

## School Management Collaboration in Managing Student Potential in Nature Schools

<sup>1)</sup> Rahmi Dewi, <sup>2)</sup> Mada Sutapa

<sup>1,2)</sup> Master of Education Management, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

Email: [rahmidewi.2025@student.uny.ac.id](mailto:rahmidewi.2025@student.uny.ac.id)

\*Correspondence Author: [rahmidewi.2025@student.uny.ac.id](mailto:rahmidewi.2025@student.uny.ac.id)

### Article Info

#### Keywords:

management collaboration, student potential management, nature school, education management

### ABSTRACT

This study aimed to analyze the patterns of school management collaboration in managing student potential at Sekolah Alam Kampung Sawah and Pesantren Alam Arrahmah Bondowoso. The inquiry focused on role distribution among school management actors, coordination mechanisms, student potential facilitation strategies, and supporting and inhibiting factors of collaboration. A qualitative approach with a multi-site case study design was employed. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, limited participatory observation, and school documentation. Participants included principals, classroom teachers, supporting teachers, dormitory mentors, administrative staff, and parents. Data were analyzed through data condensation, data display, and thematic conclusion drawing. Trustworthiness was strengthened through source triangulation, technique triangulation, member checking, and document audits. The findings revealed that school management collaboration in managing student potential was enacted through coordination meetings, daily communication, individual assistance, outdoor learning adaptation, and student progress evaluation. Effective collaboration emerged when schools developed participatory leadership, a caring culture, cross-role communication, and consistent student development documentation. The main constraints were limited potential assessment instruments, teacher workload, and uneven understanding of holistic student potential management.

### Article Information

#### Keywords:

kolaborasi manajemen, pengelolaan potensi siswa, sekolah alam, manajemen pendidikan.

### ABSTRACT

Penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisis pola kolaborasi manajemen sekolah dalam pengelolaan potensi siswa di Sekolah Alam Kampung Sawah dan Pesantren Alam Arrahmah Bondowoso. Fokus kajian mencakup pembagian peran aktor manajemen sekolah, mekanisme koordinasi, strategi fasilitasi potensi siswa, serta faktor pendukung dan penghambat kolaborasi. Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan desain studi kasus multisitus. Data dikumpulkan melalui wawancara mendalam, observasi partisipatif terbatas, dan dokumentasi sekolah. Informan meliputi kepala sekolah, guru kelas, guru pendamping, wali asrama, tenaga kependidikan, dan orang tua. Analisis data dilakukan melalui kondensasi data, penyajian data, serta penarikan kesimpulan secara tematik. Keabsahan data diperkuat dengan triangulasi sumber, triangulasi teknik, member checking, dan audit dokumen. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa kolaborasi manajemen sekolah dalam pengelolaan potensi siswa berjalan melalui rapat koordinasi, komunikasi harian, pendampingan individual, adaptasi kegiatan alam, dan evaluasi perkembangan siswa. Kolaborasi efektif muncul ketika sekolah memiliki kepemimpinan partisipatif, budaya kepedulian, komunikasi lintas peran, dan dokumentasi perkembangan siswa yang konsisten. Hambatan utama terletak pada keterbatasan instrumen asesmen potensi, beban kerja guru, dan belum seragamnya pemahaman tentang pengelolaan potensi siswa secara holistik.

### Article History

Received : 15/03/2026

Revised : 25/05/2026

Accepted : 21/07/2026

✉ Corresponding Author: (1) Rahmi Dewi, (2) Educational Management Study Program, (3) Yogyakarta State University, (4) Yogyakarta, Indonesia, (5) [rahmidewi.2025@student.uny.ac.id](mailto:rahmidewi.2025@student.uny.ac.id)

## 1. Introduction

Managing student potential is one of the core responsibilities of educational institutions and requires organizational work that is coordinated, adaptive, and based on individual developmental data. Each student possesses diverse potential in cognitive, affective, kinesthetic, social, and spiritual dimensions that must be properly facilitated so that it can develop optimally. In this context, school management cannot work merely in a sectoral and hierarchical manner; rather, it must build collaboration involving all actors: principals, classroom teachers, supporting teachers, dormitory mentors, administrative staff, and parents.

Nature Schools have emerged as an alternative education model that philosophically has a strong commitment to the holistic development of student potential. Learning activities take place through direct experience, interaction with the natural environment, strengthening independence, and relatively fluid social relationships between teachers and students. This learning character has great potential to facilitate various dimensions of student potential that cannot always be explored in conventional education models. However, such an open and dynamic character also requires strong management collaboration. The variety of natural stimuli, schedule flexibility, and diversity of student needs require principals, teachers, dormitory mentors, and administrative staff to have a shared understanding of each student's potential profile and development strategy.

School management collaboration is a strategic issue because the management of student potential cannot be assigned to a single actor individually. Friend and Cook [1] view collaboration as professional work characterized by shared goals, shared responsibility, shared decision making, and shared accountability. In the context of managing student potential, collaboration connects classroom teachers' knowledge of student learning styles, supporting teachers' skills in individual facilitation, principals' policies as organizational leaders, administrative staff support in data management, and communication with parents as a source of contextual information on child development.

Theoretically, this study rests on three main concepts. The first concept is collaborative school management as a process of aligning roles, resources, and decisions among actors in order to achieve shared educational goals. The second concept is the management of student potential, which includes identification, mapping, facilitation, and systematic and continuous evaluation of individual potential development. The third concept is the ecology of child development, which places school, family, peers, and the physical environment as systems that mutually influence the development of student potential [2]. These three concepts help explain why the management of student potential in Nature Schools must be understood as cross-role and cross-learning-space work.

The selection of Nature Schools as the research context has

strong academic reasons. Nature Schools provide space for multisensory learning, kinesthetic activities, social interaction, and experiential learning. These characteristics are relevant and conducive to the development of various dimensions of student potential that cannot always be facilitated in conventional classroom-based learning models. However, the pedagogical potential of the natural environment can only be optimized if it is managed through systematic management collaboration. Without good coordination, the flexibility of Nature Schools risks producing inconsistent and immeasurable practices in facilitating the development of student potential.

Studies on Nature Schools and alternative education management have developed, but studies that specifically position school management collaboration as the main mechanism for managing student potential in Nature Schools remain limited. In fact, the success of student potential development depends greatly on the quality of working relationships and coordination systems among actors within the school organization. [3] emphasizes that the quality of educational services needs to be understood as a process of jointly changing school culture, policy, and practice. Therefore, analysis needs to examine not only the presence or absence of potential development programs, but also how schools build a collaborative work culture that enables every actor to contribute to the development of each student.

This study was conducted at Sekolah Alam Kampung Sawah and Pesantren Alam Arrahmah Bondowoso. These two locations were selected because both develop nature-based learning and community values and accept students with diverse needs and potential profiles. This study aims to analyze patterns of school management collaboration in managing student potential. Specifically, this study examines the distribution of roles among school management actors, coordination mechanisms, student potential facilitation strategies, and supporting and inhibiting factors of collaboration. The findings are expected to contribute to the development of more systematic, collaborative, and student-potential-based Nature School management.

## 2. Research Method

This study used a qualitative approach with a multi-site case study design. This design was chosen because the study sought to understand in depth the process of school management collaboration in managing student potential in a natural context. Case studies enable researchers to examine practices, meanings, relationships, and social dynamics that emerge in managing student potential in Nature Schools [4]. A qualitative approach is relevant because the focus of the study is not to measure effectiveness statistically, but to interpret patterns of collaborative work, managerial decisions, and the experiences of school actors in facilitating student potential [5].

The study was conducted at Sekolah Alam Kampung Sawah

and Pesantren Alam Arrahmah Bondowoso. The locations were selected purposively based on three considerations. First, both schools have students with diverse potential profiles. Second, both schools implement nature- and community-based learning that is pedagogically conducive to developing various dimensions of student potential. Third, both schools have school management collaboration practices involving principals, teachers, supporting teachers, dormitory mentors, administrative staff, and parents in managing student development.

The research subjects consisted of two principals, six classroom teachers, four supporting teachers, two dormitory mentors, two administrative staff members, and six parents. The identities of informants and students were anonymized to maintain data confidentiality.

Data were collected through three complementary techniques: in-depth interviews, limited participatory observation, and document study. Interviews were used to explore informants' understanding of management collaboration, role distribution, student potential facilitation strategies, and development evaluation. Observations were conducted during learning activities, outdoor activities, activity transitions, individual assistance, teacher communication, and evaluation sessions. Documentation included school profiles, student development data, learning progress records, activity schedules, meeting minutes, communication books, teaching modules, and student portfolio documentation. The use of these three techniques supported triangulation because collaboration phenomena appear not only in statements, but also in actual practices and institutional documents.

Data analysis was conducted through data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing as developed by [6]. Data condensation was carried out by selecting information related to management collaboration patterns, actor roles, potential management strategies, and factors influencing collaboration effectiveness. Data display was presented in thematic matrices and cross-case narratives. Conclusions were drawn gradually through repeated reading of interview transcripts, observation notes, and school documents. Data trustworthiness was strengthened through source triangulation, technique triangulation, member checking, and audit trails.

### 3. Results and Discussion

The results show that school management collaboration in managing student potential at the two research sites took place as a complex and dynamic collective practice. Collaboration was not only present in formal forums such as meetings, but also appeared in daily communication among teachers, quick decisions in the field during nature activities, activity adjustments based on student conditions, and periodic evaluation of student potential development. These findings indicate that Nature Schools require a management collaboration model that is flexible yet well documented. The pattern is summarized in Table 1.

Interview data show that teachers did not interpret management collaboration as an additional activity outside learning. They understood it as a prerequisite for meaningful learning activities that can facilitate each student's potential individually. One teacher stated that every small change in a student's condition needed to be known by other teachers because such changes could affect the student's readiness to explore and express potential in the next activity. Observation notes also show that teachers' classroom decisions were often preceded by brief information from supporting teachers or dormitory mentors.

School documents strengthened these findings. Student development records, work portfolios, communication books, activity schedules, and evaluation minutes show that schools have attempted to build traces of collaborative work. Although documentation forms were not yet fully uniform, these documents helped teachers read patterns of student potential development across time and across activity contexts.

**Table 1.** Patterns of School Management Collaboration in Managing Student Potential

Collaboration Pattern	Form of Practice	Function in Managing Student Potential
Formal coordination	Teacher meetings, student development discussions, weekly evaluations	Aligning strategies for identifying and facilitating student potential
Daily communication	Brief notes, group messages, conversations before activities	Maintaining rapid responses to student development and needs
Individual assistance	Support from supporting teachers and dormitory mentors for students personally	Facilitating potential exploration, self-regulation, and active participation
Adaptation of nature activities	Modification of instructions, duration, tasks, roles, and assistive tools	Increasing access to and expression of diverse potential in nature activities
Development evaluation	Behavior records, learning achievements, portfolios, and	Assessing developmental trajectories of potential and improving facilitation strategies

parent  
communication

### 1. Patterns of School Management Collaboration in Managing Student Potential

Management collaboration at Sekolah Alam Kampung Sawah and Pesantren Alam Arrahmah Bondowoso moved through two complementary paths. The first path was structured coordination through teacher meetings, student development case discussions, and weekly evaluations. The second path was situational coordination that occurred when management actors directly faced student potential development needs in the field. Formal meetings provided direction and alignment of shared strategies, while situational coordination allowed rapid and adaptive responses. This practice is in line with Ainscow's [3] view that the quality of educational services develops through changes in school practices that are continuously negotiated together by all school members.

In both schools, principals acted as policy directors and guardians of a collaborative culture in managing student potential. Classroom teachers were responsible for designing learning activities that facilitated various dimensions of student potential, managing group dynamics, and ensuring that every student had the opportunity to express their strengths. Supporting teachers helped students maximize participation, manage self-regulation challenges, and explore potential in the dynamic context of nature activities. Dormitory mentors at Pesantren Alam Arrahmah Bondowoso extended potential management into daily life - social interaction, independence, responsibility, and character development - which did not end when learning hours were over. Administrative staff played a role in archiving development data, administrative communication, and logistical support that ensured the smooth implementation of potential facilitation programs.

This role distribution shows that managing student potential in Nature Schools requires coordinated cross-functional work within the school organization. Friend and Cook [1] state that effective collaboration requires equality, shared goals, and collective responsibility. The findings of this study strengthen that view in the specific context of managing student potential in Nature Schools.

The collaboration that emerged did not always take the form of a special organizational structure. In many cases, collaboration grew from the habit of sharing information about the development of student potential. Classroom teachers conveyed their observations of students' interests and strengths to supporting teachers. Supporting teachers provided input on students' readiness and exploration potential before outdoor activities. Principals made decisions when schedule, program, or resource adjustments were needed to facilitate the development of certain potentials. This practice reflects internalized shared

responsibility.

At Sekolah Alam Kampung Sawah, coordination often occurred before and after main activities. Teachers used brief conversations to ensure student readiness, divide mentoring tasks, and determine potential facilitation strategies to be implemented. At Pesantren Alam Arrahmah Bondowoso, coordination was longer and more comprehensive because students' lives did not stop at learning hours. Dormitory mentors provided information about nighttime conditions, patterns of social interaction, independence development, and readiness to participate in morning activities. This difference shows that the management collaboration model is influenced by the school's institutional structure and the scope of activities managed.

Informant quotations clarified this pattern. A supporting teacher stated that they could not make decisions alone in facilitating student potential because such decisions had to consider classroom teachers' objectives, group conditions, and information obtained from dormitory mentors. The principal also emphasized that all teachers needed to understand each student's potential profile and the agreed facilitation strategies so that students received consistent responses that supported their development in various activity contexts. These two statements show that management collaboration functions as a mechanism for aligning actions, not merely exchanging information.

### 2. The Roles of School Management Actors in Managing Student Potential

The principal's role was visible in three strategic aspects. First, the principal built a shared norm that every student has potential that needs to be facilitated according to their uniqueness, rather than compared with a single standard. Second, the principal provided space and legitimacy for teachers to make adjustments and innovations in facilitating student potential without fear of being considered to deviate from the plan. Third, the principal encouraged reflection on student potential development through structured and continuous evaluation forums. This type of leadership approaches the principles of transformative leadership that empowers all school management actors [7].

Classroom teachers became the main actors in designing learning experiences that facilitated diverse student potential. Teachers differentiated instruction through varied language, choices of response formats, division of activities into steps that all students could follow, and the provision of multisensory learning media. In nature activities, teachers adjusted each student's role according to their potential profile - students with kinesthetic tendencies were given physical exploration roles, students with naturalist tendencies were assigned observation and recording tasks, and students with social tendencies were given group coordination roles. This adaptation is consistent with the idea of differentiated pedagogy, which emphasizes expanding pathways of participation for all students [8].

Supporting teachers played a role in maintaining the balance between individual support and the development of student independence. Observation data show that supporting teachers were not always very close to students. In several activities, they provided distance so that students could practice exploring their potential independently and interacting with peers. Support was given when students experienced participation barriers, confusion about instructions, or fatigue in the exploration process. This approach is important because overly dominant assistance can actually hinder student potential exploration and create unproductive dependency. Sharma and Salend [9] emphasize that assistance support needs to strengthen active participation, not create new dependency.

Parents are a highly valuable source of contextual information in managing student potential. Teachers and supporting teachers used information from parents to understand children's interests, tendencies, experiences, and ability development outside school. This information was discussed in internal coordination and became a consideration in designing personal and relevant potential facilitation programs. Bronfenbrenner [2] explains that the development of children's potential is influenced by relationships among their closest environments. In this context, school management collaboration becomes stronger and more effective when schools are able to connect information from the family environment with potential development practices at school.

The role of administrative staff in managing student potential also needs to be explicitly noted. Administrative staff supported the availability of student development data, administration of facilitation programs, and logistical completeness of nature activities. This logistical support determined the smooth running of potential development programs. The readiness of learning aids, exploration spaces, transportation for field activities, and completeness of student portfolio documents are parts of the supporting ecosystem that enables management collaboration to work effectively. This finding confirms that managing student potential is not only in the pedagogical realm but also in the administrative and managerial realms.

The role distribution shows that management collaboration has structural and cultural dimensions that must be present together. The structural dimension appears in meeting schedules, task distribution, and systems for documenting potential development. The cultural dimension appears in care for each student's uniqueness, willingness to share information, and the way all school members view and appreciate diverse potential. Structure without a culture of care can turn into empty administration that has no impact on student development. Conversely, a culture of care without structure can produce personally good services that are difficult to sustain.

### **3. Strategies for Facilitating Student Potential through Nature Activities**

Strategies for facilitating student potential in the two schools took place through modifications of goals, processes, time, media, and forms of evaluation adapted to each student's potential profile. Teachers did not merely standardize final results; they more often adjusted how students accessed and expressed their potential in activities. For example, in gardening activities, students with kinesthetic tendencies were given opportunities to be directly involved in planting, while students with naturalist tendencies were assigned to observe and systematically record plant changes. In nature exploration activities, students with artistic tendencies were given the freedom to document findings through sketches, while students with analytical tendencies were asked to write observation reports. In group discussions, students who were less comfortable speaking in public were given the option to convey ideas through writing, pictures, or demonstrations.

This adaptation shows that Nature Schools have rich pedagogical potential for developing various dimensions of student potential. The natural environment not only provides an authentic context, but also opens diverse learning pathways - movement, sensory experience, social interaction, observation, and concrete experience - that can be used to facilitate different student potentials. However, this potential is only effective if it is managed through facilitation strategies based on a deep understanding of each student's potential profile. Without such understanding, nature activities risk becoming merely enjoyable activities without measurable developmental impact.

Documentation findings show that both schools had student development records, although the level of completeness differed. Sekolah Alam Kampung Sawah relied more on teacher notes and communication with parents as sources of information about potential development. Pesantren Alam Arrahmah Bondowoso had broader records because they covered both learning activities and dormitory life. This difference shows that the institutional context influences the form and scope of student potential documentation.

Observation data show that nature activities actually made it easier for teachers to see and recognize student strengths that are not always visible in conventional classroom-based learning contexts. Students who appeared passive in classroom discussions could show motor skills, courage in exploration, or extraordinary observational accuracy during nature exploration activities. Students who were less fluent in verbal communication could express rich understanding through visual work, movement, or practical actions. These findings strengthen the argument that managing student potential needs to provide various pathways for participation and expression, and Nature Schools have a significant comparative advantage in providing those pathways.

### **4. Supporting and Inhibiting Factors of Management Collaboration**

**Supporting Factors**

The main supporting factor of management collaboration in managing student potential was a strong culture of care for each student's uniqueness. Teachers and supporting teachers in both schools viewed the diversity of student potential not as a burdensome challenge, but as a richness of the learning community that needed to be facilitated with sincerity. This culture appeared in the way teachers talked about students, their willingness to share information, and their openness to receive input from colleagues about more effective facilitation strategies. Messiou [10] emphasizes that the quality of educational services depends not only on written policy, but also on social practices that respect diversity and position every student as a valuable individual.

The second factor was the principal's participatory leadership, which gave teachers space to try new strategies, discuss difficulties, and evaluate decisions together. Teachers were not positioned as mere implementers of single instructions, but as professionals who were part of the managerial decision-making process. This finding reinforces the view that effective school leadership has a significant influence on the consistency and quality of student potential management [7]. The third factor was intensive cross-role communication among principals, teachers, supporting teachers, dormitory mentors, administrative staff, and parents. This cross-role communication system connected information about student potential development from various contexts - class, nature activities, dormitory, and home - enabling school management to respond to potential development needs quickly, appropriately, and consistently.

**Inhibiting Factors**

Barriers to management collaboration emerged in three main aspects. First, not all school management actors had the same and in-depth understanding of each student's potential profile and the most effective facilitation strategies. Some teachers still tended to view student potential from a narrow perspective that prioritized academic ability, so other dimensions of potential - kinesthetic, artistic, social, and naturalist - received less proportional attention in planning and implementing learning programs.

Second, student potential assessment instruments were not yet fully standardized. Teachers had development notes, but the potential indicators used were not always clear, measurable, and consistent among teachers. This made it difficult to conduct cross-time and cross-teacher analysis of the trajectory of each student's potential development. Third, teachers' workloads were quite high because they had to manage classes, facilitate nature activities, communicate with parents, document student potential development, and participate in various management collaboration forums. This barrier indicates that collaboration requires an adequate support system - not only good intentions and personal dedication.

Another barrier was seen in the continuity of information about student potential profiles when teacher changes or supporting teacher rotations occurred. When potential facilitation strategies were stored only in the memory of certain teachers, the

Component	Main Practice	Impact on Managing Student Potential
Collaborative leadership	The principal provides direction, support, and legitimacy for potential facilitation	The school culture respects and facilitates diverse potential
Reflective communication	Teachers, supporting teachers, dormitory mentors, and parents exchange developmental information	Management responses become faster, more appropriate, and more consistent
Potential facilitation through nature activities	Teachers adjust tasks, instructions, media, roles, and evaluation	Every student can express their potential in activities
Documentation of potential development	The school records student achievements, barriers, strategies, and portfolios	Potential evaluation becomes more data-based and sustainable
Capacity building for actors	Case discussions, joint reflection, and cross-teacher learning	Understanding and ability to facilitate potential increase collectively

continuity of student potential development services became vulnerable to disruption. This situation confirms the importance of concise, structured, and easy-to-use student potential profile documents for anyone involved in managing student development. Facilities also influenced collaboration. Not all areas and facilities for nature activities automatically supported the facilitation of various dimensions of student potential optimally. Schools need to prepare more planned facility support so that the pedagogical potential of the natural environment can be optimized systematically.

**5. Finding Model: Management Collaboration Based on Nature School Culture**

Based on cross-case findings, school management collaboration in managing student potential can be understood through a model with five interrelated main components. The first component is collaborative leadership, which provides vision direction, legitimacy, and resource support for adaptive and differentiated practices in managing student potential. The second component is reflective communication, which connects information about student potential development from class, outdoor activities, dormitory, and family to responsive managerial decisions. The third component is potential facilitation through nature activities, which adjusts goals, processes, media, time, and evaluation to the diverse potential profiles of each student. The fourth component is systematic documentation of potential development as the basis for evaluation and continuous improvement of facilitation strategies. The fifth component is strengthening the capacity of management actors through case discussions, peer learning, cross-teacher observation, and structured reflection that build a shared understanding of student potential management.

This model differs from ordinary administrative collaboration, which tends to stop at the formal division of tasks. Management collaboration based on Nature School culture requires shared awareness that every space and every moment in a Nature School is an opportunity to develop student potential. Potential management does not only take place in the classroom, but also when students move between activities, play, garden, worship, eat, participate in nature exploration, and interact with peers. From the perspective of developmental ecology, the diversity of spaces and contexts shapes children's learning experiences through repeated relationships between individuals and their environment [2].

## Discussion

The study results show that school management collaboration is a core mechanism that determines the effectiveness of student potential management in Nature Schools. These findings broaden and deepen the understanding of education management in alternative educational institutions. Managing student potential is not enough to depend on the pedagogical competence of individual teachers; it requires organizational work that systematically connects school leadership, teacher practice, mentoring support, family information, and developmental documentation.

In the context of Nature Schools, management collaboration has distinctive characteristics that differentiate it from collaboration models in conventional schools. An open and dynamic learning environment requires all management actors to make decisions quickly in situations that cannot always be fully planned. These decisions often occur while nature activities are taking place - when a student shows deep interest in a particular phenomenon, when another student expresses potential that has not previously been observed, or when natural conditions present spontaneous learning opportunities of high value. This situation

requires a shared understanding among actors of each student's potential profile and coordinated decision-making flexibility.

The finding about the importance of balancing individual support and the development of independence also has significant managerial relevance. Excessive or overly directive potential facilitation risks limiting students' independent exploration and creating dependency that hinders long-term potential development. Supporting teachers need to regulate the intensity and form of support so that students have enough space to experience, try, fail, and learn independently from experience. Florian and Black-Hawkins [8] emphasize that effective potential facilitation is not about providing all answers, but about expanding choices and learning pathways for every student.

The limitation of potential assessment instruments is an important managerial note. Without clear and mutually agreed instruments, evaluation of potential development risks depending on teacher memory or subjective perceptions that are not verified. Schools need to develop a simple, standardized, and consistently used potential profile documentation format for all management actors. This format needs to include the profile of students' potential tendencies, contexts that reveal strengths, effective facilitation strategies, strategies that need evaluation, and development in various dimensions - academic, social, character, and life skills. With good documentation, management collaboration can move from personal care toward a more accountable and sustainable potential management system.

This discussion confirms that Nature Schools have great opportunities to become highly conducive spaces for student potential development. Their main strengths lie in flexibility, fluid community relationships, concrete experiential activities, and multisensory learning. However, these strengths can only be optimized through a management collaboration system that is clear, structured, and based on developmental data. Managerially, schools need to establish coordination forums with specific agendas - not only discussing students' general conditions, but also discussing potential development data, individual achievement trajectories, successful facilitation strategies, strategies that need improvement, and measurable follow-up plans.

These findings have theoretical and practical contributions. Theoretically, this study shows that school management collaboration can bridge the philosophy of Nature Schools regarding holistic student potential development and systematic and accountable management practice. Practically, this study offers a management collaboration model that positions collaborative leadership, reflective communication, potential facilitation through nature activities, development documentation, and capacity strengthening as components that must be present together and synergistically. This model can be used by other Nature Schools with adjustments to the characteristics of each institution.

The limitation of this study lies in the scope of locations involving two Nature Schools. These findings provide in-depth

contextual understanding, but are not intended for statistical generalization. Future studies may expand the scope to more Nature Schools with diverse institutional contexts and examine in greater depth collaboration with external parties - such as educational psychologists, counselors, and talent development institutions - in managing student potential more comprehensively.

#### 4. Conclusion

This study concludes that school management collaboration in managing student potential at Sekolah Alam Kampung Sawah and Pesantren Alam Arrahmah Bondowoso takes place through formal coordination, daily cross-role communication, individual assistance, adaptation of nature activities, and continuous evaluation of student potential development. This collaboration is not merely an administrative division of tasks, but an organizational mechanism of the school to ensure that every student receives facilitation according to their potential profile in various contexts - class, nature activities, dormitory, and family.

The success of management collaboration in managing student potential is influenced by three main factors: participatory leadership that empowers all actors, a culture of care for the uniqueness of each student's potential, and reflective communication that consistently connects developmental information from various contexts. The main obstacles lie in the limited availability of standardized potential assessment instruments, high teacher workload, and uneven understanding of holistic student potential management among all management actors.

The implications of this study indicate that Nature Schools need to build a management collaboration system that is flexible, reflective, and based on data on student potential development. Schools need to prepare individual potential profiles for each student, develop standardized documentation formats for development, schedule structured and routine student potential evaluation forums, and design capacity-building programs for all management actors in facilitating student potential. Future research may develop student potential assessment instruments that are appropriate to the approach and character of Nature Schools and test their effectiveness in more diverse management contexts.

#### References

- [1] M. Friend and L. Cook, *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*, 8th ed. Pearson, 2017.
- [2] U. Bronfenbrenner, *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press, 1979.
- [3] M. Ainscow, "Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences," *Nord. J. Stud. Educ. Policy*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 7–16, 2020, doi: 10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587.
- [4] R. K. Yin, *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*, 6th ed. SAGE Publications, 2018.
- [5] J. W. Creswell and C. N. Poth, *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*, 4th ed. SAGE Publications, 2018.
- [6] M. B. Miles, A. M. Huberman, and J. Saldana, *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*, 3rd ed. Sage Publications, 2014.
- [7] D. E. DeMatthews, A. Serafini, and T. N. Watson, "Leading inclusive schools: Principal perceptions, practices, and challenges to meaningful change," *Educ. Adm. Q.*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 3–48, 2021, doi: 10.1177/0013161X20913897.
- [8] L. Florian and K. Black-Hawkins, "Exploring inclusive pedagogy," *Br. Educ. Res. J.*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 813–828, 2011, doi: 10.1080/01411926.2010.501096.
- [9] U. Sharma and S. J. Salend, "Teaching assistants in inclusive classrooms: A systematic analysis of the international research," *Aust. J. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 41, no. 8, pp. 118–134, 2016, doi: 10.14221/ajte.2016v41n8.7.
- [10] K. Messiou, "Research in the field of inclusive education: Time for a rethink?," *Int. J. Incl. Educ.*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 146–159, 2017, doi: 10.1080/13603116.2016.1223184.

