3,13
6	Environment development	73,31	2,92
7	Supporting and maintaining the culture of the school environment	67,42	2,53
8	Environmental creation	73,81	2,92
9	Use of the environment as a learning resource	76,34	3,04

Based on Table 14, it can be seen that the scope of activity indicators in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools on the cultural component and school environment has the highest percentage or average value of 81.23 and an average value of 3.23. While indicators support and maintain the culture of the school environment in the implementation of school-based management in UM Laboratory Schools on the components of culture and school environment, the lowest percentage or average value is 67.42 and the average value is 2.53.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

One of the educational problems faced by the Indonesian people is the quality of education at every level and education unit. Various efforts have been made to improve the quality of national education, for example: (1) developing national and local curricula; (2) increasing teacher competence through training; (3) holding books and learning tools; (4) organize and improve educational facilities and infrastructure; and (5) improving the quality of school management (14–16). However, various indicators of the quality of education have not shown significant improvement. The reality of school quality is not influenced by many factors, one of which is the management of education (17). Centralistic education management has put the school in a marginal position, powerless, lacking in independence, and even attached to its creativity. Therefore, the government is encouraged to reorient the implementation of education by implementing school-based management policies. The government has a strong will and is determined

to strive for development to take place and take root in schools (18).

This shift in management approach clearly requires adjustments, both technically and culturally (19,20). Technical adjustments can be made through upgrading, workshops, seminars, and discussions about school-based management, while cultural adjustments can be made through the planting of thoughts, actions, habits, to the character of school-based management for all school members. School-based management is a management model that gives schools greater autonomy to regulate and implement various policies widely (Ministry of National Education, 2003). Autonomy in education is an opportunity for schools to improve the performance of school staff, increase the participation of related parties, and increase public understanding of education. School-based management is arguably a relatively new management model for the world of education in Indonesia.

School-based management requires a change in the paradigm of managing education from centralized to decentralized. If at first the managers of education in schools (principals, administrative staff, and teachers) are waiting for instructions from the center, then school-based management is required to have high creative power in planning, implementing, and evaluating school development programs based on objective conditions of the school concerned. As a system, school-based management has components that are systematically interrelated with each other, they are context, input, process, output, and outcome (21,22). The estuary of all school activities is the quality of student learning outcomes. The progress of a school will be seen from the extent to which the quality of student learning outcomes. Therefore, the indicator of the successful implementation of school-based management is the quality of student performance or the quality of student learning outcomes.

Student learning outcomes can be academic or non-academic. Schools, in this case, must be able to show the extent to which students' performance is increasing (quantitatively and qualitatively) after school-based management programs are conducted. Schools in measuring the success of student performance should have clear indicators, known by all parties, and can be measured easily (23–25). In addition to the output, the school must also have clear success criteria for the impact of the school programs on the school itself, its graduates, and the community (6). Government support (especially local / district governments), financial support, availability of human resources, school culture, and leadership styles vary widely seen from the different provinces, districts in the provinces, sub-districts in the district, and in the smallest neighborhoods are schools within the sub-district (23). This variation will affect the effectiveness of the implementation of school-based management from one province to another, districts with other districts, sub-districts with other sub-districts, and schools with other schools.

## V. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis research concluded: (1) implementation of curriculum management and learning including at very high quality; (2) the implementation of student management including at very high quality; (3) implementation of management of educators and education personnel including high quality; (4) financing management implementation including at very high quality; (5) implementation of infrastructure management including high quality; (6) implementation of school and community relationship management including medium quality; and (7) implementation of management of school culture and environment including high quality. Implementation of school-based management requires commitment from high school principals, teachers, and staffs.

## REFERENCES

1. Bandur A. School-based management developments and partnership: Evidence from Indonesia. *Int J Educ Dev.* 2012;
2. Gonzalez-Suarez C, Worley A, Grimmer-Somers K, Dones V. School-Based Interventions on Childhood Obesity: A Meta-Analysis. *Am J Prev Med.* 2009;
3. Fullan M, Watson N. School-Based Management: Reconceptualizing to Improve Learning Outcomes. *Sch Eff Sch Improv.* 2000;
4. Bandur A. School-based management developments: Challenges and impacts. *J Educ Adm.* 2012;
5. Vally GVS, Daud K. The Implementation of School Based Management Policy: An Exploration. *Procedia - Soc Behav Sci.* 2015;
6. Teguh Triwiyanto, Desi Eri Kusumaningrum J. Community Participation Deficits in the Implementation of School-Based Management in Indonesia. *J Educ Pract.* 2017;8(January 2017):67–74.
7. Ostrom E. Institutional rational choice: An assessment of the institutional analysis and development framework. In: *Theories of the Policy Processes.* 2016.
8. Bamber V, Anderson S. Evaluating learning and teaching: Institutional needs and individual practices. *Int J Acad Dev.* 2012;
9. Ottem R, Owens C, Rear IO. *Stats In Brief Teacher Professional Development.* Institute of Education Sciences; 2017.
10. Juharyanto. Kepemimpinan unggul Kepala Sekolah Dasar Daerah Terpencil (Studi Multisitus pada Sekolah Dasar di Kabupaten Bondowoso). *J Sekol Dasar [Internet].* 2017;1(Tahun 26). Available from: url: <http://jurnal.fip.um.ac.id/sekolahdasar>
11. Bafadal I. Strengthening School Governace Throught Preparation and Empowerment School Principal As the Instructional Leader. In: *The Challenges of Educational Management and Administration in Competitive Environment and The 4th Congress of ISMaPI.* Makassar: State University of Makassar; 2014.
12. McHugh ML. Descriptive statistics, Part II: Most commonly used descriptive statistics. *J Spec Pediatr Nurs.* 2003;
13. Amrhein V, Trafimow D, Greenland S. Inferential Statistics as Descriptive Statistics: There Is No Replication Crisis if We Don't Expect Replication. *Am Stat.* 2019;
14. Meier KJ, O'Toole LJ. Public Management and Organizational Performance: The Effect of Managerial Quality. *J Policy Anal Manag.* 2002;
15. Amanchukwu RN, Stanley GJ, Ololube NP, Amanchukwu RN, Stanley GJ, Ololube NP. A Review of Leadership Theories, Principles and Styles and Their Relevance to Educational Management. *Management.* 2015;
16. Muslihah E. School Based Management. *Al Qalam.* 2019;
17. Cheng ECK. *Knowledge Management for School Education.* 2015.
18. Bouchamma Y, Basque M, Marcotte C. School Management Competencies: Perceptions and Self-Efficacy Beliefs of School Principals. 2014;(May):580–9.
19. Nicolescu R. The Influences of Globalization on Educational Environment and Adjustment of National Systems. *Procedia - Soc Behav Sci.* 2015;
20. Marouli C, College T. Multicultural Environmental Education: Theory and Practice. *J Environ Educ.* 2002;
21. Mohebbi N, Akhlaghi F, Yarmohammadian MH, Khoshgam M. Application of CIPP model for evaluating the medical records education course at master of science level at Iranian medical sciences universities. In: *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences.* 2011.
22. Dubrowski A, Morin MP. Evaluating pain education programs: An integrated approach. *Pain Research and Management.* 2011.
23. Farooq MS, Chaudhry AH, Shafiq M, Berhanu G. Factors affecting student' quality of academic performance: a case secondary school level. *Journal of Quality and Technology Management.* 2011.
24. Durlak JA, Weissberg RP, Dymnicki AB, Taylor RD, Schellinger KB. The Impact of Enhancing Students' Social and Emotional Learning: A Meta-Analysis of School-Based Universal Interventions. *Child Dev.* 2011;
25. Management AB, Costing AB. ABC – Activity Based Costing; ABM – Activity Based Management. *Burns.* 2000;

## AUTHORS PROFILE



**Ahmad Nurabadi**, he got his master degree from Universitas Negeri Malang, majoring in Education Management. He is also the chairman of laboratory of Education Administration Department of UM. He has many papers and books publication in indexed journal, proceeding, and publishers. He is now doing many researches on School Based Management.



**Sucipto**, he is a senior lecture of Universitas Negeri Malang, majoring in Non-formal Education. He helps the Rector of Universitas Negeri Malang, especially as the university management expertise. He also the chairman of Technical Laboratory Unit for Educational Laboratory Development Center of UM Malang.



**Juharyanto**, he got his Ph.D. from Universitas Negeri Malang, majoring in Education Management. He published his research in several Scopus indexed international journals and proceedings. He is working in many researches, one of them is about leadership based on local wisdom in Indonesia. He is also the chairman of University Cooperation Team of Universitas Negeri Malang.



**Imam Gunawan**, he got his master degree from Universitas Lambung Mangkurat Banjarmasin, majoring in Education Management. He responsible as reviewer and editor from many indexed journals and proceedings in Universitas Negeri Malang. He has many papers and books publication in indexed journal, proceeding, and publishers. He is now doing many researches on School Based Management, supervision, and leadership.