

THE IMPACTS OF SBM MODEL ON THE ISRAELI EDUCATION SYSTEM

Ph.D. Student Levnawi AYED

Free International University of Moldova, Republic of Moldova

Abstract: *The trend era of globalization and networks is pushing individuals, organizations, societies and companies to survive fast changes of this trend and its' consequences. The main theme is the ability of passing and flowing this transformation trend that being less expensive and more productively efficient by meeting the global market requirements, via conducting self-changes based self-management and self-economic mobility whose match globalization spirit. There is a deep relationship between education and economics, namely there is no adopt that economy based-knowledge system of a globalized economy, and knowledge-based economy behavior and values are the major tool of easily jump on survival boat to flow with the transformation of the new-age of globalization. The aim of the research is to evaluate and analyze the SBM model as an integration model of economic-educational testing, by conducting a comparative examining of traditional schools (NSBM) and schools based management (SBM), via exploiting various methods of management analysis, comparative descriptive data of schools numeric outcomes; and comparative descriptive data of schools survey outcomes, according to school management type.*

Keywords: SBM model, Israel, education system, globalization.

JEL Classification: F02, I2, O32.

1. Introduction

The correlation evidence showed that education and economic growth are related, the primary economic development tool for any country is the education level (Carnevale and Desroches, 2002, p.16). Schools and other educational institutions have a vital role of preparing a generation which can face the challenges of this new-age, especially facing skills' illiteracy for the advancement of the knowledge-based globalized economy at large (Carnevale and Desroches, 2002, p.17). Managing the transformation process requires new model of educational institutional system, effective human resources, behavior based-economic and high effectiveness values. Namely, mobilization process towards idealization of the implementation and the demand actions belong. The main tools of this theme related school system are transition from traditional school to school based management-SBM, from low to high effective manager, from unsatisfied to satisfied employees, and from dependent climate to open and independent one. Many countries have a higher growing rate of population rather than increasing rate of national income, thus they are heading to reduce expenses as well as they can at all life aspects and ministries, including Ministry of Education. While reforming and aligning education is costly, not implementing these changes is perhaps even more expensive. Furthermore, countries tend to increase their achievements such as students' achievements, comparatively related to other countries, with trying to raise and to be proud of these achievements, especially when they are members of international organization like "OECD", and with attempting to raise their economy and systems as their organization commitments and expectations, the target is to win the race. One important part of these transformations is the transition of the traditional schools to new model of managing (SBM) all over the world, in order to achieve better outcomes, economic improvements and students' achievements, flow the reducing expenses, increasing productively efficient and paralleling globalization spirit in addition to international organization membership. SBM model is implemented in many schools around the world in different ways, as a product of local concept.

School Based Management (SBM) is a new educational management direction which includes reducing of centralization and formal authority to the school management staff level with parent's council, contains making independent decisions on educational,

financial, and organizational issues, in order to improve the school outcomes, students' achievements and effectiveness, by exploiting the financial and educational resources, under the policy of the Ministry of Education (Ministry of Education in Israel, 2015). Thus, there is a great need for conducting more reports and studies in order to assess the Israeli's 2012 SBM reform to expel disclarity; thus, this study explores and seeks more truths and more evaluation the SBM reform, and answers with attempt to answer the main question, does SBM impact school outcomes: economic, students' achievements, school and principal effectiveness and staff satisfaction.

Methodological support. This study is a quantitative-comparative research, based on data taken from a questionnaire distributed in 21 Arab primary schools, and by data taken directly from schools and from the Israeli Ministry of Education, the National Authority for Measurement and Evaluation in Education in Israel, the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics, as well as world data from OECD.

2. SBM model. There are mixed results about the SBM. While many studies are supporting, for example (Obiwuru et al., 2011; Caldwell, 2005; South Australian Department of Education and Children's Services, 2008), others brought criticism of SBM (Brus et al., 2011; Hanusek, Link and Woessman, 2013). First, the present of studies that show positive results in SBM that help to understand the benefits. Further, representative studies, which showed findings, do not support self-management that helps to understand difficulties of SBM.

The researchers investigated three main components, which improved following the implementation of SBM:

- Improving student achievements - most studies tried to explore effects of SBM model on student achievement. For instance, in 1988 SBM reform in Chicago, the goal was to raise student achievement. A comparison was made between testing scores in 1990 and 1997, and student achievement was improved (Ben, Dunphy and Griffiths, 2014).
- A large study that surveyed 39 countries, found SBM has an impact on student achievement in TIMSS test in many countries, and has shown a link between SBM and student achievement (Popham, 2004).
- Ability to lead – school autonomy has improved by providing conditions for leading to improve SBM (Nayab, 2011).
- Responsibility and reporting - a study in Europe which tested SBM, results have shown increasing of reporting responsibilities at school local level (Ben, Dunphy and Griffiths, 2014).

Studies which have not found support for SBM model. Many studies explored that SBM rule does not affect student achievement. For example, in PISA tests in 2009, a student reading scores in SBM were 6 points lower than student scores in schools with less autonomy. In 2012, the difference was nine points lower in science; although SBM showed more taking part of decision making related to traditional schools, it's still without real impact on improving achievement (Nusche et al., 2012; OECD, 2013).

Another example shows, SBM don't affect student achievement, SBM survey in Australia, New Zealand and other countries explored that no impact of SBM on teaching improvements (Popham, 2004). Finally, SBM also does not affect the inequality between students with different social background, in developed country or developing countries (Hanusek, Link and Woessman, 2013).

The study elaborated by the author is supported by literature review and economic research, including results of questionnaires, is based on the following questions:

- How does SBM influence the economic improvement as measured by the school outcomes lists (a descriptive statistics), comparative between pre SBM period and SBM

- period of experimental schools (SBM) themselves; and between experimental schools (SBM) and control schools (NSBM), as measured in elementary Arab Israeli schools?
- How does SBM influence the student achievements as measured by the school outcomes reports, comparative between pre SBM period and SBM period of experimental schools (SBM) themselves; and between experimental schools (SBM) and control schools (NSBM), as measured in elementary Arab Israeli schools?
 - How does SBM or NSBM influence the perception of teachers about Management effectiveness level in experimental schools (SBM), comparative to control schools (NSBM), as measured by the general Effectiveness and Satisfaction Questionnaire (ESQ), from the viewpoint of school staff?
 - How does SBM or NSBM influence the teacher and principal satisfaction in experimental schools (SBM) comparative to control schools (NSBM), efficacy outcomes and teacher satisfaction as measured by the Effectiveness and Satisfaction Questionnaire, in elementary Arab Israeli schools?

In order to explore the level and differences in outcomes; economic improvement; students achievements; and school climate by knowing teachers' and principals' level of job satisfaction, the target population of this study were 21 Arabic schools in Israel, located in Haifa (north) district with mixed urban and rural schools: 18 – elementary are the experimental schools (SBM); 9 – junior schools are the control schools (NSBM). In both were researched 360 teachers and principals.

Research questions will explore the impact of SBM model on Arabs Israeli on schools improvement and effectiveness outcomes (economic improvement and student achievement); and on perceived principal management effectiveness level (style); and on teachers and principals level of satisfaction.

This is a quantitative, comparative and descriptive designs study, will utilize two instruments in order to answer the research questions. The first one is the data lists of the SBM schools outcomes, directly from the schools and treasury departments of Arabs municipalities, and against outcomes lists of NSBM and BSBM traditional schools.

The second one is a survey instruments Likert - type questionnaire. The Effectiveness-Satisfaction-Questionnaire – (ESQ) Questionnaire will be used to measure the conceptions of teachers with regard to elementary SBM Managers effectiveness style; and teachers and principals in order to determine school effectiveness level.

The questionnaire consists of 3 elements, the first one contains three questions about profession (teacher or principal); school kind (SBM vs. NSBM) and school SBM seniority (school NSBM has zero seniority), the second part is about effectiveness which contains two questions; and the third part is about satisfaction whose contains 3 questions. The ESQ will test the perceived effectiveness and satisfaction among the Arabic elementary SBM teachers and principals; against the Arabic elementary and traditional junior schools-NSBM.

Both of questionnaires parts collected in one pamphlet in order to facilitate the task for the respondents the respondents were asked to consider their school principal, and answer a number of questions that related to their school, and their perceptions of the teaching occupation about their satisfaction related to work in school. In addition, background and demographic information wasn't collected due to this study aimed to investigate the general feeling and climate as comparison between the two school kinds, thus, wasn't necessary of exploiting personal details.

The researchers and principals conducted the survey at participate schools by deviating the questionnaires to the participating persons, by the Author direct visiting to the schools. In addition, the researcher has collected economic data and student achievement lists of the participate schools from the schools and from education and

treasure departments of the municipalities besides to the sites related to the Israeli Ministry of Education (Ministry of Education in Israel, 2015).

Data was collected through surveys and numerical data methods. It was recorded on Excel program and SPSS program, using means, regression and figures to explore the significant outcomes and significant differences of the SBM vs. NSBM, in order to determine the real impacts of SBM model on the school effectiveness, feelings and staff satisfaction.

The initial data of this stage contains the study sample characteristics, research relevant years, the four main analysis outcomes: Economic improvements; student's achievements; effectiveness and level of satisfaction.

Study sample characteristics: number and kind of schools and participants (Table 1).

Table 1. The study sample characteristics (independent variables)

Non-SBM vs. SBM	Participants N	Frequency	School Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Non SBM Schools	120	9	42.9	42.9	42.9
SBM Schools	240	12	57.1	57.1	100.0
Total	360	21	100.0	100.0	

Source: calculated by the author based on data research sample

The data in table 1 shows that the school's sample contains 12 SBM schools and 9 NSBM schools, 360 participants are divided into the 120 of NSBM vs. 240 of SBM. Owing to conducting two kinds of comparison, the SBM vs. BSBM, and SBM vs. NSBM, the schools number and participants' quantity of the SBM were doubled rather than the NSBM.

Following the conducted analysis by the author, will be highlighted **the achievements comparison between BSBM and SBM.**

Achievements comparison between BSBM and SBM in the last 3 years before implementation the SBM reform 2010-2012, of the other 12 SBM schools, and the years of the after SBM implementation 2013-2015/16, of the same SBM schools, who have been applying SBM. (Table 2).

Table 2. Means test of achievement according to years for the experimental group (SBM)

Subject	Scholastic Years							
	SBM from 2010 - 2012/13				SBM from 2013 - 2015/16			
	Mean	Count	Min	Max	Mean	Count	Min	Max
Math	431.22	12	379.00	502.00	463.17	12	434.00	504.00
English	440.06	12	449.00	490.00	460.28	12	420.00	513.00
Science	434.00	12	451.00	493.00	484.67	12	416.00	505.00

Source: calculated by the author based on schools' achievements reports (top score is 600)

From the above table the study observes that the student achievement means before applying SBM reform in the 12 experimental schools (BSBM) were lower in the three items, about average of 30 points minus, Math., English, and Science, compared to the years after the application of SBM in same schools. That means there is a clear improvement in all student achievements. This improvement is about 6% increase, makes the improvement not significant, although it's towards achieving SBM targets, which the ministry of education aimed to fulfill.

These study findings reflect indeed the improvement process which the SBM reform started, but as mentioned, this improvement isn't significant, due to increasing scores isn't excessive. If the increase is up to 10% on NSBM scores at least, then perhaps the improvement is significant. The quality, number of the items which has increased scores, in this case all subjects (Math., Eng., Science) increased and testified scores improvement, is important to exist improvement. But the improvement is more significant when the scores quality also available. It means that, not just the target is to increase scores all over items; moreover the intent is to achieve incisive extension.

Student Achievements Differences between NSBM and SBM. Student achievements differences between NSBM and SBM in the 3 years after implementation the SBM reform (2013-2015/16), of the 9 NSBM schools, and 12 SBM schools, as the third part of conducting comparison, in order to test the study issue, and if the SBM reform fulfills achievements assumptions (Table 3).

Table 3. Test-achievement differences from 2013-2015/16 between NSBM and SBM schools

Achievement subject	Mean of 9 NSBM scores	Mean of 12 SBM scores	Mean differences in favor SBM	SBM Changing direct	SBM scores Improvement
Math	440.11	463.17	23	+	yes
English	431.33	460.28	29	+	yes
Science	445.11	484.67	39	+	yes

Source: calculated by the author based on schools' achievements reports (top score is 600)

From the above table 3. the data shows that the student achievement means in traditional schools-NSBM, in parallel period (2013-2015/16) of applying SBM reform in the 12 experimental schools-SBM, were lower in the three items (Math., Eng. and Science). The average differences in the SBM schools is higher than 30 points, compared to the NSBM schools. This mean improvement is about 7% increase, in favor of SBM schools. This finding is similar to former finding related comparison between BSBM vs. SBM. But also this result doesn't make this improvement a significant, although it is encouraging findings, it is still not incisive, due to the extension is small.

When comparing subject grades of the student achievements table 3 shows that there are nearly significant differences but not incisive differences, due to the mean scores improvement is just about 7% in all the three subjects. The improvements after implementation SBM (2013-2015/16) are: In math 23 points is about 5% extension; English 29 points is about 7% extension and Science 39 point is about 9%, thus, the extension mean of the three subjects is about 7%. This is also an encouraging finding towards achieving SBM targets, although the improvement isn't significant, SBM supporters will be proud to present it.

The data in table 3 shows that there are nearly significant differences in means achievements in all subjects (Math, English and Science). Scores were little better in the years from 2013 until 2015/16 as study hypothesis was assumed, the SBM can achieve improvement student scores. If factors related SBM reform were fulfilled, the result which expected is towards improvement direction.

In conclusion the comparison between two kinds of schools, student achievement result and differences, the findings are in favor of SBM schools, and they confirm SBM does affect student achievement. The improvement is clear but not significant or incisive changings, which is meaning, the direction is towards improving and this is in favor the SBM reform. That mean, due to the short SBM period (just 3 years seniority) can't give significant result or incisive finding.

It seems that in the current SBM is better than the old SBM (2001), and lessons were learned from the past and implemented in the improved present model. The results speak for themselves, it is very important to give SBM reform the chance for improving itself; and to continue this research for along years in order to determine absolute findings, although the results in this study are encouraging.

The student's achievements analysis. Regarding the results of the statistical analysis of the effect of self-based management (SBM) on the student's achievements, we can conclude as follows:

- In the first 12 schools, before applying SBM (2010-2012), the means were low compared to the years after the application of SBM (2013-2015-16) in these schools, and it is clear through the means of each subject items (Math., Eng., and Science).
- The difference between before (BSBM) and after applying SBM in the first 12 schools during the years from 2010 to 2012; and from the 2013 to 2015/16 was nearly significant, the means of the student grades items during the years 2010 to 2012/13 were low compared to the means during the years 2013 to 2015/16. The mean of grades increase was 7% in favor of SBM.
- When we compare between the means for the second 9 NSBM schools during the years 2013-2015/16 and the means for the 12 SBM schools after the application of SBM 2013-2015/16, there were differences in favor of the years after the application of SBM in the first 12 SBM schools. The mean of grades increase was 7% in favor of SBM.
- Thus, the SBM reform as tested at the school grades achievements part, SBM school has achieved advantages more than the traditional schools-NSBM, and the reform direction is towards fulfillment the targets. The huge fulfillment of achieving goals, as this study assuming, will be achieved after more seniority years, if this trend continues growing.

Comparative between pre SBM period and SBM period of experimental elementary Arab schools (SBM). Means and standard deviations for the first 12 schools (with SBM) before and after the application of SBM from 2010-2012/13 and from 2013 to 2015/16 (Table 4.)

Table 4. Means of SBM school in 12 experimental schools (SBM), before and after SBM

Finance	before the application of SBM 2010-2012/13			after the application of SBM 2013-2015/16		
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Bank Balance	500	35100	2849.41	9210	17500	12807.84
1- volunteer	3750	11190	9247	9550	10900	9286
2- parents payments	29200	642500	54420	37980	59451	53451.57
3- computer purchases	5	12	9	11	20	16

Source: calculated by the author based on financial schools report (finance 1-3 are in Shekels- Israeli Coin)

From the above table the study observes that the means before applying SBM reform in the 12 experimental schools (BSBM) were lower in two parts, bank balance and computer purchases, compared to the years after the application of SBM in themselves schools. That means there is a clear improvement in two budget items, but equal result in one finance part is the volunteer is very similar, without significant difference. Another field is the parent payments the results also resulted equal, even in the BSBM period the mean is higher a few, the score is 969 shekels in favor BSBM.

Differences between before SBM (BSBM) period and SBM period of experimental schools (SBM). The economic differences between before and after applying SBM in the 12 SBM schools during the years from 2010 to 2012/13 and from 2013 to 2015/16 see (Table 5.).

Table 5. Test- Economic differences between after and before implementation SBM of 12 SBM

Finance	Mean 12 BSBM	Mean 12 SBM	Mean differences in favor SBM	SBM Changing direct	Improvement SBM
1- Bank Balance	2849.41	12807.84	9958	+	yes
2- Volunteer	9247	9286.27	39	=	Not clear
3- Parents payments	54420.57	53451.57	969 -	-	No
4- computer Purchases	9	16	7	+	yes

Source: calculated by the author based on financial schools report (finance 1-3 are in Shekels- Israeli Coin)

The data in table 5 shows that the economic differences were in favor of the years after the application of SBM, in the Bank Balance and computer purchases while at the parent's payments there were no significant difference, even it was few in favor of BSBM (969 shk.). So also at the volunteer part there are no differences between the two periods.

When comparing terms of the budget shows that there are significant differences in two budget parts. Bank balance has increased about 4 times in SBMS, and computer purchases also have increased about double times. Opposite, in another two budget parts there weren't significant differences. In general, the direction results and differences divided into two parts, the one confirms SBM affect economic improvement in form significant, and the other one either doesn't confirm improvement, in this case equal results (volunteer) in the two periods; or even confirms un improvement (parents payments).

In conclusion finance comparison result and differences the findings confirm, SBM does affect economic improvement, but with no significant improvement. Thus, it's in favor of SBM, in meaning, the direction is in favor the SBM reform.

Economic comparison between the last 3 years 2013-15/16 of the 9 NSBM schools that haven't applying SBM reform; and the last 3 years 2013-2015/16 of the 12 SBM schools who have been applying SBM. Mean's finance subjects for the control 9 NSBM schools, after the application of SBM during the years 2013-2015/16; and the means for the experimental 12 SBM schools after the application of SBM 2013-2015/16. (Table 6).

Table 6. Economic means of 9 NSBM and 12 SBM after applying SBM reform

Finance	SBM after application of SBM			NSBM after application of SBM		
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
1-Bank Balance	650	4550	3459	9210	17500	12807
2-Volunteer	1400	6500	3266	9550	10900	9286
3-Parents payments	49600	60700	55007	37980	59451	53451
4-computer Purchases	7	15	11	11	20	16

Source: calculated by the author based on financial schools report (finance 1-3 are in Shekels- Israeli Coin)

From the above table the study observes that the means after SBM period, 2013-2015/16, in 9 control traditional schools-NSBM, were low compared to the means of for the 12 experimental SBM schools after the application of SBM 2013-2015/16. And it is clear through the means for each budget item. Except in the parents payments item the mean was higher.

Economic differences between: the last 3 years 2013-15/16 of the 9 NSBM schools that haven't applying SBM reform; and the last 3 years 2013-2015/16 of the 12 SBM schools who have been applying SBM. The economic differences between after and after applying SBM in the 12 SBM schools during the years from 2010 to 2012/13; and 9 NSBM schools during parallel period 2013-2015/16 (Table 7.)

Table 7. Economic differences between Control Schools NSBM and experimental SBM schools

Finance	Mean 9 NSBM	Mean 12 SBM	Mean differences in favor SBM	SBM Changing direct	Improvement SBM
1- Bank Balance	3459	12807.84	9348	+	yes
2- Volunteer	3266	9286.27	6020	+	yes
3- Parents payments	55007	53451.57	1556 -	-	No
4- computer Purchases	11	16	5	+	yes

Source: calculated by the author based on financial schools report (finance 1-3 are in Shekels- Israeli Coin)

The data in above table 7 shows that the economic differences again were in favor of the SBM schools after the application of SBM, related to parallel period of the traditional schools-NSBM. The Bank Balance is in favor SBM, has increased 9348 shk. About 3 double of NSBM bank balance; and the volunteer also has doubled 3 times in SBM schools after applying SBM reform; besides to computer purchases which increased 45%. While at the fourth item the parent's payments, there was no significant difference, even it was few in favor of NSBM (1556 shk.). When comparing terms of the budget shows that there are significant differences in three budget parts. Bank balance, volunteer and computer purchases, have increased about double times. Oppositely, in another budget item, there wasn't a significant difference, but this advantage for NSBM doesn't reject the economic improvement direction. Due to 3 items in favor of SBM vs. just one part is in favor the NSBM.

So, the direction results and differences divided into two parts, the one is major (3 of 4) which confirms SBM affect economic improvement in form significant, and the other one is minor (1 of 4). doesn't confirm improvement (parents payments).

In conclusion finance comparison result and differences the findings confirm that SBM does affect economic improvement. But again it is without significant improvement, although the results are in favor SBM they still not incisive. In sum, the direction is in favor the SBM reform, but due to the short SBM period (just 3 years seniority), thus, the next few years can help research field to determine absolute findings about SBM reform.

3. Conclusions

Regarding the results of the economic analysis of the effect of SBM on the school budget **author conclude as follows:**

-In the first 12 schools, before applying self-management, the means were low compared to the years after the application of SBM in these schools and it is clear through the means of each budget item, except the parents payments were in favor of traditional schools NSBM, and the volunteer was equal.

-In the last 9 schools, the means after applying SBM were low compared to the means of the 12 SBM schools after the application of SBM 2013-2015/16.

-The difference between before and after applying SBM in the first 12 schools during the years from 2010 to 2012 and from the 2013 to 2015/16 was significant, the means of the budget items during the years 2010 to 2012 were low compared to the means during the years 2013 to 2015/16.

-When we compare between the means for the second 9 NSBM schools during the years 2013-2015/16 and the means for the first 12 SBM schools after the application of SBM 2013-2015/16 there were differences in favor of the years after the application of SBM in the first 12 SBM schools.

-Thus, the SBM reform as tested at the economic part, has achieved advantages more than the traditional schools-NSBM, and the reform direction is towards fulfillment the targets.

References

1. Ben, S., Dunphy, D. and Griffiths, A., 2014. *Organizational change for corporate sustainability*. (3rd ed). New York: Routledge, pp.1-349.
2. Brus, G.M., Hengeveld, G.M., Walvoort, D.J., Goedhart, P.W., Heidema, A.H., Nabuurs, G.J. and Gunia, K., 2011. Statistical mapping of tree species over Europe. *European Journal of Forest Research*, 131(1), pp.145–157.
3. Caldwell, B., 2005. *School based management*. [online] Available at: <<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001410/141025e>> [Accessed 3 March 2019].
4. Carnevale, A.P., and Desrochers, D.M., 2002. The Missing Middle: Aligning Education and the Knowledge Economy. *Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education*, 25(1), pp.3-23.
5. Germano, M., 2010. *Leadership Style and Organizational Impact*. Library Work life. [online] Available at: <<http://ala-apa.org/newsletter/2010/06/08/spotlight/>> [Accessed 3 March 2019].
6. Hanushek, E., Link, S. and Woessman, L., 2013. Does school autonomy make sense everywhere? Panel Estimates from PISA. *Journal of Development Economics*, 104(C), pp.212–232.
7. Ministry of Education in Israel, 2015. *School Based Management*. [online] Available at: <<http://cms.education.gov.il/EducationCMS/>> [Accessed 3 March 2019].
8. Nayab, N., 2011. *A Critique of the Autocratic Leadership Style*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.brightbpm.com/resource>> [Accessed 3 March 2019].
9. Nusche, D., Laveault, D., MacBeath, J. and Santiago, P., 2012. *OECD reviews of evaluation and assessment in education: New Zealand*. [pdf] Available at: <<http://www.oecd.org/newzealand/49681441.pdf>> [Accessed 3 March 2019].
10. Obiwuru, T.C., Okwu, A.T, Akpa, V.O. and Nwankwere, I.D., 2011. Effects of leadership style on organizational performance. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(7), pp.100-111.
11. OECD, 2013. *PISA 2012 Results: What makes schools successful? Resources, Policies and Practices Vol. IV*, PISA. Paris: OECD Publishing.

12. Popham, W.J., 2004. *America's failing schools: How parents and teachers can cope with No Child Left Behind*. New York: Routledge-Falmer.
13. South Australian Department of Education and Children's Services, 2008. *Local governance*. [online] Available at: < <http://www.decs.sa.gov.au/>> [Accessed 3 March 2019].
14. Vaughn, V., Gill, P.B. and Sherman, R., 2009. *Effective school research: teachers' and administrators' perceptions of its existence on campus*, pp. 1-10. [online] Available at: <http://www.ncmle.org/journal/PDF/Jan09/Effective_School_Research.pdf> [Accessed 3 March 2019].