

Teacher's Perception of the Implementation of School-Based Management in Maritime Vocational High School of "Akpelni" Semarang

Cahya Fajar Budi Hartanto
Ploteknik Bumi Akpelni
 Semarang, Indonesia
 fajar@akpelni.ac.id

Rusdarti
Universitas Negeri Semarang
 Semarang, Indonesia

Kardoyo
Universitas Negeri Semarang
 Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract - Purpose of this research is to assess how much the teacher's perception to the implementation of school-based education management (SBM) in the Maritime Vocational High School of "Akpelni" Semarang. There are two research questions raised, first about the teacher's perception of the current implementation of SBM, and secondly about the things that can be done to improve the implementation of SBM. Data collection method was done by literature study and questionnaire. Respondents of this study were 21 teachers with random sampling. The results of the study to the 6 research variables show that the teacher's perception of the implementation of SBM for the school component scores is 3.78 and for the requirements for applying SBM is 3.91 which means that it is above the minimum standard of 3.50. As for the problems in SBM the score is 2.86 and the constraints of applying SBM are 2.30 which means there are still problems in applying SBM even though the obstacles are not too large (maximum standard score is 2.40). For the characteristics of successful SBM, the score is 3.49 and for the effective SBM, the score is 3.46, which means that teachers have seen or felt the effectiveness of SBM, although it has not been very significant.

Keywords: teacher perception, implementation of SBM

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the era of regional autonomy, many policies are no longer determined entirely by the central government but are also regulated by local governments themselves. No exception to this, it applied to the education sector too. Now the local government has the authority to manage educational institutions more freely, even though it is only at the primary and secondary education levels which are in schools. Recognizing that the character of each school is different, a management system that is able to answer the needs of each school is needed. Therefore, then School Based Management (SBM) emerged, the

concept that first emerged in the United States under the name School Based Management where it began when people wanted the relevance of the demands of community development with the management of education. To meet this expectation, education managers are given broader authority to manage their resources in an effort to respond to community challenges. In addition, the community is also more actively involved, especially in monitoring the course of the education process. The community is invited to take responsibility for the progress of the school. But before that can all be realized, it is necessary to be given the same understanding to all relevant parties (stakeholders) about the importance of this SBM.

In the realm of Indonesia's education, the central and regional governments cannot just let go the management of education entirely just to schools because there are things that must be controlled such as the achievement of national education quality. Meanwhile, on the other hand, at the school level there are still managerial and operational obstacles. These constraints include the management and leadership capabilities of the school principal, support from all school members, and a culture of quality and accountability. In addition, increasing public awareness to participate is not an easy thing to do because so far the community's stigma that the management of education and the quality of graduates is the full responsibility of the school.

Based on the above background, researchers are interested in trying to find out the teachers' perceptions to the implementation of SBM in their schools. As it is known that the teacher is one of the important human resources in the education process at school. By knowing the perceptions of the teachers, it will be obtained an assessment of the parts that are already good or still lacking in implementing SBM at schools. The spirit to create quality and competitive education must continue to be encouraged in the hearts of the teachers so that they always actively participate in creating a socially equitable education for all Indonesian people. Thus, the issues raised in writing this paper are formulated with two questions as follows:

- a. What is the teacher's perception in the implementation of SBM in the Maritime Vocational High School of "Akpelni" Semarang?
- b. What can be done to improve teacher's participation in implementing SBM in the Maritime Vocational High School of "Akpelni" Semarang?

II. THEORETICAL BASIS

Understanding and Platform for School Based Management (SBM)

Caldwell (2005) states that SBM is a decentralized authority and responsibility systematically to schools in order to make decisions on significant matters related to school operations while still referring to the framework of objectives, policies, curriculum, standards, and accountability that has been established in a way that is centered. The most important feature of this SBM in the school system is the decentralization of costs and budgeting to schools. As an implication, the principal must be personnel who have the capacity to make decisions on very important matters related to school operations with a strong understanding of the elements set by the central government. SBM has been described in several studies which later revealed the existence of a direct or indirect relationship between SBM with the outcomes of the learning process.

Based on Mahdayeni (2015) notes, SBM was born from a long journey of struggle for teachers in the United States who rose to improve their dignity of life by earning a better income. The National Education Association was formed in 1857, then followed by New York and Chicago in 1887, Philadelphia in 1903, and Atlanta. Mahdayeni quoted Danim's account as explaining that there have been four generations of educational reform that led to decentralization until the term SBM emerged. The four generations are The New Progressive Era (1960), School Effectiveness Studies (1970), National Report (1980), and Public School by Choice (21st century). Mahdayeni further quoted Ogawa's research in 1987 where the average school learning outcomes tested with SBM showed better results than non-trial schools, so that later SBM entered into all states in the United States and spread to several other countries.

Furthermore, Mahdayeni cites the definition of several education experts. Etheridge states that SBM is a formal process involving principals, teachers, parents, students, communities near schools, in making various decisions. According to Short and Greer, SBM is a strategy that elevates the concept of empowerment and empowers all individuals in the school to achieve educational goals. Ogawa and White stated that SBM was a form of restructuring to change the school system in its efforts to improve academic performance by redesigning the organization and its programs. Oswald mentioned that

SBM was a decentralized decision-making authority to the school level. This understanding was also supported by Abu-Duhou (1999) whose writings were published by UNESCO. The last quote from Larry Kuehn said that SBM was given names such as local management of schools, shared decision making, self-managing schools, self-determining schools, locally autonomous schools, participatory schools, devolution, school decentralization, restructured schools, and self-governing schools.

The basis for implementing SBM is Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System. Article 51 paragraph (1) states "the management of early childhood education, basic education and secondary education is carried out based on minimum service standards with the principle of school / madrasah based management". Regarding education funding, it is specifically regulated in Chapter XIII, the substance includes: 1) education funding is a joint responsibility of the Government, Regional Government and the community; 2) the source of education funding is determined based on the principles of justice, adequacy, and sustainability; 3) management of education funds based on the principles of fairness, efficiency, transparency, and public accountability; and 4) allocation of education funds. The basis of SBM is Law No. 25 of 2000 concerning the National Development Program. In Chapter VII on the Division of Development Programs in the Field of Education, specifically target (3), namely the realization of school and community-based education management. Other supporting rules are Decree of the Minister of National Education Number 44 of 2002 concerning the Establishment of the Education Board and School Committee, Kepmendiknas Number 087 of 2005 concerning School Accreditation Standards, and Government Regulation Number 19 of 2005 concerning National Education Standards as amended by Government Regulation Number 32 years 2013, especially in the financing standard section.

The Purpose and Advantages of Implementing SBM

We cannot deny that the success of the learning process is also influenced by the availability of funds. Teaching and learning activities will run smoothly if supported by the application of school regulations, teacher and employee performance, adequate infrastructure, active participation of students' parents, and so on, all of which require support in terms of educational costs. Wijaya (2009) states that good education funding management will have a positive impact on school programs, such as: 1) improving the welfare of teachers and administrative personnel that have implications for teaching and learning activities; 2) the teacher does not need to look for additional salary outside of his assignment and can devote his attention to the place of teaching.

Mulyasa in Mahdayeni (2015) explained that

due to the implementation of SBM, schools were required to be independent in exploring, allocating, determining priorities, controlling, and taking responsibility for the empowerment of resources, both to the community and the government. Mahdayeni also quoted Rohiat's writings which stated that the goal of SBM was to improve the efficiency, quality and equity of education. SBM aims to improve school performance through giving greater authority and responsibility to schools that are implemented based on the principles of good governance. The next goal, with SBM, schools can improve their ability to plan, manage, finance, and organize their education. With SBM, schools can utilize and empower available resources and increase the awareness of school residents and the community in the delivery of education according to their abilities.

Implementation of SBM in Several Countries

The history of SBM cannot be separated from its application in other countries. Abu-Duhou (1999) describes the implementation of SBM in countries that use English as a means of communication. For example, in Canada SBM is known as the 'school-site decision-making' which is realized by the decentralized allocation of resources for teachers and staff, equipment, supplies and services. Stages began in the mid-1970s with 7 pilot schools that were able to really apply in 1980-1981. Now SBM has become something institutional in Canada. While in Hong Kong, in 1991 there were various problems in education such as lack of management structures, poor assignment of responsibilities, no performance measures, and low control. Based on this, then the school management initiatives were initiated as a form of SBM. As for the UK, the use of SBM was supported by the Education Reform Act in 1988 which changed fundamental things such as the national curriculum, age of national exam participants, support for education costs, the establishment of vocational / technical higher education, the breakdown of central education authority into 13 local authorities, and the establishment of a local school management scheme. Another thing that happened in New Zealand, in October 1987, Prime Minister David Lange formed a special team to review the administration of education. There were a number of serious weaknesses such as over-centralized decision making, lack of information and choices and a feeling of powerless on the part of the school. The report, known as the Picot Report, recommends that 95% of the education budget should be held directly by schools. Two years later, the school funding and operational formula was formulated. Implementation of SBM in Australia begins with the 1973 Karmel Report which mentions the importance of reducing the centralization of school operations to ensure effectiveness by involving teachers and parents when making decisions in the use of resources. Australia needed 20 years to make various restructuring efforts to transfer the responsibility for using resources to

schools.

As a comparison, Abu-Duhou also explained the implementation of SBM in the Netherlands, Belgium, Spain and Hungary, all of which led to changes in the education management system from being initially centralized to becoming more devolved to school authorities. Specifically, Karsten and Meijer (1999) conducted a study to see how schools in the Netherlands are adapting significant changes in financing strategies where schools are given greater responsibility. In the new system, schools are given the same funds (lump-sum) and then given the freedom to find additional funds from other financial sources to meet their needs. Thus the school has more flexibility in organizing quality activities in order to produce competitive graduates.

The application of SBM in East Asia also varies as revealed by Shoraku (2008). For example, Cambodia, which made school autonomy a national program established in the Priority Action Program. To ensure the realization of each program, a School Support Committee was formed at each elementary school consisting of community leaders around the school, elders in the community, school principals, teachers, and parents of students. At the beginning of the implementation of SBM, it was found that parents found it difficult to implement this system because so far they had trusted the teacher in educating their children and they felt it is enough to contribute by paying school fees. Another example in Thailand which has 12 years of free and quality basic education. The Thai government is very focused on preparing human resources to meet the demands of economic and social development, thus incorporating plans for developing education that are consistent with the National Economic and Social Development Plans. Evaluations in 1992-1996 showed that there were gaps in opportunities to access basic education so that the SBM was launched in 1997. To ensure that education reform proceeded according to plan, the Committee on Reform of the Educational Administrative System and the Committee of Learning Reforms were formed in 1999 and followed by the School Management Committee in 2003.

Strategies for Implementing SBM in Indonesia (Variables A and B)

According to Mahdayeni (2015), the SBM journey in Indonesia began in 1999/2000 with the launch of Quality Management Operational Assistance (BOMM) which was sent to school accounts. The BOMM changed its name to the Pilot Fund in 2003 in line with the enactment of Law Number 22 of 1999 concerning Regional Autonomy in the Field of Education and Law Number 25 of 2000 concerning the National Development Program. The idea of SBM became even more pronounced after the issuance of Government Regulation No. 25 which regulates the authority of the government and the province as an autonomous region which implies a change in the management of education and gave

birth to a school accountability discourse.

Mahdayeni then explained that there are at least seven school components that must be managed properly such as:

- a. Curriculum management and teaching programs, including planning, implementing, and evaluating curriculum activities;
- b. Management of educational staff, which aims to empower teaching staff effectively and efficiently to achieve optimal results, but still in pleasant conditions;
- c. Student management, namely the structuring and regulation of activities related to students, from beginning until finishing of a school;
- d. Financial management and financing, namely structuring and regulating activities related to financial problems and school financing;
- e. Management of facilities and infrastructure, namely the structuring and regulating all equipment and supplies as well as all facilities used, both directly and indirectly that support the learning process;
- f. Management of school relations with the community, namely the arrangement and management of harmonious and reciprocal relationships between the school and the community;
- g. Special service management, which includes library management, health, and school safety.

According to Shoraku (2008), the application of SBM in Indonesia since the reform era has targeted four basic aspects of education, namely quality, equality, relevance, and efficiency. To get funds, the school prepares an annual work plan that shows alignments on these four aspects. Subsequently a School Committee was formed in 2002 consisting of parents, education experts, and alumni as well as teacher representatives at the school. Unfortunately, Shoraku's research found that SBM did not have much positive influence on educational equality in various regions because it widened the gap between schools that were able to be independent and those who still needed support and attention. There are also problems where principals tend to dominate SBM information and lack of communication between teachers and school committees. So that there are not many changes made by teachers in learning methods and the improvement of student achievement is also not optimal.

According to Hamalik as quoted Sutarto, Darmansyah, Wasono (2012), to implement SBM in Indonesia, the following conditions are required:

- a. SBM must have the support of school staff;
- b. SBM is more likely to be successful if implemented gradually;
- c. It may take five years or more to implement SBM successfully;
- d. School staff and official offices must get training in its application, while at the same time learning to adapt to new roles and communication channels;

- e. Budget support must be provided for training and staffs need to have regularly meeting;
- f. National and local governments must delegate authority to the principal, and the principal then shares this authority with teachers and parents.

For this reason, one of the strategies that can be used is to create preconditions that are conducive to implement SBM, for example by increasing the capacity and commitment of school residents, including the community and parents of students. Then it needs to be continued with efforts to build a school culture that is democratic, transparent and accountable.

Constraints that Inhibit the Implementation of SBM (Variables C and D)

Danim as quoted by Mahdayeni (2015) stated that there were problems that might occur in the implementation of SBM, including:

- a. The unpreparedness of officials who oversee schools to delegate or devolve authority;
- b. The unpreparedness of school principals and teachers to carry out new assignments;
- c. Weak school autonomy attitude;
- d. Blurred organizational structure;
- e. The unpreparedness of the community to accept the burden of education more than usual.
- f. The workload of principals and teachers is too heavy;
- g. The workloads of teachers increased;
- h. The management of the school have not been good;
- i. The efficiency of school management is not adequate;
- j. The confusion over new roles and responsibilities for interested parties.

According to Rosyada in Sutarto et al. (2012), there are several obstacles that might be faced by the implementation of SBM, namely:

- a. Not everyone is interested in being actively involved, especially in the time-consuming planning and budgeting process;
- b. Participatory decision making is considered slow and ineffective;
- c. When cohesiveness has formed, there is a tendency for school board members to begin to get infected with 'group minds';
- d. Requires training to apply models that are not simple in terms of work, decision making, communication, etc.;
- e. There is confusion over new roles and responsibilities because it has been very conditioned by the work climate that has been in the works;
- f. Difficulty of effective and efficient coordination on a complex model and includes a variety of activities.

Characteristics of SBM Successful Implementation (Variables E and F)

Wijaya (2009) explains that the management

of SBM-based education financing management is achieved if general and specific principles are met. General principles include fairness, efficiency, transparency and public accountability. Justice means the amount of funding is in accordance with the ability of the Government, Regional Government, and the community. Efficiency is the ratio between input / power (energy, thought, time, cost) with output or results. Transparency means openness in financial management, that is, openness of financial resources and their numbers, details of their use, and clear accountability so that they can make it easier for various parties to find out. Public accountability means that the use of money is accounted for according to a predetermined plan. There are three requirements for public accountability, namely: 1) transparency of education providers in terms of their input and participation in various components of the school; 2) school performance standards in terms of the implementation of tasks, functions and authority; and 3) participation in creating a conducive school atmosphere in the form of educational services with easy procedures, low cost, and fast processes. Specific principles include effectiveness, adequacy and sustainability. School financial management is declared effective if the principal can manage finances to finance school activities in order to achieve the objectives according to quality as planned. Adequacy means education funding is sufficient to finance the implementation of education that meets the National Education Standards (SNP). The principle of sustainability means that education funding can be used continuously to provide educational services that meet the SNP.

Mahdayeni (2015) explains the ideal characteristics if SBM is successfully implemented. The quote from Bailey states the 21st century school is characterized by:

- a. There is diversity in teacher payroll patterns;
- b. School management autonomy;
- c. Optimal teacher empowerment;
- d. Participatory school management;
- e. Centralized system;
- f. School autonomy in making choices;
- g. The partnership between the business world and the world of education;
- h. Open access for schools to grow relatively independently; and
- i. "Marketing" the school competitively.

The second quote is taken according to Sagala which states that MBS will be effective if:

- a. Having outputs (effective learning achievement and school management) expected by vision and mission;
- b. High effectiveness of teaching and learning process;
- c. Principal's leadership is strong in coordinating, mobilizing, and harmonizing all available resources;

- d. A safe, orderly and comfortable learning environment and a pleasant learning environment guarantee school management is more effective;
- e. Needs analysis, planning, development, performance evaluation, employment relations, and the compensation of education staff and teachers meet their living needs, so they are able to carry out their duties properly;
- f. The accountability of the school towards the success of the program that has been implemented; and
- g. Management and proper use of the budget, right on target and can be accounted for according to real needs improve the quality of learning services.

Based on the above quotes, Mahdayeni concluded that the characteristics of SBM were independence, partnership, participation, ideal leadership, openness, and accountability. Independence is considered the most important because SBM basically gives the school authority to do self-managing, self-planning, self-organizing, self-directing, and self-controlling.

Triwiyanto (2013) cited the evaluation of Ministry of Education and Culture's Directorate General of School Education Development in 2012 that SBM in Indonesia from 2000 to 2010 showed positive impacts, including: 1) increasing transparent, participatory, democratic and accountable school management; 2) improving the quality of education; 3) declining dropout rates; 4) increasing the implementation of student-centered learning with the PAKEM strategy (active, creative, effective, and fun learning); and 5) increasing community participation in education.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Object

Maritime Vocational High School of "Akpelni" Semarang (hereinafter referred to as SMKP Akpelni) is an upper secondary level education in the vocational track. SMKP Akpelni was established on July 17, 2009 by the Wiyata Dharma Foundation and located on Jl. Mgr. Soegiyopranoto No. 37 Semarang. Based on the spectrum of September 2, 2016, it was determined that the area of expertise was Maritime, the Sailing Vessel Commerce expertise program, and the competence of its expertise was the Nautical Merchant Vessel and Engineering Merchant Vessel. The following are the principals who have led:

- a. Capt. H. Turiman Mijaya, Sp.1 (July 17, 2009 - June 30, 2015)
- b. Drs. Djajari, M.Si. (July 1 2015 - June 30, 2016)
- c. Capt. Soegiyanto, M.M. (July 1 2016 - August 31 2016)
- d. Capt. Fakhurrozi, M.Mar.

- (September 1, 2016 - July 30, 2017)
- e. Capt. H. Arijanto, M.Mar.
(August 1, 2017 - February 6, 2019)
- f. Budi Purnomo, M.Si., M.Mar.E.
(February 7, 2019 – present).

The history of SMKP Akpelni shows that this school has implemented education quality management well. On 24-27 November 2010, the school was audited by the Indonesian National Maritime Quality Supervision Committee and on 3 - 4 May 2011 was also audited by the Maritime Transportation Human Resource Development Center with the results of Recommendation B on 30 June 2011. On 6 - 9 In August 2012, this school was visited by the National High School Accreditation Board (BAN-SM) with the results of Accredited B on October 24, 2012. The first approval from the Ministry of Transportation was obtained on March 22, 2016 followed by ISO 9001: 2015 certification on February 8, 2017 BAN-SM Accreditation Ranking increased to A on November 16, 2017. Every year this school continues to conduct internal audits and get external audits from various related parties.

Every year, this school graduates 100%. The first graduation was on May 24, 2012. Examination for the Level IV Nautical and Technical were first held on January 29, 2013 and graduated with a professional degree on October 22, 2015. Teachers who are in charge of productive subjects come from the Professional Merchant Marine Officer. Regarding infrastructure, the school initially occupied the location of Purusatama High School which is managed by the Wiyata Dharma Foundation as well. Then had time to carry out learning in army flight because of the renovation of the building from 1 September 2013 to 1 May 2014. Since then, the school has continued to improve both with the Foundation's independent ability and with grants or assistance from the Government.

Characteristics of Respondents

The population of this research is the teachers. The sample was randomly selected as many as 21 teachers in the hope that it would be sufficient to give a general picture of the school. The following is a description of the respondents' statistics:

Table 1. Teacher Respondents by Age

Age	Amount	Percentage
20 – 27	5	23,8 %
28 – 35	7	33,3 %
36 – 43	6	28,6 %
44 – 51	3	14,3 %
Total	21	100 %

Table 2. Teacher Respondents based on Gender

Gender	Amount	Percentage
Male	13	61,9 %
Female	8	38,1 %
Total	21	100 %

Questionnaire Results and Discussion

Based on the respondent's response to the statement on the questionnaire, the respondent's response statistics are presented as follows:

Table 3. Respondents Response Statistics (Mean)

A	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7				
	3,8	3,9	3,8	3,9	3,7	3,5	3,6	4,1			
B	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6					
	3,9	3,7	3,9	3,4	4,2	4,1	4,2				
C	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	
	2,9	2,7	3,0	2,6	2,9	3,2	2,8	3,1	2,8	3,1	2,5
D	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6					
	2,3	2,4	2,3	2,4	2,1	2,3	2,5				
E	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	E7	E8	E9		
	3,5	3,7	4,0	3,1	2,9	3,3	3,6	3,3	3,7	3,7	
F	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7				
	3,5	3,5	3,3	3,3	3,4	3,6	3,5	3,6			

Based on the table above, it can be seen that for variables A (the school component) and B (requirements for applying SBM), teachers already have scores above a minimum grade of 3,50. That is, according to the perception of the teachers, SMKP Akpelni is ready to run SBM because 7 management components and 6 requirements for implementing SBM are good. For variable C (problems in SBM) it is still above the maximum standard of 2,4 and variable D (inhibition of applying SBM) also has a score close to the maximum limit. This means that there are still problems and obstacles in implementing SBM in the SMKP Akpelni. The biggest problem according to this research is the unpreparedness of the community to receive an education burden that is more than usual (variable C5 with a score of 3,2) and the biggest obstacle is the difficulty of effective and efficient coordination in complex models and includes diverse activities (variable D6 with a score of 2,5). The variables E (the characteristics of the success of SBM) and F (the characteristics of effective SBM) get a score close to the minimum limit of 3,50. This means that teachers have begun to feel the characteristics of successful implementation of SBM, although it is not very significant yet. Next, the instrument quality was tested by using SPSS.

1. Validity Test

This test is conducted to find out whether the items presented in the questionnaire really describe the thing being studied. The test uses Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy, namely the analysis of the adequacy of the sample with a value > 0.5 and Loading Factor/ Component Matrix > 0.4. In this test found items A3, C6, and C7 are invalid because LF < 4.0 so it is not used.

Table 4. Validity Test Results

School Components		Requirements for Implementation		Obstacles for Implementation	
KMO	LF	KMO	LF	KMO	LF
-	-	-	-	-	-
MSA		MSA		MSA	
0,622		0,794		0,759	
A1	0,76	B1	0,66	D1	0,82
A2	0,66	B2	0,75	D2	0,77
A4	0,67	B3	0,69	D3	0,49
A5	0,69	B4	0,74	D4	0,63
A6	0,48	B5	0,75	D5	0,77
A7	0,60	B6	0,72	D6	0,67
SBM Issues		Characteristics of the Success		Characteristics of Effective SBM	
KMO	LF	KMO	LF	KMO	LF
-	-	-	-	-	-
MSA		MSA		MSA	
0,723		0,857		0,820	
C1	0,57	E1	0,59	F1	0,83
C2	0,74	E2	0,64	F2	0,77
C3	0,76	E3	0,75	F3	0,86
C4	0,80	E4	0,77	F4	0,76
C5	0,67	E5	0,56	F5	0,78
C8	0,66	E6	0,64	F6	0,87
C9	0,62	E7	0,83	F7	0,75
C10	0,65	E8	0,79		
		E9	0,62		

2. Reliability Test

This test is used to determine the extent to which research instruments are consistent in their use many times at different times. Reliability testing with Cronbach's Alpha standard where the coefficient $\alpha > 0.7$.

Table 5. Reliability Test Results

Instrument Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
School Components	0,712
Conditions of Application	0,806
MBS problem	0,836
Barriers to Implementation	0,783
Characteristics of Success	0,861
Characteristics of Effective SBM	0,905

Once it is known that the instrument is valid and reliable, it is continued by conducting a One-Sample t-Test analysis to find out whether the application standards have been met as expected. For school component variables, the requirements for implementation, the characteristics of success, and the characteristics of SBM are effectively used at least 3.5 standard test values. As for the SBM problem and barriers to implementation, a maximum standard score of 2.4 is given. The following are the results of the significance of each variable and are divided into 2 tables, namely the drivers and inhibitors.

Table 6. One-Sample t-Test (Test Value 3,5)

V	Sig.	V	Sig.	V	Sig.	V	Sig.
A	0,00	B	0,00	E	0,13	F	0,03
A1	0,00	B1	0,11	E1	0,89	F1	0,04
A2	0,19	B2	0,09	E2	0,05	F2	0,74
A3	0,00	B3	0,11	E3	0,81	F3	0,00
A4	0,04	B4	0,00	E4	0,81	F4	0,00
A5	0,27	B5	0,00	E5	0,81	F5	0,12
A6	0,00	B6	0,00	E6	0,09	F6	0,06
A7	0,00			E7	0,14	F7	0,38
				E8	0,00		
				E9	0,04		

If we look at the table above, it can be seen that overall, variables A, B, and F have Sig.< 5%. This means that if we hypothesize that the application of SBM in SMK Akpelni is already good (minimum value of 3.5), then the hypothesis can be accepted because the t-test value $\neq 3.5$. If we look back at table 3, it can be seen that the values for variables A, B, and F are 3.8, 3.9, and 3.5, respectively. As for the variable E, the value of Sig.13.1% indicates that the hypothesis is rejected or it can be said that this variable still does not show minimum adequacy. This means that the characteristics of SBM success cannot be seen or felt yet by the teachers. If examined further, the large values are E1, E3, E4, and E5, each of which represents the diversity of teacher payroll patterns, optimization of teacher empowerment, participatory school management, and a centralized system of education. If we continue to look closely, in fact there are actually 3 variables F that must also be of our concern, namely F2, F5, and F7. Variable F2 is a code for the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process where the score is Sig.74% and indicates that the teaching and learning process at SMK Akpelni has not been effective so it needs serious handling if it wants to produce competent graduates. Variable F5 is a code for needs analysis, planning, development, performance evaluation, work relations, and the rewards of education personnel and teachers fulfilling their livelihood needs, so that they are able to carry out their duties properly. Sig.12% score indicates that there is still something felt by the teachers not yet suitable in these matters. Variable F7 is a code for the proper management and use of the budget, right on target and can be accounted for according to the real needs of improving the quality of learning

services. A Sig.38% score indicates that budget management and use is still not optimal as one of the characteristics of effective SBM implementation.

The following are the test results on the problem and obstacle variables in implementing SBM which are represented by variables C and D.

Table 7. One-Sample t-Test (Test Value 2,4)

Var.	Sig.	Var	Sig.	Var	Sig.
C	0,00	C6	0,00	D	0,29
C1	0,00	C7	0,00	D1	0,24
C2	0,00	C8	0,00	D2	0,14
C3	0,00	C9	0,00	D3	0,06
C4	0,00	C10	0,05	D4	0,30
C5	0,00			D5	0,77
				D6	0,47

If we look at the table above, the variable C has Sig. 0.00% (<5%). If we hypothesize that there are still problems in applying SBM (maximum value of 2.40), then the hypothesis is accepted because the t-test value \neq 2.40. Empirically we see the average value of this C variable is 2.86 or 0.46 above the maximum limit value. Almost all elements of variable C have a Sig value of 0.00% which means that in almost all parts there are still problems ranging from school officials, organizational structure, unpreparedness of the community to accept the burden of education, the workload of school principals and teachers, as well as the effectiveness and efficiency of school management. Only 1 element, C10, is a confusion variable code of roles and responsibilities for interested parties, which has Sig.5%. This shows that the roles and responsibilities of all related parties have been well explained and understood.

Furthermore, in variable D, the value is not significant (Sig. 29%). This means that the obstacles to implementing SBM can be said to be gone or even if it is there, they are relatively small. This is supported by an average of 2.30 or 0.10 points below the maximum limit of 2.40. The biggest obstacle is the element of variable D5, which is the confusion over the new roles and responsibilities of the teachers because it has been very conditioned by the work climate that has been cultivated. This is very understandable because previously SMKP Akpelni was a non-vocational high school (SMA Purusatama) which later changed to vocational high school. So teachers of normative and adaptive subjects need to adjust. In addition, the teacher of productive subjects has a seafarer background so it needs a lot of adjustments when switching professions to the world of education.

Based on the discussion above, we already have the answers to the problems we raised earlier in the introduction to this paper. Implementation of SBM in SMKP Akpelni according to teachers' perceptions in

general has been going well, while the shortcomings are still in a reasonable stage but need to be examined in detail considering there are problems that are actually quite large but covered by other things. To maintain the sustainability of the school, the satisfaction of all external and internal stakeholders including teachers needs to be maintained. Implementing SBM requires the support of all parties. Things that have been good need to be maintained while those that still lack need to be repaired or improved. It is hoped that the application of school-based management at SMKP Akpelni can encourage the realization of competent graduates as Commercial Shipping Officers and are ready to enter the maritime work world.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Education is a non-profit public sector whose job is to serve the community by presenting a learning process so that it has a distinctive mission and characteristics. Therefore, the management must also be different from the profit-oriented company management. The size of the cost of education does not automatically improve the quality of education if it is not supported by quality management based on school quality.

It should be noted that changing school management from a center-based approach to a school-based approach is not easy and needs an ongoing process with the involvement of all relevant parties including teachers. The implementation of school-based education management in Indonesia apparently still faces several problems that must be resolved immediately so that the quality of education in Indonesia can soon overtake other countries that have already implemented SBM and have succeeded in improving the quality of their education.

In order to create a socially equitable education for all Indonesians, the application of a standard management system in schools needs to be established. Thus, there is no longer a difference between large and small schools, in cities and villages, public and private. Ideal conditions can only be achieved if all schools in the country are managed with good school governance (good corporate governance).

Some suggestions the author tries to propose for the realization of an effective and efficient SBM implementation include:

- a. Strengthening the current laws and regulations related to education to support the implementation of SBM. Special technical instructions are needed for teachers who are always adjusted to the latest conditions related to planning, management / use, reporting, and supervision of school funding.
- b. SBM is disseminated in various ways to all parties, especially teachers so that more people know and are ready to implement it. Social

media and mass media can be used to continue to foster this concept, besides of course through direct socialization at meetings at various levels including in schools, for example when receiving the results of learning to parents.

- c. Schools must provide professional and competent human resources to operate the school. Teacher recruitment must get people who are willing and able, moral and noble, skilled or competent in their fields. Especially for teachers who are trusted to occupy positions as leaders in schools must have adequate managerial skills so that they can implement this school-based funding management properly.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abu-Duhou, I. (1999). School-based Management. In *International Institute for Educational Planning*. Paris: UNESCO : International Institute for Educational Planning.
- [2] Caldwell, B. J. (2005). *School-based Management*. Paris: The International Institute for Educational Planning.
- [3] Karsten, S., & Meijer, J. (1999). School-Based Management in the Netherlands: The Educational Consequences of Lump-Sum Funding. *Journal on Educational Policy*, 13(3), 421–439. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904899013003005>
- [4] Mahdayeni. (2015). Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah. *At-Tasyrih*, 1(1), 9–39.
- [5] Shoraku, A. (2008). Educational Movement toward School-based Management in East Asia: Cambodia, Indonesia and Thailand. *Background Paper Prepared for EFA Global Monitoring Report 2009*, 1–34.
- [6] Sutarto, M., Darmansyah, & Wasono, S. (2012). Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen 'The Manager Review'*, 13(3), 343–355.
- [7] Triwiyanto, T. (2013). Pemetaan Mutu Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah Melalui Audit Manajemen Pendidikan. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 24(2), 125–134.
- [8] Wijaya, D. (2009). Implikasi Manajemen Keuangan Sekolah terhadap Kualitas Pendidikan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Penabur*, 8(13), 80–96.