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Indonesia Education Background

Before Law No. 22, 1999, the education system was very centralized.

Law No 22, 1999 and Law No. 25, 1999 mandated decentralization of the government, and the education system has been decentralized.

High disparity of education quality among provinces, districts/cities, schools.
WHY SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT IS IMPLEMENTED?

IT LEADS TO BETTER MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE

IT CAN CREATE THE ENABLING CONDITIONS FOR IMPROVED TEACHING AND LEARNING
Implementation of School-Based Management in Indonesia

• <1998:
  • Before Crisis → No School-Based Management, Schools only have Parents’ Teachers Association

• 1998-2000:
  • During Crisis → Social Safety Net Implemented;
    • School-Based Management Introduced
    • School Committee Established

• 2000:
  • Law No. 25 on National Development Planning, one of objectives is to establish School-Based Management.
Implementation of School-Based Management in Indonesia

- **2002**: Ministerial Regulation No. 44; School Committee Regulation Established.
- **2003**: Education Law Enacted
- **2004**: Ministerial Regulation No. 87 on School Accreditation mandated schools to have school-based management
- **2005**: the School Operational Assistance Program (Bantuan Operasional Sekolah [BOS]) introduced
  - Government Regulation No. 19 on National Standard of Education mandated school to implement school-based management
Decree No. 044/U/2002 (Ministry of Education, 2002) on the Education Board and School Committees (SC) defined the school committee as the community representative body at the school level with membership comprising:

- Parents
- Community leaders
- Education professionals
- Private sector
- Education associations
- Teachers
- NGOs
- Village officials.

It must comprise a minimum of nine members and the chairperson must come from outside the school.
• The Decree explicitly stipulates that SC objectives should include:

1) to accommodate aspirations of the community on operational policies and education sector programs at the education unit (school level);

2) to encourage more community roles in education provision at the school level; and

3) to facilitate the establishment of education service provision at the school level in a transparent and accountable manner.
The SBM survey in Indonesia

- In April 2010, the World Bank, in collaboration with the RAND Corporation and Survey Meter, carried out a sample survey of 400 public primary schools in Indonesia spreading over 54 districts. Interviews were carried out with 400 principals, 781 school committee members, 1,953 teachers, and 2,400 parents. In addition, 54 heads of district (Kabupaten) or municipality (Kota) education offices, 47 heads of sub-district (Kecamaten) education offices, 52 chairs of the district education board, and 54 of chief school inspectors in each district were also interviewed. Selected Grade 5 pupils in each surveyed school were tested in Indonesian language and mathematics.
Results of SBM Survey
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Figure 4: Parental participation of school affairs

- Talked with your child’s teacher
- Attended schoolwide meetings for parents
- Talked with your child’s principal
- Helped with fundraising
- Provided input on how the school budget will be spent
- Served on a committee (other than School Committee)
- Volunteered in the classroom (e.g., help with classroom activities)
Figure 5: School principals’ influence on various school affairs

During this school year (2009-2010), as principal how influential are you over the following aspects of your school?

- Setting student admission criteria
- Allocating BOS funds
- Planning and allocating the school budget
- Drafting the school’s work plan
- Planning school facility
- Purchasing supplies and materials
- Determining the content of teacher professional development
- Determining school calendar
- Choosing textbooks and instructional materials
- Determining lesson content and syllabi
- Hiring and firing of non-PNS teachers
- Setting the school’s vision, mission, and/or goals

Legend:
- 1. not influential
- 2. little influential
- 3. quite influential
- 4. much influential
Figure 6: School committee’s influence on various school affairs

During this school year (2009-2010), how influential is SC over the following aspects of the school?

- Community-school relationship
- Planning to improve school facility and/or goals
- School vision, Allocation of BOS funds
- School work plan
- Student enrollment and admissions
- School budget planning and allocation
- Teacher performance or evaluation
- Teacher hiring
- Curriculum
- School calendar
- Textbook choice

Legend:
- Not influential
- Little influential
- Quite influential
- Much influential
Figure 7: School report card received by parents

How often receive report card (2009-10)

- Never
- Once
- Every semester
- Quarterly
- Monthly
- Weekly

%
Figure 7: School report card received by parents

How understandable is report card

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very easy</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat easy</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat difficult</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very difficult</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8: Information flow to parents and parental satisfaction

% of parents reporting school provided information in various areas

- School performance
- Donations/aids received by the school
- Opportunities for parent involvement in the school
- School and/or student activities
Figure 8: Information flow to parents and parental satisfaction

Parental satisfaction

Overall, how satisfied are you with the management of this school
Overall, how satisfied are you with the quality of education at this school
Overall, how satisfied are you with your child’s teacher

Very satisfied
Satisfied
Dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied
Figure 9: Pressure from parents to improve student performance: viewed by various stakeholders

- Principal: 68% strong to very strong, 33% no to weak pressure
- District education office: 63% strong to very strong, 37% no to weak pressure
- Sub-district edu. Off.: 60% strong to very strong, 40% no to weak pressure
- District education board: 56% strong to very strong, 44% no to weak pressure
- School inspector: 43% strong to very strong, 57% no to weak pressure
- SC chair: 39% strong to very strong, 61% no to weak pressure
Figure 10: School visits by district

Since the beginning of this school year (2009-2010), how many times have schools received monitoring visit by varies authorities, according to principal.

- School Committee member(s): 2.6
- District or sub-district education supervisor(s) (pengawas): 5.8
- Other district or sub-district education representative(s): 1.5
- Education Board member(s): 0.2
Figure 10: School visits by district

Frequency of district visiting schools
(Reported by District education officer)

Figure 11: Top-down accountability

Purpose of Dinas visit (reported by Dinas)

- Provide feedback on principal’s performance
- Check conditions of school buildings and facilities
- Provide feedback on teacher’s performance
- Review school policies and procedures
- Review and discuss school budget
- Monitor instruction in classroom

Legend: 0 No, 1 Yes
Figure 11: Top-down accountability

Whether measures are taken by Dinas for principal low performance (reported by Dinas)

- Reassigned the principal to another school
- Provided mentor
- Gave notification letter
- Provided training
- Demoted principal back to teacher or administrator
- Fired the principal

[Bar chart showing percentages]
The results of multiple regression show that among the school decision and intermediate outcome variables, controlling for other school and parent characteristics:

- school spending on student activities
- the number of non-civil service teachers
- the teacher attendance rate

all have significant effects on **math scores**

In the meantime, only the teacher attendance rate shows a significant effect on **language scores**.
• Both the share of teachers receiving training from districts or other sources, and the share of teachers receiving performance evaluations from principals have a significant effect on test scores.

• One result that might be comforting is that the share of certified teachers is highly correlated with higher test scores, for both language and math. This at least shows that the on-going teacher certification process does identify good teachers.
Summary

- The survey finds that the level of parental participation and voice in school management is quite low in Indonesia.
- While the role of school committees is still limited to community relations, school facilities, and other administrative areas of schools, the school principal, together with teachers, is very much empowered to assert professional control of the school.
the accountability system is very weak in Indonesia’s school system, which is reflected in inadequate information flow to parents, as well as seemingly low parental awareness of holding schools accountable.

The accountability arrangement of the Indonesian school system currently puts more emphasis on top-down supervision and monitoring.

Even though the interactions between district or sub district education offices and schools are generally frequent, the lack of rewards and sanctions for good or bad performance also leaves the system weak.
Summary (3)

- Although the scope of school-based management in Indonesia is limited today, it has begun to help schools make the right decisions on allocation of resources and hiring additional (non-civil servant) teachers, and to create an enabling environment for learning, including increasing the teacher attendance rate. All these aspects are found to have significantly positive effects on student learning outcomes.
More importantly, non-civil service teachers contribute significantly to student learning. The study argues that non-civil service teachers may have very different characteristics from the current civil service teachers: they are generally younger, and many are fresh from college, and with updated knowledge. They may be also more motivated to earn — job security.
PARADIGM SHIFT IN INDONESIA EDUCATION SECTOR

CENTRALIZED EDUCATION SYSTEM

DECENTRALIZED EDUCATION SYSTEM

IMPLEMENTING SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT DECENTRALIZED BASIC EDUCATION (DBE1) PROJECT

IN THE CONTEXT OF REGIONAL AUTONOMY
WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF IMPLEMENTING SBM INLINE WITH REGIONAL AUTONOMY

- Increase local participation and voice
- Increase school autonomy
- Increase accountability and transparency

- School Committees (SC) created in 2002/2003
- School responsibilities were expanded (2005), schools required to produce vision, annual and 4-year plans
- School Operational Assistance (BOS) block grants implemented in 2005
This study assessed the effectiveness and impact of DBE1 school-based management interventions in terms of (1) changes in management and governance in project target schools and communities, and (2) the extent to which the interventions were taken up and replicated beyond the scope of the project.
Figure 1. Performance against the baseline (Cohort 1: 526 schools)

- Schools with good-quality development plans: Baseline (December 2005) = 2%, Measure 1 (July 2006) = 91%, Measure 2 (January 2007) = 95%, Measure 4 (January 2008) = 96%
- Schools reporting finances in more than two forums: Baseline (December 2005) = 16%, Measure 1 (July 2006) = 40%, Measure 2 (January 2007) = 56%, Measure 3 (July 2007) = 58%, Measure 4 (January 2008) = 61%
- School committee members active in school planning: Baseline (December 2005) = 13%, Measure 2 (January 2007) = 74%, Measure 3 (July 2007) = 85%, Measure 4 (January 2008) = 83%, Measure 5 (July 2008) = 86%
- School committees supporting transparency: Baseline (December 2005) = 50%, Measure 3 (July 2007) = 84%, Measure 4 (January 2008) = 82%, Measure 5 (July 2008) = 84%, Measure 6 (July 2008) = 85%
Figure 2. Types of DBE1 school-based management programs disseminated

- School development planning: 52%
- Leadership training: 9%
- School committee strengthening: 9%
- School database system: 9%
- Enhanced school database system: 9%
- Financial management: 8%
- Asset management: 9%
Implementation of Autonomy (1)

- Majority of principals reported making final decisions regarding school operations

Implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) in Indonesia
Implementation of Autonomy (2)

- But rarely did principals make final decisions on their own

Implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) in Indonesia
Implementation of Autonomy (3)

Districts continued to be “somewhat to very influential” on school matters such as defining school vision, developing school plans, determining staff development.

SC and parent’s participation in final decisions and influence in school matters were low.

SOURCE: Study and Paper by Jeffery Marshal, Rita Karam, Georges Vernez, 2012 Implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) in Indonesia
District supervisors monitored schools more frequently than other stakeholders.

Implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) in Indonesia
District and SC monitored BOS allocation quarterly

- SC was limited to signing BOS forms

Majority of parents did not receive information, limiting their ability to hold schools accountable

SOURCE: Study and Paper by Jeffery Marshal, Rita Karam, Georges Vernez, 2012 Implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) in Indonesia
Overall, The Level of School Capacity and Support Fell Short

- Majority of principals, teacher, SC and parent were not provided with adequate socialization, thus their knowledge and preparedness suffered.

- Resources varied greatly among schools.

- But there was school support and capacity variation to capture their association with implementation.

SOURCE: Study and Paper by Jeffery Marshal, Rita Karam, Georges Vernez, 2012 Implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) in Indonesia
# Support Factors Facilitating School Autonomy

| Source: Study and Paper by Jeffery Marshal, Rita Karam, Georges Vernez, 2012. Implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) in Indonesia |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School Final Decision (ES)</th>
<th>Principal Influence (ES)</th>
<th>Teacher Influence (ES)</th>
<th>Parental Input (ES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of teacher training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days of teacher training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal education (versus high school)</td>
<td>-.77***</td>
<td>+.48**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.89****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>-.46***</td>
<td>+.28***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>+.44**</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School-parent relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School responsiveness</td>
<td>-.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of information</td>
<td>-.52***</td>
<td>+.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td>+.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region (versus Java)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalimantan</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
<td>-.52***</td>
<td>-.54***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua</td>
<td>-.83*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumatera</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulawesi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maluku</td>
<td>-.61*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.1***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban school</td>
<td>-.35*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size (schools)</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained variance (R²)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Associations Between SBM And Student Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student and family characteristics</th>
<th>Bahasa (ES)</th>
<th>Mathematics (ES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student gender (versus girls)</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education</td>
<td>+.17***</td>
<td>+.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student attendance</td>
<td>+.02***</td>
<td>+.03**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bahasa (ES)</th>
<th>Mathematics (ES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher certification</td>
<td>+.06**</td>
<td>+.07***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in teaching</td>
<td>+.03***</td>
<td>+.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal preparedness</td>
<td>+.13*</td>
<td>+.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum standard level 4 (versus standard level 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+.28*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Region (versus Java)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Bahasa (ES)</th>
<th>Mathematics (ES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalimantan</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bali</td>
<td>-.37***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulawesi</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maluku</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample size (students/teachers)**

- **Bahasa (ES):** 7,164 / 348
- **Mathematics (ES):** 7,350 / 355

**Explained variance (R²)**

- **Bahasa (ES):** .18
- **Mathematics (ES):** .07

Implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) in Indonesia
Key factors associated with maximum impact have been identified as follows:

• The program is firmly and explicitly based on government policy.
• Stakeholder ownership is strong.
• Institutional and human capacity is built.
• Technical assistance rather than funding is provided.
• The program is manageable and affordable for local partners.
• Scope and geographical focus is limited.
• A locally-based implementation methodology including on-site mentoring is adopted.
• A complete and integrated school-based management program is provided.
• Commitment is built at provincial and district level.
How to Strengthen SBM in Indonesia

- Strengthen the capacity of SCs, principals and teachers to implement SBM
- Develop district capacity to support SBM
- Provide the SC, parents and the public with comparative information on the performance of schools to hold them accountable
- Address resource disparities among schools
  - Examine the current financing of education
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