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A

Aceh = Previous name of *Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam* Province
ADB = Asian Development Bank
APK (Angka Partisipasi Kasar) = Gross Enrollment Rate
APM (Angka Partisipasi Murni) = Net Enrollment Rate
APBN (Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara) = Central Government Budget
APBD (Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah) = Local Government Budget
AusAID = Australian Agency for International Development

B

Badan Pusat Statistik = Central Bureau of Statistics
Baduy = Indonesian ethnic group
Bali = Indonesian province
Bandung = The capital city of *Jawa Barat* Province
Banten = Indonesian province
Bekasi = Indonesian district
Bengkulu = Indonesian province
Bhinneka Tunggal Ika = Unity in Diversity
BOCES = Board of Cooperative Education Services
Bogor = Indonesian district
BP3 (Badan Penyelenggara Pendidikan) = Parent and Teacher Association
BPS (Biro Pusat Statistik) = Statistical Centre Bureau
Bupati = Mayor

C

Cikarang = The capital city of *Bekasi* District

D

Daerah Istimewa = Special Territory
Dayak Punan = Indonesian ethnic group
DBEP = Decentralized Basic Education Project
DEO = District Education Office
DEC = District Education Council
Departemen Pendidikan Nasional = Ministry of National Education
Dewan Pendidikan Kabupaten/Kota = District Boards of Education
DGMPSE = Directorate General for Management of Primary and Secondary Education
Donggala = Indonesian district
Drop Out Rate = Percentage of students who discontinue their study for the next level

F

FGD = Focus group discussion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>G</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golkar (Golongan Karya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorontalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHA LIDI (Gerakan Peduli Pendidikan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habibie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>I</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing Ngarso Sung Tulodho, Ing Madya Mangun Karso, Tut Wury Handayani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irian Jaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irian Jaya Barat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>J</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaman Penajahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawa Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawa Tengah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>K</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalimantan Selatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kecamatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keluarga Berencana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepulauan Bangka Belitung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepulauan Riau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>L</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lampung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombok</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maduranese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maluku Utara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mataram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPR (Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mojokerto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>N</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngayogyakarta Hadiningrat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nusa Tenggara Barat = Indonesian province
Nusa Tenggara Timur = Indonesian province

O
Orde Baru = New Order
Orde Lama = Old Order
Orde Reformasi = Reformation Order

P
Pancasila = Five principles/foundations of Indonesia
Pandeglang = Indonesian district
PDI (Partai Demokrasi Indonesia) = Indonesian political party
Pendapatan Asli Daerah = Local Genuine Income
Pendapatan Per Kapita = Per Capita Income
Peraturan Daerah = Government Regulations
PGRI (Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia) = Indonesian Teacher Association
POMG (Persatuan Orangtua Murid dan Guru) = Parent and Teacher Association
PPP (Partai Persatuan Pembangunan) = Indonesian political party
Praya = The capital city of Lombok Tengah district
Program Bapak Angkat = Foster Daddy Program
PSSC = Parent School Support Committees
Pusat Penilaian Pendidikan = Centre of Education Assessment

R
RAPBS (Rencana Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Sekolah) = School Budget Plan
REDIP = Regional Education Development Improvement Project
Rencana Strategis = Strategic Planning
Repetition Rate = Percentage of students who still stay at the same grade
Riau = Indonesian province
RMIT University = Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology University
Rupiah = Indonesian currency

S
SD Inpres = Primary Schools were built by President Instruction
SD (Sekolah Dasar) = Primary School
Sekolah Dasar Bumiputera = Primary School for the natives
Sekolah Dasar Kelas Pertama = First class Primary School
Sekolah Dasar Kelas Kedua = Second class Primary School
Selamat Datang = Welcome
SMA (Sekolah Menengah Atas) = General Senior Secondary School
SMK (Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan) = Vocational Senior Secondary School
SMP (Sekolah Menengah Pertama) = Junior Secondary School
Soeharto = Second President of Indonesia
Soekarno = First President of Indonesia
SR (Sekolah Rakyat) = People School
Sulawesi = Indonesian islands
Sulawesi Barat = Indonesian province
Sulawesi Selatan = Indonesian province
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Sulawesi Tenggara</em></td>
<td>Indonesian province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sultan</em></td>
<td>Leader of a Sultanate (e.g., <em>Yogyakarta</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sumatera Selatan</em></td>
<td>Indonesian province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sumatera Utara</em></td>
<td>Indonesian province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sundanese</em></td>
<td>Indonesian ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tangerang</em></td>
<td>Indonesian district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tasikmalaya</em></td>
<td>Indonesian district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tigaraksa</em></td>
<td>The capital city of <em>Tangerang</em> District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Transition Rate</em></td>
<td>Percentage of students who attend to the next level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>UNICEF</em></td>
<td>United Nations Children Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>UNESCO</em></td>
<td>United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>UNDP</em></td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>UUD 1945 (Undang-undang Dasar 1945)</em></td>
<td>Basic Fundamental Law of Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>VIP</em></td>
<td>Very Important Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Walikota</em></td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wonogiri</em></td>
<td>Indonesian district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Yogyakarta</em></td>
<td>Indonesian district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the location of provinces, districts, and cities referred to in this exegesis, please see the map (Figure 3.1-1) on Portfolio.
Abstract

In mid 1997, Indonesia was seriously affected by the Asian economic crisis. This quickly spread into monetary, political, and social crises. Following a new presidential appointment, pressures and demands from the grass-roots to reform government systems become stronger and more persistent. Several provinces, particularly those having rich natural resources, pressed for greater autonomy. They felt that their natural resources were being taken by the central government but only a small part came back to them. If the central government did not respond to their pressures and demands, they threatened to proclaim independence from Indonesia.

Education in Indonesia has been a decentralized system since the issuance of Law Number 22/1999 on Local Government. This law was reviewed in 2004 and became Law Number 32/2004 on Local Government. The essence of Law Number 22/1999 was that education was devolved mostly to local government which in Indonesia is at the district level. As a consequence, education was no longer dominated by the central government; local government had voices in policy, planning, management, finance and delivery of education. Law Number 32/2004 revised some earlier decisions and provided more authority to Provinces.

Despite an initial impression that the Ministry of National Education (MONE) has real power, its reach is limited and constrained by political and bureaucratic structures and the capacity of those working in the system at all levels. It is worth noting that the MONE’s role is rendered even more complex by the fact that education in Indonesia falls under three ministries: MONE, Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) and Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA). While MONE has the responsibility for coordinating education, each ministry has its own political and administrative agenda and processes, complicating the already complex and demanding tasks associated with decentralization.

Implementation of education decentralization in Indonesia is not easy because of its political dynamics and geographic and administrative complexity. The dynamics and complexity of Indonesia can be seen in its demography – population size and variations in density and ethnicity, and its geography – the 13,000 islands causing serious communication problems. From the political perspective, issues such as bureaucratic complexity, complex processes of decentralization due to it being driven by political and donor forces, and implementation complexity involving a range of actors and arenas have also contributed to the challenges. From the administrative viewpoint, the challenges included rapid implementation (big bang), simultaneous political, administrative, and fiscal decentralization, and delays in establishing legal frameworks stipulating the divisions of obligatory functions between central, provincial, and district levels. In addition, the lack of capacity amongst local managers to do their jobs created real problems at the district level.

Decentralization of education in Indonesia has brought a lot of changes and one of the most important of them is community participation in education. The community must now take part in the quality improvement of educational services, which includes planning, monitoring, and evaluation of educational programs through Boards of Education.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia (MONE) develops the capacity of Boards of Education continuously in terms of building community participation in order for them to have responsibility to manage education. The proper functioning of these Education Boards will strengthen the implementation of good governance and education management accountability.

(Minister of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia, 2007)

1.1 Research Background

Decentralization of education in Indonesia has brought a lot of changes and one of them is increased community participation in education. Improvement in the quality of education in a decentralized system, particularly in Indonesia, is not only affected by the policies of the Government but also by the participation of the local community and the quality of this participation. To deal with this issue, the MONE expects that the local community will assume a greater responsibility for the management of education through the existing District Boards of Education. These Boards should be a form of community organization showing commitment, loyalty and caring in terms of improving the quality of education in a district.

The development of District Boards of Education should take into account different district characteristics, including culture, demography, ecology, and traditions. For this reason, the Boards should be developed within national frameworks, but reflect local conditions and interests. This means that District Boards of Education should have an orientation to clients, power sharing and partnerships. This orientation should focus on the improvement of the quality of education service in the district and, as a consequence, the improvement of teaching and learning.

Historically, education in Indonesia has been decentralized since the issuance of Law Number 22/1999 on Local Government. This law was reviewed in 2004 becoming Law Number 32/2004 on Local Government. The essence of Law Number 22/1999 is that education is devolved mostly to the local government, which in Indonesia is at the district level, including communities. Education is no longer dominated fully by the central government. Under the new law local government has voices in policy, planning,
management, finance and delivery of education (Law Number 22/1999). Law Number 32/2004 provides more authority to provinces.

However, both Laws stress that the authority and responsibility of education is devolved mostly to local government levels, both to provinces and districts. As a consequence, the main current issue of Indonesian education is the transition from a centralized to a decentralized system. (All references to Government of Indonesia (GOI) Laws and Regulations can be found in the bibliography.)

As a result of these changes, local government now has more power than before in terms of planning, managing, financing and delivering education at the local level. The community at large has been given voices and has been encouraged to be involved more intensively in education matters. To implement community involvement in education, MONE has issued Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002 on Boards of Education and School Committees to support the capacity of districts and schools respectively to plan, manage, finance and deliver education. Based on the Ministerial Decree, both Boards of Education and School Committees have the following roles and functions:

1. advising on the formulation and implementation of education policy;
2. supporting education finance;
3. controlling the transparency and accountability of management and output of education; and
4. mediating between local government, parliament, and the community.

The involvement of Boards of Education and School Committees in education matters has been empowered through the issuance of Law Number 20/2003 on the National Education System, particularly Article 56 which says that:

1. the community has a role in planning, executing, controlling, and evaluating education through Boards of Education and School Committees, (2) both Boards of Education and School Committees as independent bodies have roles in improving the quality of education service by providing advice, direction and support in the form of human resources, facilities and control of education at the national, provincial and district levels respectively with no structural hierarchy (MONE, 2003, p. 24.)

Therefore, improving the quality of education in Indonesia’s decentralized system is not only affected by the policies of the Government but also by the participation of the local community and the quality of this participation. The intention of Ministerial Decree 044/2002 and Law 20/2003 was to increase community involvement in education development, especially in the context of the Boards of Education. As stipulated in those regulations, the
Boards of Education have significant roles and functions to play to improve the quality of education at the district level. The regulatory framework will be discussed in Chapter IV.

According to the Report on Boards of Education Evaluation (MONE, 2004), by 2004, when this project commenced, all districts had officially established Boards of Education. What was not clear from the report was what was happening in the newly established districts, of which there were approximately 491 (MOHA, 2008), and how the District Boards of Education were executing their official roles and functions. In fact, there has been criticism of the Board’s minimal roles, their low performance and their minimal contribution to developing education in the districts.

This research is important because it focuses on the Boards, and their important roles. However, the low performance of District Boards of Education and their minimal contribution to the development of education in their respective districts is of concern. One possible reason for this is that the District Boards of Education are still young (seven years) and they are not yet sufficiently mature, experienced or autonomous to play the roles of policy makers and developers of standards as has happened in the United States of America and Japan. However, it is difficult to substantiate this claim because, with the exception of my research, there is very little formal academic material regarding Indonesian Boards of Education, either from the Universities, Indonesian Journals or the MONE itself. To some extent, this reality has compounded the difficulties of collecting hard data about the District Boards of Education. On the other hand, this paucity of academic resources reinforced the importance of this research.

This research project is being collaboratively undertaken with two other projects. All three projects are concerned with improving educational outcomes in the context of educational decentralization in Indonesia. However, the focus of each project is different. My colleague, Mr. Agus Haryanto, Head of Sub Division in Planning Division, is focusing on service quality in the District Education Offices (DEOs) while Mr. Didik Suhardi, Deputy Director of Junior Secondary School (promoted to Director of Junior Secondary Schools in May, 2008), is concerned with improving planning and co-ordination in Junior Secondary Education in Indonesia. As a contribution to the education decentralization system, all three researchers will explore the development of education decentralization in Indonesia, each focusing on his own research interests. Consequently, when exploring the big picture of the development of
decentralization in Indonesia, Context 3.1 in Portfolio was developed collaboratively with my two colleagues.

During the research, (in November, 2006) I was promoted to Head of Evaluation and Reporting in the Directorate of Vocational Education. This promotion made no substantial difference to my research. I continued my research on District Boards of Education and the results of this research are eagerly awaited by those concerned about the performance of District Boards of Education.

1.2 Decentralization in Indonesia
The characteristics of Indonesia can best be understood by looking at the country’s unique identity. Geographically, Indonesia is a very complex nation. There are about 13,600 islands scattered throughout the country. With this geographic complexity, effective communication is a challenge. Complex geography is one of the factors which exacerbated the frustration with central domination and led to demands for decentralization. The complex geography of Indonesia can be seen in Figure 3.1-1 in Portfolio. This geographic complexity creates significant problems for schools, school communities, teachers, and education managers, including Boards of Education and those like me who work in the MONE.

The uniqueness of Indonesia is also characterized by its governance process in transferring decision making authority: decentralization. The decentralization process in Indonesia can be traced back to the colonial era when the Dutch divided the country into regions to facilitate control and governance. After independence, in the Soekarno and Soeharto era, the relationship between the centre and regions remained the same as that inherited from the colonial era (personal communication with Prof. Slamet PH.)

In Soeharto era, from 1966 to 1996, economically, Indonesia was very successful according to The World Bank report The East Asian Miracle: Economic Growth and Public Policy (Boediono, 1996). Indonesia was one of eight High Performing Asian Economies in the region. Besides the economic successfulness, in his era, especially from 1966 to 1985, development of education in Indonesia was very successful. The GER and NER increased significantly. In 1968, GER and NER for primary education were 67.98% and 58.38% respectively. Meanwhile, in 1985, GER and NER for primary education were 107.56% and 88.66%. The development of GER and NER was influenced significantly by Presidential
Instruction Primary Schools or SD Inpres for short. At the end of the academic year 1983/1984, 139,740 primary schools had been built. The majority of the school buildings consisted of three classrooms. Starting from 1981/1982, and only in urban areas, two storey school buildings with 6 (six) classrooms were built (Directorate of Junior Secondary School, 2007.)

The development of education during this time had improved significantly. In 1984, the inauguration of the movement for six-year basic education (six years at elementary school), was enacted by the Government of Indonesia. In almost all of the villages in Indonesia, the government built Sekolah Dasar and most sub-districts had one Sekolah Menengah Pertama (Junior Secondary School). After the success of the six years basic education movement, the nine-year basic education movement (six years elementary school and 3 years junior secondary school) was declared in 1994. The progress of the schools and the students during those two movements can be seen in the following tables 1 and 2:

Table 1
The Development of Six Year Primary Education from 1968 to 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1968/1969</td>
<td>60,023</td>
<td>12,163,495</td>
<td>308,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1973/1974</td>
<td>65,910</td>
<td>13,069,456</td>
<td>427,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1978/1979</td>
<td>92,499</td>
<td>19,074,819</td>
<td>592,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1983/1984</td>
<td>129,388</td>
<td>25,804,380</td>
<td>925,834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MONE (1996)

As is shown in table 1 (above), by 1984, when the Government of Indonesia declared six years of compulsory basic education, the number of schools was increased dramatically by more than 100%. Furthermore, the number of students increased substantially by more than 100%. As well the number of teachers increased three fold from 308,657 teachers in 1968/1969 to 925,834 teachers in 1983/1984.
Table 2 shows that in line with the success of *Keluarga Berencana* (Family Planning) in Indonesia, the number of the population aged 7-12 decreased. However, the number of students increased. Gross Enrollment Rates increased slowly but steadily and Net Enrollment Rates also significantly increased.

Unfortunately, in 1997, the Asian economic crisis had a dramatic impact on Indonesia. The increased value of the US dollar and the decreased value of the *Rupiah* caused a monetary crisis in Indonesia because most capital investment was in US dollars, borrowed from multilateral and bilateral agencies. The monetary crisis caused an economic crisis, and the economic crisis caused an education crisis. The evidence for this can be seen in the high drop out rate and the fact that the GER was stagnant because the purchasing power parity of the people to education was very weak (personal interview with, Prof. Slamet PH). In fact, this economic crisis caused a multi-dimensional crisis which increased the demands from local governments to decentralize the country. Finally in 1998, “… after a multi-dimensional crisis struck, and forced by political and regional pressures, *Habibie*, as the president had no other choice to save the country from disintegration except by implementing a policy of decentralization” (Karim, 2003, p. 50.)

Decentralization was finally mandated through a collective decision by the highest national authority, the MPR (*Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat* or People’s Consultative Assembly) in 1998 as a response to pressures and demands from regions. The MPR, then, reconfirmed the
mandate for provincial/district governments to pursue decentralization. Based on the MPR mandate, the central government then quickly issued two important laws of decentralization in May 1999: Law Number 22/1999 on Local Government and Law Number 25/1999 on the Financial Balance between Local Government and Central Government. By law, Indonesia has been a decentralized country since the enactment of those two laws. According to these laws, local government has the major authority in public functions except in the fields of foreign affairs, national security, finance, fiscal matters, religion, and other specified areas. In essence, authority has been transferred from the central government to local governments in all public services except the aforementioned fields. However, as Duncan argues that the Indonesian government’s plan for decentralization, despite being rather vague and not well thought out, has been very ambitious (Duncan, 2004).

After five years of experiencing decentralization, this research suggests the following things have emerged: unclear divisions of labor in obligatory functions between province and district because the Government Regulation Number 25/2000 did not specify division of labor between province and district; large gaps among the districts; local government machines were not well run; there was a lack of coordination among the districts and provinces and among the districts and central government.

To redress these weaknesses, in 2004 two new Laws, Number 32/2004 and Number 33/2004 were enacted to replace Laws Number 22/1999 and Number 25/1999, respectively. According to Prof. Slamet PH in personal interview (2007), there are ten substantial changes from the 1999 to 2004 Laws: (1) clearer concept of autonomy, (2) clear division of labor in obligatory functions among central, provincial, and district governments, (3) direct general election of president, governor, and mayor/Bupati by the people, not by parliament members, (4) construction of local government including its institutions, (5) restructuring of personnel management, (6) restructuring of local financial management, (7) clearer direction, guidance and supervision of local government, (8) reformulation of minimum public service based on local potential, (9) improved local government management, and (10) more regulations on defining villages, towns, and special territories. These changes resulted in greater clarity about the functions of the different levels of government.
1.3 The Objectives of the Research
The initial objective of this project was to improve Boards of Education in Indonesia, especially in terms of their selection, recruitment, performance and contribution to educational development. However, after doing preliminary study and field visits, I realized that the initial objective was far too ambitious. It quickly became evident that there was considerable confusion about District Boards of Education and a lack of basic information about how they should contribute to educational decision making. As a consequence, I changed my objective. Rather than focusing directly on improvement, I developed a better understanding of Boards of Education in order to improve their contribution and performance over time. The new objective focused on three components, which are to:
- paint a picture of the current situation relating to the District Boards of Education,
- contribute to more informed understandings about the functions of these Boards,
- inform the revised Ministerial Decree about the functions of District Boards of Education.

The importance of the objectives of this research can be justified as follows: if the first objectives could be achieved, the actual current situation pertaining to the District Boards of Education would be explored. If the actual current situation of the Boards could be articulated, new practices for District Boards of Education could be developed. If the second objective is achieved, the contribution of the Boards of Education could be improved, and education performance (quality, equity, efficiency, effectiveness and good governance) at the district level would be better. If the third aim of this research is achieved, it would reduce uncertainty, reduce risks, increase the clarity of recruitment and selection, and improve the Boards of Educations’ capacity (individual, entity and system), performance and their contribution to the development of education at the district level.

1.4 Research Questions
Initially, in order to achieve the aims of the research project, the following research questions were formulated:
- How can Boards of Education be more effective in supporting the DEO in planning, managing, financing and delivering education?
- How can Boards of Education members be better selected in order to get the right person in the right place?
c. How can Boards of Education members’ capacity be developed effectively and efficiently in order to assist them to be able to do their jobs?

When I revised my research objectives I then had to revise my research questions. The revised questions were:

a. What was the current status of recruitment and selection, and what were the roles played by, and the real contribution of the District Boards of Education to the development of education at the district level?

b. What new practices should be developed to govern recruitment and selection and the roles played by the Boards in order to maximize the contribution of the Boards to the development of education at the district level?

c. How can Board of Education members be better selected in order to get the right person in the right place?

d. How can Boards of Education be more effective in supporting the DEO in planning, managing, financing and delivering education?

e. How can Board of Education members’ capacity be developed in order to help them to do their jobs effectively and efficiently?

f. What kind of guidelines (portfolios) are needed to support the Boards in order for them to play their roles and contribute optimally to the development of education at the district level?

1.5 Expected Outcomes

This research and current literature suggests that decentralization as a government political policy is more than just imposing laws and regulations. This is not to suggest that these laws are not relevant or important. Despite political will and appropriate regulations, many problems related to education quality in district offices still exist. Unless these problems are resolved, the decentralization process will be far from successful. Research was needed to explore the current status of District Boards of Education, as a manifestation of community participation in education. As a result of this research, the need for new practices by existing District Boards of Education was also identified and serious efforts were (and still are being) made to improve the quality of education. District Boards of Education were selected as a research focus simply because devolution of education was mostly to the district level.
I am undertaking this research in the By Project mode. One of the objectives of the Research by Project mode of post graduate research is to facilitate change. I was initially interested in Research by Project because of problems which I confronted in my workplace. My interest was also aroused by the possibility of bringing about innovations or developments that were needed to foster better practice in the real world of education in Indonesia and the fact that this research would contribute to both professional and practical knowledge. As RMIT regulations suggest:

The purpose of the RMIT Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) by Research programs is to provide the community with graduates of enhanced ability, knowledge and diversity of experience; particularly in the skills of problem solving, creative endeavor and presentation of original research (RMIT, 2007, p.8);

In addition, according to Mike Brown, “… researchers in these programs develop a range of knowledge, for example the management of groups and, more generally, with increasing the knowledge related to improvements in the conduct of professional practices” (Brown, 2004, p. 7.) According to Hodges (2005), Research by Project was first offered as a mode of post-graduate research in the RMIT School of Education in 2000 based on notion of practical knowledge.

The aim of the Research by Project Program is based on notions of practical knowledge (Gibbons et. al., 1994; Jarvis, 1999; Polanyi, 1958) and the application of this knowledge in the workplace. This program aims to improve the capability of the practitioner (Hodges, 2005, p. 3).

It tries to improve the relationship between the workplace, in this case the Indonesian Ministry of National Education, and the University. Brown (2003) attempts to capture this complex relationship in the diagram below:
Unlike a traditional research approach, this approach directly links the university activities to the work place of the student as a researcher. As a result, the product of the research (Portfolio) is applicable to resolving the existing problems because it is based on the real situation faced by the student. On the other hand, the exegesis is contributing to the professional knowledge related to the issue raised. Based on RMIT regulations, the aims of Research by Project are: to improve the competency of the researcher, to contribute to scholarly and professional knowledge and to improve practices of the workplace (RMIT, 2007.)

Lee, Green and Brennan argue that, “…… the professional doctorate is fostering a “hybrid curriculum” that exists in the intersection between the university and the organization in which typically, a doctoral research project will be undertaken, new kinds of knowledge will be developed, involving new relationship among participants and new kind of research writing” (Lee et al., 2000, p. 127.)

The authors use three intersecting circles to demonstrate the place where the interest and actions of the stakeholders are mediated. They envisage that the three stakeholders would form a reflexive relationship with each contributing to the production of knowledge.
Figure 2 captures the intersecting spaces envisaged by Lee and her colleagues. Hodges (2005) suggests that these intersecting spaces are presented as being largely unproblematic with the university, the profession and the workplace in good co-existence, if not collaboration. Central to the hybrid curriculum is the student who must mediate the conflicts in the space and forge new relationship, knowledge and research writing.

In more detail, the general overview of the research can be described in the next paragraphs. As previously noted, this research has three expected outcomes: a more knowledgeable and skilled researcher; a contribution to professional and scholarly knowledge, and changes or improvements in practice. It is sometimes very difficult to decide in which RMIT outcome category the following comments are located. For example, it is not easy to decide whether greater insights into the functions and responsibilities of District Boards of Education should be placed under the heading: more knowledgeable researcher, or under the heading: contribution to professional knowledge. In fact, it could appear in both. As a consequence, some of the placements below are somewhat arbitrary. I have tended to locate knowledge that is of significant importance to the broader system of education under the second heading - contribution to professional knowledge, although it may very well have added to my knowledge.
The following three expected outcomes of this research were listed as below:

**More Knowledgeable and Skilled Researcher**

Unlike the classical model of research which suggests that it is possible to choose any topic regardless of its relation to the student’s real world, Research by Project should directly or indirectly be related to the student’s real life as a practitioner. The researcher is immersed in the research on a day to day basis. In addition, Research by Project involves the researcher in more intensive self reflection about the student’s work environment, resulting in a more informed practitioner. By undertaking this research, it was expected that I would become a more informed practitioner in the area of education in general, and District Boards of Education, in particular. I also would be more confident when both presenting a part of my research and learning about education decentralization in other countries at international education conferences. More specifically, I would improve my thoughts and practices in directing, guiding, managing and leading the Boards of Education at the district level. As a part of the MONE which provides direction and guidance to Boards of Education at the district level, I would be more aware of, confident and conscientious in facilitating Boards of Education development.

**Contribution to Knowledge**

Another expected outcome of this research would be to contribute to a better understanding of education decentralization in Indonesia, especially as it relates to Boards of Education and their capacity to contribute to improving education in the context of Indonesian education decentralization.

**Changes in Practice**

It is envisaged that this research will lead to improvements in the practice and capacity of Boards of Education in terms of recruitment and selection, in the capacity to do their jobs, and in their performance and contribution to education development at the district level.

As a part of this change in practice, this research contains a portfolio which will be divided into two sections:

a. Working Documents which will include: relevant questionnaires, reports, meeting agendas, minutes of meetings, photographs, and presentation.

b. Products of the research that will outline action to be taken, including:
1. Significant inputs into government regulation about educational management standard which is being processed by the Ministry of National Education;

2. Operational guidelines on how to improve Boards of Education in terms of recruitment and selection, capacity to do their jobs, and strategies for improving Board’s contributions to education development at the districts level.

1.6 Definitions of Significant Terms

The following definitions of significant terms were extracted from the Ministry of National Education Decree Number 044/2002 on Boards of Education and School Committees, Law Number 20/2003 on the National Education System, the Law Number 32./2004 on Local Government, and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP, 1997):

1. Boards of Education are independent boards, independent from school principals or other governmental institutions. Boards of Education are independent education community organizations having roles to advise, support, mediate and exert control over education at the district level. They are required to have high commitment, loyalty and caring in terms of improving education performance (increased equity, quality, efficiency, effectiveness, productivity) at the district level (The Ministry of National Education Decree Number 044/2002 about Board of Education and School Committee).

2. Decentralization is the transfer of authority from central government to autonomous regions to govern and manage their affairs within the system of the Indonesian Republic (Law Number 32/2004 on Local Government).

3. Decentralization of Education is the transfer of authority from the Ministry of National Education to the Offices of Education at the Province and District levels to govern and manage their tasks and functions under the National System of Education (Law Number 20/2003 on National Education System).

4. Capacity building is an effort to assess the needs of and develop the capacity of individuals, entities or institutions and systems at certain levels (UNDP, 1997).

1.7 The Parts of the Exegesis

This exegesis is divided into five chapters as follows:

1. Introduction: consisting mainly of research background, objectives of the research, research questions, and expected outcomes of the research.

2. Methodology and Methods: this has been divided into four parts. The first part provides an overview of the methodologies that guided the research. The second part outlines
research methods consisting of the data collection methods and method of data analysis. The third provides a time line of the project during which the research was conducted. The final part describes the ethical considerations. This part explains two ethical issues that were very important in my research with human subjects, namely that: 1) subjects enter research projects voluntarily, understanding the nature of the study and the possible dangers and obligations that might be involved, and 2) subjects are not exposed to risks that are greater than the gains they might derive.

3. District Boards of Education in the Context of Indonesian Education Decentralization. This chapter will be divided into three sections, the first which outlines community participation in education, the second which explores international experiences of educational governance, and the last section which discusses Boards of Education in Indonesia. The intention of this chapter is to explore both of these research concerns in Indonesia and other jurisdictions.

4. Improving the Performance of District Boards of Education. This chapter will be organized into four case studies. The case studies will be based on the districts visited. Each case study will explore the three main dimensions of the challenges facing District Boards of Education, including recruitment and selection, roles played, and improving their contributions to local education.

5. Conclusions. This will contain conclusions and recommendations which are based on the findings derived from exploration of these research issues. Both conclusions and recommendations are organized in accordance with the expected outcomes of the research by project: they indicate how I became a more knowledgeable and skilled researcher, the contributions made to professional and scholarly knowledge, and changes in practices within the MONE and, more broadly, in DEOs across Indonesia.
CHAPTER II
METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

2.1 Introduction
This chapter outlines the research approach that was adopted during this research project. This approach was informed by the key objective of this project, that is, to develop a better understanding of Boards of Education in order to improve their contribution and performance over time in the era of decentralization in Indonesia. It was also informed by an acknowledgement of the challenges of achieving this objective in the context of the complexities of Indonesian governance in this era of decentralization.

The chapter has been divided into four parts. Part 1 provides an overview of the methodologies that guided the research. The central feature of this research project is four case studies. The case studies were based on four districts: Yogyakarta; Lombok Tengah; Tangerang and Bekasi districts. (For location, see map on page 29.) These four case studies were supplemented by two consultation activities. The first occurred at the beginning of the project and was designed to paint a broad picture of the state of community participation in education in Indonesia. The second took place in the central offices of MONE. These consultations were completed with the data gathered from the National Workshops of District Boards of Education which took place on August 2005 and April 2007 in Bogor, Jawa Barat.

Part 2 of the chapter outlines the research methods consisting of the data collection methods and method of data analysis. The data was collected through in-depth interviews, questionnaires, focus group discussions, participant observation, field visits, document analysis, and supplemented by consultations with stakeholders (at the MONE and districts) and with supervisors. The data collected also gives brief descriptions of the situation in a range of districts. Then, data collected was cross-checked using triangulation until convergence was achieved. This also provided data analysis as the next step of the data collection. As noted above, although the data has been collected through in-depth interviews, questionnaires, focus group discussions, participant observation, visits and document analysis, which often contained numerical information, most reporting and analysis was done using language. When dealing with data in words qualitative data analysis was appropriate.

Part 3 provides a time line of the project during which the research was conducted. This part explains the planned activities, schedules and estimated time duration. Part 4 describes the
ethical considerations. This part explains two ethical issues that were very important in research involving human subjects: 1) subjects enter research projects voluntarily, understanding the nature of the study and the danger and obligations that are involved and (2) subjects are not exposed to risks that are greater than the gains they might derive. This part also provides information about approval of the ethics dimension of this research by RMIT in 2004 which indicates this study pays careful attention to ethical considerations as outlined by RMIT.

2.2 Research Methodology
This part gives an overview of the research methodology used in this research project, namely the case study. It looks at why the case study is appropriate for this research project, and how to design and conduct case study research. Dealing with this, Crotty (1998) defines research methodology as a strategy, plan of action, process or design lying behind the choice. Methodology is the justification that links the choice and use of methods with the purpose and desired outcomes of the research.

Based on the key research objectives as outlined in Chapter 1, a qualitative case study approach was chosen as the most appropriate methodology. There are many definitions of case study methodology. For instance, Yin (1999) defines case study as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident, and in which multiple sources of evidence are used. He further claims that case studies are the preferred strategy when “how”: and “why” questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context. Such “explanatory” case studies can also be complemented by two other types, namely “exploratory” and “descriptive” case studies.

Another definition is advanced by Creswell (1998). He suggests a case study is an in-depth exploration of a bounded system (an entity in itself, for example an activity, event, process, or individuals) based on extensive data collection. Meanwhile, Merriam (1998) defines a case study as a detailed examination of one setting, or a single subject, a single depository of documents, or one particular event. Another similar definition states that a case study is an investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events (Burns, 2000). From these definitions, it can be paraphrased that a case study is an investigation to
describe in detail an individual, a group or some aspects in a group in order to get insights and meanings.

According to Fetterman (1991), qualitative research is appropriate if we are interested in what people think and in why they think what they think. The search for the insider’s perspective is fundamental to almost every qualitative approach. Borrowing the words from Geertz (1999), as a researcher I joined the subjects’ world, but I remained detached. I learned how the subjects think, but I did not think like the subjects. I was empathetic, but I was also reflective. I was as a person who wanted to know what it was like to be them, but not as a person who wanted to be like them. A qualitative case study is then defined as a way of doing research in a particular case in order to find insights, meaning and more understanding of the phenomenon being researched from the perspective of the research participants/subjects (Bogdan & Biklen, 1999).

Why did I choose a qualitative case study approach for this research project? As I said earlier in this chapter, a qualitative case study is relevant to my research because the main objective of my research project was to improve the performance of District Boards of Education in the context of the complexities of the Indonesian decentralized education system. The qualitative case study methodology is relevant to my research project because the main purpose of my research was to get meaningful understandings of, and insights into, District Boards of Education; to get rich, descriptive, real life accounts of District Boards of Education in terms of their current status, expected future performance and ways they could improve their performance.

How then could I best design and to conduct my case study in this research project? Yin (1999) defines research design as a blueprint for research dealing with at least three things, namely: what data to collect in order to answer research questions or to achieve the key objectives of the research, how to collect the data, and how to analyze the data. In general I follow the research design formulated by Yin (1999). Data to be collected mainly consists of the current status of District Boards of Education, the expected future performance of District Boards of Education, and strategies for improving the performance of District Boards of Education. The data was collected using data collection methods: questionnaires, visits, in-depth interviews, participant observation, document analysis, focus group discussions, and consultations with stakeholders at the MONE and district boards of education, and with
supervisors both in Indonesia and in RMIT. The data was analyzed by using qualitative data analysis developed by Miles and Huberman (1994).

2.3 Practitioners and the Politics of Research
Research in education, especially the governance of education, is always likely to be political. The political nature of research has the potential to influence the collection of data, the involvement and views of the participants, the analysis of the data and the acceptance of any conclusions and recommendations that emerge from the research.

In Indonesia, hierarchy and respect are strong characteristics culture and society. The importance of hierarchy was reinforced in the Suharto or New Order Era during which power and authority became increasingly concentrated in the central government. The President and central ministries established strategic directions and policy. Provinces and districts were subservient to the centre. Ministry staff in Jakarta was considered to be more knowledgeable and have greater expertise.

In practice, this meant that staff in District Education Offices tended to think that someone who has higher authority or power, especially MONE, automatically had more knowledge and experience by virtue of their position. In other words there was a strong sense of positional power.

In the past ten years there have been major reforms to the Indonesian political system, notably decentralization and greater participatory democracy. Local Government, including District Education Offices are no longer subservient to MONE. Although MONE makes some funding decisions it does not have the authority to direct District Education Office or Boards of Education.

Cultural changes evolve more slowly and many education staff in districts continued to view MONE staff as superior. There was the possibility that staff will provide politically correct answers or responses that he or she thinks the MONE staff member wants to hear. This was a challenge for this research project because I worked for the MONE. It was essential that I assessed the accuracy and truthfulness of data and not automatically take it at face value.
During this project the funding of education was a topic of considerable interest. District staff often viewed visits by MONE staff as an opportunity to press their case for increased funding for their district. Because this situation was common, I was not alone in experiencing this situation. I wanted the participants to provide truthful responses and therefore throughout this project I continually emphasised that my investigation would have no impact on funding decision – either positive or negative. The separation of responses and funding was especially important in the earlier parts of the project and while some participants may have continued to think that funding was somehow linked, I am confident that most participants did not hold this view.

This research could be considered as a form of insider research. Coghlan (2003) identifies three issues that an inside researcher must address during their research project. One of these issues is pre-existing knowledge. He refers to the danger that an insider might continue to hold pre-conceived ideas. At the same time existing knowledge has a number of advantages. My existing knowledge assisted me in addressing the cultural and political issues that I discussed above. First, as an Indonesian I was acutely aware of the importance of hierarchy and respect. I was aware of and had experience dealing with the responses of local officials. At the same time, as a MONE staff member I had a good but incomplete understanding of educational governance issue. This insider knowledge assisted me when assessing the responses of the participants and enabled me to maintain a distance.

Maintaining distance is important when undertaking research. I have spent time studying in western countries, first in the United States and more recently Australia. I was exposed to western culture and in particular education. Western education, at least in my experience, places much greater emphasis on challenging assumptions and on being critical both of the views expressed in literature and on the responses of participants. During this research, I often seemed to be in two cultures, Indonesia and western. I attempted to use my knowledge of Indonesian culture to build relationships and gain a deeper understanding of the view of the participants and the culture of western education to challenge those views.

In addition, I had two formal visits to each of the districts and a number of informal communications. During the first visit, staff of District Education Office tended to be more formal and in some cases reversed. However, as the relationship with the participants developed, the formality declined and staff appeared more inclined to reveal their genuine
thoughts and views. Once again, being an insider was an advantage because I was able to connect respondents views with data from other sources.

2.4 Research Methods
This part is divided into three sub-parts, namely data types and sources, methods of data collection and methods of data analysis. The data types and sources were organized based on research questions as outlined in Chapter 1. The methods of data collection, as stated previously, included: in-depth interviews, questionnaires, focused group discussions, participant observation, field visits, document analysis, consultations, and triangulation. The method of data analysis used the model developed by Miles and Huberman (1994). They suggest a simple but effective method for analyzing data based on organizing the data and then identifying key themes or issues.

I also kept a research journal to keep track of the data and information collected and my responses. However, from time to time it was difficult to maintain the discipline of keeping my journal up-to-date when I was confronted with heavy work demands. This was especially the case when there were many responses about the impact or significance of particular events or comments from participants. However, when my workload was normal, I updated my journal and completed the records on time. To secure the data and information, a folder was maintained to collect and secure all documents in one place.

In my research, I investigate multiple cases, sometimes called a collective case study (Stake, 1995), in which multiple cases are described and compared to provide insight into an issue. Thus, I examined four District Boards of Education in the districts of Yogyakarta in the Special Territory of Yogyakarta Province, Lombok Tengah in Nusa Tenggara Barat Province, Tangerang in Banten Province, and Bekasi in Jawa Barat Province. Although the data was explicitly gathered from the districts of Yogyakarta, Lombok Tengah, Tangerang, and Bekasi during the course of this project, I also visited other districts. The data that was gathered from these visits was used as background to provide initial impressions.

Data Types and Sources
Types of data to be collected were based on research questions to be answered. Data sources were also dependent on types of data to be collected. The following Table 3 shows the
connection between research questions to be answered, types of data to be collected and sources for each type of data sought.

Table 3
Data Types and Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What was the current status of recruitment and selection, roles played by and the real contribution of the District’s Board of Education to the development of education at the district level?</td>
<td>• Current recruitment and selection • Roles played • Contributions to education</td>
<td>• Board members • DEO Staff • School committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What new practices of recruitment and selection and what roles should be played by the boards in order to maximize the contribution of the boards to the development of education at the district?</td>
<td>• Criteria for new practices of recruitment &amp; selection • Criteria for new roles played • Criteria of ideal contributions</td>
<td>• Board members • DEO Staff • School committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How can Board of Education members be better selected in order to get the right person in the right place? How can Boards of Education be more effective in supporting the DEO in planning, managing, financing and delivering education?</td>
<td>• Strategy of recruitment &amp; selection • Ways of planning, managing, financing and delivering of the boards</td>
<td>• Board members • DEO Staff • School committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How can Boards of Education members’ capacity be developed in order to help them to do their jobs effectively and efficiently?</td>
<td>• Capacity of the Board of Education to be developed • Capacity building strategies</td>
<td>• Board members • DEO Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What kind of guidelines (portfolios) were needed to support the boards in order for them to play their roles and contribute optimally to the development of education at the district level?</td>
<td>• Current guideline</td>
<td>• Board members • DEO Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methods of Data Collection
As noted above, the data was collected from the following 4 (four) districts, namely Yogyakarta (Special Territory of Yogyakarta Province), Lombok Tengah district (Nusa Tenggara Barat Province), Bekasi district (Jawa Barat Province), and Tangerang district (Banten Province). These data collected then combined with data which collected from National Workshops of Board of Education. These districts were selected for two reasons.
First, because of their active role and the uniqueness of their situation in the decentralization process: Yogyakarta town was located in a Special Territory Province (as an education center), Lombok Tengah district was a rural district involved in the Decentralized Basic Education Project (DBEP) funded by the Asian Development Bank (ADB), Bekasi district was closer to the average metropolitan district in Indonesia, and Tangerang district was located in a newly established province. These four districts provided something of a cross-section of the uniqueness of the situations of District Boards of Education. Secondly, these districts were selected for convenience – as a representative of the Ministry of National Education, at central level, I had to select districts on the basis of my ability to travel and to interact with the participants. (Details of data collection strategies and findings are located in Working Documents # 2.6.1, # 2.6.2, # 2.11.1 and # 2.11.2 in the accompanying Portfolio.)

The following section describes the data collection methods that were used in this research project. However, this research used the principle of evolved data collection. New data collection methods might be used in the process of doing research as new types of data emerged. This allowed me to collect the right data (contributing to authenticity) in order to be able to answer research questions effectively and to build on data collected earlier in the research project. Based on the research questions to be answered, the following methods of data collection were used:

**In-depth interviews**
Bogdan & Biklen (1999) define the in-depth interview as an interaction and conversation between two persons in order to get information from the other. Further, they said that the in-depth interview was used to gather descriptive data in the subject’s own words so that the researcher can develop insights into how subjects interpret some piece of the world. In-depth interviews are also appropriate to collect data about phenomena from a respondent’s point of view. For this research, for example, in-depth interviews were used to collect data from District Board of Education members, DEO staff, school staff and school principals and committee members regarding the methods of recruitment and selection of District Board of Education members, on ways to improve roles played by the District Board of Education, on techniques to develop Board of Education capacity and on ways to maximize Board of Education contributions to district education development.
In terms of this research, I conducted six in-depth interviews to collect data from District Board of Education members, DEO staff, and school principals and committees from four districts. This data was then complemented by in-depth interviews at the National Workshops of Board of Education. These in-depth interviews were then followed by twelve interviews in the same four districts.

**Questionnaires**

Questionnaires were another of the data collection methods. These took the form of written questions or statements to gather facts, opinion, ideas or other information from respondents. Questionnaires are useful due to their ability to maintain the confidentiality of respondents’ opinions or ideas particularly when dealing with criticism of the existing situation. They also allow for standardized structures and responses. In this research, questionnaires were used to collect information, opinions, ideas and criticism from Board of Education members, DEO staff, school principals, and school committee members. The questionnaires were distributed during the Board of Education workshop. They consisted of several questions in the areas of recruitment and selection, the roles played by the District Boards of Education, finance, coordination, and the contribution of the District Boards of Education to district education development. Details of these questionnaires are located in the Portfolio as working documents.

To deal with this data collection method, two different questionnaires were distributed at two National Workshops of Boards of Education. I distributed 80 questionnaires at the National Workshop of Boards of Education respectively. From these National Workshops, 69 questionnaires were returned at the First National Workshop in August 2005 and 76 questionnaires were returned at the Second National Workshop in April 2007. Thus, a total of 145 questionnaires were returned and analyzed.

**Focus Group Discussions**

Focus group discussion (FGD) was a small discussion conducted by the researcher with knowledgeable respondents consisting of Board of Education members, the DEO staff, school principals and school committee members. The objective of FGDs was to brainstorm (in a fairly focused way) and canvas ideas regarding Board of Education recruitment and selection policy and procedures, ideal roles that might be played, and the expected contribution of the Board of Education to education development at the district level.
I conducted the FGDs in four districts. They were done in Yogyakarta on 23 August 2005, Lombok Tengah on 26 August 2005, Bekasi on 23 February 2006, and Tangerang on 24 February 2006. These FGDs then were followed by number of less formal meetings, individual interviews and discussions.

**Participant Observation**

Observation was used to collect data regarding behavior. Observations were used to collect data from respondents in relation to their reactions to criticism, opinions, new ideas or other behavior relevant to the research questions. Observations may be carried out in both a passive and active way. When the researcher is trying to be distant from respondents, he/she is conducting a passive observation. In other words, passive observation is possible when the observer is not emotionally involved with the topic. Of course, this is easier said than done, especially in the context of doctoral research. During this research, I used a number of techniques to ensure that, when appropriate, I remained a passive observer. When tempted to become active I turned to detailed note taking and consciously assumed the role of a disinterested reporter. On other occasions I resisted the temptation by remaining aloof even when my intervention may have clarified or assisted the discussion. On the other hand if the researcher is actively involved in respondents’ business, he or she is conducting active participant observation (Bogdan & Biklen, 1999).

My research utilized both techniques. During the National Workshops of Boards of Education and other meetings, I participated actively in the meeting and I interacted with the District Boards of Education members regarding the issues and problems confronting District Boards of Education. Meanwhile, I also made active observations by conducting some meetings in the designated DEOs to discuss recruitment and selection procedures, the roles played by the Offices, new ideas used to develop the Board of Education, strategies to develop the Board of Education, and the contributions made by the Board of Education.

**Field Visits**

Field visits were also used to gather real and authentic information in the field. In this research, I visited several designated District Board of Education Offices and DEOs to discuss with personnel in those institutions recruitment and selection procedures, the roles played by the Offices, new ideas used to develop the Board of Education, strategies to
develop the Board of Education, and the contributions made by the Board of Education. Those designated Board of Education Offices and DEOs were in the districts of Yogyakarta, Lombok Tengah, Bekasi, and Tangerang.

During my visits to District Boards of Education, I gathered data from carefully observed fieldwork. According to Bogdan and Biklen (1999), fieldwork refers to being out in the subject’s world, for example:

- not as a person who pauses while passing by, but as a person who has come for a visit;
- not as a person who knows everything, but as a person who has come to learn;
- not as a person who wants to be like them, but as a person who wants to know what it is like to be them.

During a field visit, the first thing I did was to gain formal access so that I was perceived as belonging to a similar family to the practitioners (respondents) and the subjects would not be suspicious of the researcher. With this method, the subjects would consider the researcher not as a foreigner who was distrusted, but as a family member who was trusted. (Because of my role in the MONE, this was not always easy as there were times when I was treated with some suspicion and sometimes I was treated with deference which made establishing open relationships a challenge.) In the field, the researcher played roles ranging from a passive to an active participant.

During the course of this research, three formal visits were conducted to each district. These formal visits were then followed by a number of informal visits to each district.

**Document Analysis**

Data was collected by extracting information from a range of documents, including a range of official GOI documents and donor reports. There were a lot of documents containing relevant data to be considered. However, precautions needed to be taken: not all documents were well-informed or accurate and therefore it was important to cross-check or triangulate data with other data sources such as interviews, observations, relevant literature, and tape recordings.

As a part of this research, some documents have been analyzed, including literature on the current development of District Boards of Education, MONE Annual Reports, and documents which were collected from DEOs and District Boards of Education. Then, findings from the
document analysis were crossed-check with other data sources by interviewing officers and consultants at the MONE, who were in charge of developing District Boards of Education. I also consulted with my local supervisor who had been involved in a project to improve Board performance.

**Data Collection Steps**

The data collection steps may be described as follows. A constant comparative method was used as a main research design to answer the research questions. The constant comparative method was a research design for multi-data sources, which was like analytical induction in that the formal analysis began early in the study and was nearly completed by the end of data collection. Like other qualitative studies, the constant comparative method involved the combination of data collection with analysis. This approach was based on the work of Bogdan & Biklen and was sequenced as follows:

1). Visit and familiarize myself with DEO staff, District Board of Education members, and schools people, and other key informants related to this research to tell them the purposes of the study, and to inform them of their rights as outlined in RMIT ethics procedures;

2). Begin collecting data by interviewing those people to look for key issues, recurrent events, or activities in the data that become focal categories of the study;

3). Collect data that provides the dimensions under significant categories;

4). Write about the categories I was exploring, attempting to describe and account for all the incidents I had in my data while continually searching for new incidents;

5). Work with the data and emerging model to discover the impacts of decentralization on stakeholders;

6). Engage in sampling, coding, and writing focusing on the core categories; and

7). Repeat strategies three to six to allow for the processes of cross-checking, triangulation, and re-cycling until convergence is achieved.

**Method of Data Analysis**

As mentioned before, this research was a form of qualitative case study. When dealing with data in words, then qualitative data analysis was the most appropriate. Miles & Huberman (1994) suggested that data analysis consists of three concurrent flows of activity: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. Data reduction refers to the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the raw data that appears in
written-up field notes. Not only does the data need to be condensed for the sake of manageability, it also has to be transformed so it can be made intelligible in terms of the issues being addressed. Data reduction often forces choices about which aspects of the assembled data should be emphasized, minimized, or set aside completely for the purposes of the project at hand. A common mistake many people make in quantitative as well as qualitative analysis, in a vain effort to remain "perfectly objective," is to present a large volume of unassimilated and uncategorized data for the reader's consumption. Dealing with data analysis, I considered the three concurrent flows of activity which are data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing in my research. For example, some of the findings in 2004 - when District Boards of Education were being surveyed - were reduced and minimized for the purpose of the objectives of my research. In general, it was found that the degree of participation was good, particularly participation by local government in the form of partnership.

Data display was an organized assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action taking. A display can be an extended piece of text or a diagram, chart, or matrix that provides a new way of arranging and thinking about the more textually embedded data. Data displays, whether in word or diagrammatic form, allow the analyst to extrapolate from the data enough to begin to discern systematic patterns and interrelationships. At the display stage, additional, higher order categories or themes may emerge from the data that go beyond those first discovered during the initial process of data reduction. (Again, this process is detailed in Working Documents # 2.6.1, # 2.6.2, # 2.11.1 and # 2.11.2 in the accompanying Portfolio.)

2.5 Project Timelines
The case studies were not meant to be linear and rigid, but more flexible. This was due to the nature of a qualitative case study and the demands of my work in the MONE. In general, this qualitative case study may be divided as follows:
- Case 1 will describe the description of the field visit to the municipal of Yogyakarta,
- Case 2 will explore more detail about the performance of the District Board of Education in the field visit activity in Lombok Tengah district,
- Case 3 will describe the field visit to Bekasi district,
- Case 4 will explore the field visit to Tangerang district.
Each of these follow-up visits will build on and add to data to the earlier visits.
To provide more comprehensive reporting of the research data, I began with some introductory paragraphs regarding preliminary observations about District Boards of Education and their operation before conducting the case studies. This was followed by an account of the current status of recruitment and selection, the roles played, and the contribution of District Boards of Education which I had already examined. It was completed with the National Workshops of Board of Education with which I was involved. Although it was not directly part of the four case studies that form the central part of this project it has been included in this chapter because it was an excellent opportunity to clarify data that had been collected in the case studies. Table 4 below shows the detail of each activity and its time duration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exploring of current status of District Boards of Education</td>
<td>October 2004 to April 2005</td>
<td>Current status of District Boards of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brainstorming (Preliminary data gathering) Initial literature review</td>
<td>June 2005 to July 2006</td>
<td>Initial new practices of District Boards of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Introducing changes or new practices of District Boards of Education</td>
<td>August 2006 to May 2007</td>
<td>Agreed upon new practices of District Boards of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Brainstorming a way of implementing changes in District Boards of Education</td>
<td>September 2006 to June 2007</td>
<td>Strategies for implementing improvements in District Boards of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Developing a guideline to implement new practices of District Boards of Education</td>
<td>July 2007 to December 2009</td>
<td>Draft Guidelines to implement new practices of District Boards of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Final review</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>Final revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public presentation of research</td>
<td>July 2010</td>
<td>Final Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.6 Ethical Considerations

All researchers should act ethically. As stated by Gay (1981), the foremost rule of ethics is that subjects should not be harmed in any way (physically or mentally) in the name of science. Subjects should be completely informed concerning the potential risks, the subject’s right to privacy should be considered, and therefore permission from subjects being researched is required. As well, personal integrity of the researcher is required. Bogdan and Biklen (1999) claim that two ethical issues are very important in research with human
subjects: informed consent and the protection of subjects from harm. They argue that subjects must enter research projects voluntarily, understanding the nature of the study and the danger and obligations that are involved and that subjects must not be exposed to risks that are greater than the gains they might derive.

I was also very conscious of my twin roles as manager and researcher. I took great care to indicate that the data gathered would be used for my research and for the MONE. The ethical dimension of this research was approved by RMIT in 2004. This research by project pays careful attention to ethical considerations as outlined by RMIT. For example, the human rights of those respondents being researched must be protected. This research does not violate the existing laws in Indonesia, and plagiarism is avoided. Prior to interviews all interviewees were given the official letter from RMIT, identifying the interviewer, indicating the purpose of the research and stating that their privacy would be guaranteed. In questionnaires, the interviewees also were given a clear understanding that responses would be anonymous.

2.7 Concluding Comments
This chapter has highlighted the methodology and methods of research that were used in this research project. In essence, this chapter has outlined clearly and succinctly the methodology of qualitative case study research, methods of data collection, methods of data analysis, project timelines, and ethical considerations. These key concepts outlined in this chapter form the basis for discussion in the next chapters.

Chapter III will briefly touch on the decentralization context as it relates to some definitions of the community participation and the nature of Boards of Education both from international experiences and the Indonesian perspective. (A more detailed context for this research, the development of decentralization in Indonesia is described and explained in the accompanying Portfolio (see # 3.1. Decentralization: Some Literature Reviews and Its Implementation in Indonesian Context). In essence, this context paper will describe chronologically the development of decentralization in Indonesia from the Jaman Penjajahan (Colonial Era) to Orde Reformasi (Reformation Order). It will also provide the historical context for the forces and factors driving decentralization in Indonesia.)
CHAPTER III
DISTRICT BOARDS OF EDUCATION
IN THE CONTEXT OF EDUCATION DECENTRALIZATION

One of the aims of educational decentralization is to increase community participation, especially in the area of educational governance. In centralized education systems there is very little opportunity for local communities to contribute to educational practices or to be involved in educational decision making. During the latter years of the Soeharto regime, there were increasing calls for local autonomy and democratization. The Government of Indonesia was caught between calls for autonomy and the fear of national fragmentation. (See Portfolio: # 3.1. Decentralization: Some Literature Reviews and Its Implementation in Indonesian Context.) In this context one of the specific aims of Indonesia’s Big Bang approach to decentralization was to increase rapidly local participation and democratic processes. Given the concern about territorial integrity, the clear intention of Law Number 22/1999 was to devolve authority and decision making to district governments rather than provincial governments. In other words, to make sure that there was a much broader involvement in political decision making at the district level.

As has been noted in Portfolio: # 3.1, one of the important aspects of democratization in terms of education decentralization, especially in Indonesia, is community participation. Communities can be defined by characteristics that the members share, such as culture, religion, language, tradition, law, geography, class, and race. As Shaeffer (1999) argues, some communities are homogeneous while others are heterogeneous; and some united while others conflictive. Some communities are governed and managed by leaders chosen democratically who act relatively autonomously from other levels of government; whereas some are governed by leaders imposed from above and represent central authorities. Another scholar, Bray (2006) presents three different types of communities, applied in his study on community financing of education. First is \textit{geographic community}, which is defined according to its members' place of residence, such as a village or district. The second type is \textit{ethnic, racial, and religious communities}, in which membership is based on ethnic, racial, or religious identification, and commonly cuts across membership based on geographic location. The third one is \textit{communities based on shared family or educational concerns}, which include...
parents’ associations and similar bodies that are based on families’ shared concern for the welfare of students.

3.1 What is Community Participation in Education?

Education takes place not only in schools but also within families, communities, and society. Uemura (1999) argues that despite the various degrees of responsibilities taken by each group, none can be the sole agent for educating children. Parents and families cannot be the only group of people responsible for children's education as long as their children interact with and learn from the world outside their families. Communities and society must support parents and families in the upbringing, socializing, and educating of their children. Schools are institutions that can prepare children to contribute to the betterment of the society in which they operate, by equipping them with skills important in society. Schools cannot and should not operate as separate entities within society.

Since each group plays a different role in contributing to children's education, there must be efforts to make a bridge between them in order to maximize their contributions. Education takes place most efficiently and effectively when these different groups of people collaborate. Accordingly, it is important to establish and continuously attempt to develop partnerships between schools and communities.

Many research studies have identified various ways of community participation in education, providing specific channels through which communities can be involved in children's education. For example, Colletta and Perkins (1999) identified six forms of community participation in education: (1) research and data collection; (2) dialogue with policymakers; (3) school management; (4) curriculum design; (5) development of learning materials; and (6) school construction.

Community participation has been recognized as one of the factors contributing to school effectiveness (Heneveld and Craig, 2006). In their study in Sub-Saharan Africa, they identified five categories of parent and community support that are relevant to the region: (1) children come to school prepared to learn; (2) the community provides financial and material support to the school; (3) communication between the school, parents, and community is frequent; (4) the community has a meaningful role in school governance; and (5) community members and parents assist with instruction.
In a similar vein, Williams (2004) identified three models of education and community participation in education. First, *traditional community-based education*, in which communities provide new generations of young people with the education necessary for transmitting local norms and economic skills. In this model, education is deeply embedded in local social relations, and school and community are closely linked. The government, being of little use in meeting the specialized training needs of industrialized economies, plays a minor role, providing little basis for political integration at the national level. The second model is *government-provided education*, in which governments have assumed responsibility for providing and regulating education. The content of education has been largely standardized within and across countries, and governments have diminished the role of the community. However, a lack of resources and management capacity has proven that governments cannot provide the community with adequate educational delivery, fully-equipped school buildings, and a full range of grades, teachers and instructional materials. This triggers the emergence of the *collaborative model*, in which the community plays a supportive role in government provision of education.

Communities participating in education face a number of challenges. In general, as Crewe and Harrison (1998) articulate, participatory approaches tend to overlook complexities and questions of power and conflict within communities. They are designed based on the false assumption that the community, group, or household is homogeneous, or has mutually compatible interests. Differences occur with respect to age, gender, wealth, ethnicity, language, culture, and race. Even though marginalized or minority groups (such as female, landless, or lower-caste people) may be physically present during discussion, they are not necessarily given a chance to express their views to the same degree as others.

Increasingly community participation is seen as a way of solving local problems. In many development education projects, community participation is included in the project design even when it is highly unlikely that local participation could improve underlying problems. For example, Jones (2005) examined the link between participation and education in the context of Pakistan and Yemen. In these two examples participation in education was intended to resolve long standing problems such as political conflict.

In attempts to understand factors that prevent communities from being involved in formal education, Shaeffer (1999) found that the degree of community participation is particularly
low in socially and economically marginal regions. He argued that this was because such regions tend to have the following elements: (a) a lack of appreciation of the overall objectives of education, (b) a mismatch between what parents expect of education and what the school is seen as providing, (c) the belief that education is essentially the task of the country, (d) the length of time required to realize the benefits of better schooling, and (e) ignorance of the structure, functions, and constraints of the school.

Community participation in education takes many forms including parental involvement in classroom learning activities, fundraising for a school or a group of schools, establishing links between classroom learning and the world of work and the sponsorship by local employers/businesses of particular educational activities. In some cases, businesses ‘adopt a school’. For the purposes of this project it is possible to divide participation into two broad areas: participation in educational governance (at provincial or district level) and participation that directly contributes to school quality improvement.

This research project is concerned with a particular form of community participation in education. In Indonesia, local participation in educational governance is an increasingly important form of community participation (MONE, 2002). The aim of this project is to improve the performance of Boards of Education. As has been explained previously, Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002 established Boards of Education at each level of government – the national level, the provincial level and the district level. This chapter is concerned with local participation in educational governance at the district level.

Any discussion about community participation in educational governance quickly reveals a number of challenges. First, in the literature there is a vagueness about the term, a point that was emphasized by Swift (2006, p. 364, 365) in her study of educational participation in Ethiopia. She concluded:

That community participation in education is a great deal more complex than the term alone typically suggests. Forms of participation can vary widely according to both the domain and the extent of participation, as well as in terms of who in the community is engaged.

In short, it seems that there is considerable support for participation but much less clarity about what it actually means. How does this concept get translated into real action? It often
seems to be assumed, especially in the development literature that participation automatically generates solutions to long standing local problems.

The second challenge is that different jurisdictions use different terms. The term ‘Board’ is used in the United States and Japan whereas ‘Council’ is used in Canada. In Australia the term ‘Council’ is used in relation to school education and in the university sector, while the term ‘Board’ tends to be used in the vocational education sector. In Indonesia the term ‘Board’ is used in relation to educational governance at the national, provincial and district level while the term ‘Committee’ tends to be used at the school level.

The third issue is the level at which board or council educational governance is actually practiced. By this, I mean that in some jurisdictions the governance body is established at the institutional level, for example the individual school or university. In other places it relates to a level of government authority. For example, a board or council may be established at a national, provincial or district (local government) level. This complicates any analysis of international practice in educational governance.

The final challenge relates to the relationship between power and participation. It is sometimes assumed that all people within a particular district have the same power to participate and/or contribute to educational decision-making. McCormick & Barnett (2006) indicate that it is widely accepted that Board characteristics are largely determined by the characteristics of individual board members. Desirable attributes include expertise in areas that are important for the organization, knowledge of the operation and management of the organization and its external environment, ability to make and influence decisions, willingness to commit to the task of governing and to devote time to effective decision making. However, these attributes alone are unlikely to result in board effectiveness. For example, a board member with expertise must be able to apply and share that expertise in board processes. Similarly, when the mission is unclear, goals are not shared, and strategies are inappropriate, information and expertise may not be enough to ensure board effectiveness.

This part has two aims. First, to explore international experiences of education governance; and second, to analyze the regulatory structure and institutional structure of Indonesian educational governance. The structure of the chapter reflects these two objectives. In terms of international experiences of educational governance I examine the experience of the United
States, Canada and Japan. These countries were chosen because the regulatory structure is similar to that which was adopted by Indonesian legislation. They are located at the local bureaucracy/government level or region. In the United States, Boards of Education operate at the state level; in Canada, Education Councils exist at the provincial level and in Japan Boards of Education are organized at prefecture level – similar to provinces in some countries – and municipalities. Meanwhile, under Indonesian legislation Boards of Education were established at the national, provincial and district levels.

The decision to examine the experience of the United States was also personal. In 1996 I, together with 12 colleagues, was selected to study for a Masters degree in the United States. This program was funded by the Asian Development Bank through the Government of Indonesia. I studied for a Masters of Educational Administration at State University of New York (SUNY). A key aspect of the program was accountability in education and governance of education. In addition to the official study program I had the opportunity to examine the governance practices in the State of New York. I visited a number of schools, and the Board of Cooperative Education Services (BOCES) and met key staff involved in educational management and governance. We shared information on governance structure particularly in education. At the time, it was not easy to understand the governance structure of New York and how it was implemented because it was completely different from my experience of Indonesia. I imagined that BOCES could be similar to the DEO, and the Superintendent would have similar roles to the Heads of DEOs in Indonesia.

I remember at the time reflecting on whether it would be possible to introduce a similar governance structure in Indonesia based on our existing DEO. Of course in 1998, the process of decentralization had not commenced but DEOs were an active part of educational management in Indonesia – but within a centralized system.

Japan also was selected because it has had considerable experience in terms of community participation in education. It has had more than sixty years experience in Board of Education implementation. As JICA (2004) stated, the Board of Education Law was issued in 1948, following the enactment of the Fundamental Law of Education - the core of education reforms in Japan – which were enacted in 1947.
3.2 International Experience of Educational Governance

The intention of this section is to identify key dimensions of the regulatory and operational frameworks of Boards of Education in the United States, Canada and Japan. In particular, I examine the history, governance models, roles and responsibilities, how membership and chairs are selected, remuneration and budgets, and meeting arrangements. This international experience will inform the key objectives of this project.

History of Establishment

One of the significant factors in determining the maturity of Boards of Education is when they were established. In Ohio, by adopting the amendment to the Ohio Constitution, the State Government of Ohio established the State Board of Education in 1953. Then three years later, on January 3rd, 1956, the State Board of Education held its first meeting which was attended by 23 Board members. Participants voted to appoint a Superintendent of Public Instruction at that meeting (State of Board of Education of Ohio, 2007).

Massachusetts State has a different history. The Massachusetts State Board of Education was established in 1837. It is the oldest State Board of Education in the United States (Massachusetts Board of Education, 2007). At the time, the Governor of Massachusetts had recommended the establishment of a Board of Education in his address to the 1837 legislature's opening session. His brief argument ran as follows:

While nothing can be further from my purpose, than to disparage the common schools as they are, and while a deep sense of personal obligation to them will ever be cherished by me, it must yet be candidly admitted that they are susceptible of great improvements. The school houses might, in many cases, be rendered more commodious. Provision ought to be made for affording the advantages of education, throughout the whole year, to all of a proper age to receive it. Teachers well qualified to give elementary instruction in all the branches of useful knowledge, should be employed; and small school libraries, maps, globes, and requisite scientific apparatus should be furnished. I submit to the Legislature, whether the creation of a board of commissioners of schools, to serve without salary, with authority to appoint a secretary, on a reasonable compensation, to be paid from the school fund, would not be of great utility (Massachusetts General Court records for 1837, Senate #1, p. 17).

Community participation in Canada has a different story. The history of District Education Councils (commonly referred to as DECs) was started when the Government of Canada formed DECs in December 2000 by issuing An Act to Amend the Education Act. This changed the governance structure, redistributing responsibilities and the balance of authority.
between the Minister of Education and the new local governing bodies called DECs. This Education Act tries to strike a balance in the division of responsibilities and the authorities related to the operation of the school system. The DECs were first elected to office in 2001 (Districts Education Council of New Brunswick, 2008).

Japan’s experience is different again. In Japan, the establishment of the Board of Education was started when the Government issued the Board of Education Law in 1948. Historically, after its defeat in 1945 Japan was occupied by the Allied forces. From that time until 1951, Japanese sovereignty was placed under the control of the General Headquarters of the Allied Forces (GHQ). Under this system of control, priority was given to demilitarization, democratization, and the rebuilding of the country. Education was seen as a key aspect of the democratization process. With a view to examining the overall concept of post-war Japanese education reforms, GHQ requested the United States to dispatch an investigatory group of education specialists in the form of the “United States Education Mission to Japan” (JICA, 2004).

The team of education specialists arrived in Japan in March 1946 – that is just six months after the formal surrender (JICA 2004). This team worked in cooperation with a committee of Japanese educationalists. In August 1946, the Education Reform Council, composed mainly of the educationalists who had cooperated with the United States Education Mission, was formed as a special committee responsible for education reform. Thereafter, post-war education reforms were carried out in accordance with the decisions made by this committee. With regard to the new education system, after the Second World War, the Americans reformed the Japanese education system along the lines of their own which consisted of six years of elementary school, three years each of junior and senior high school, and four years of university or two years of junior college (Japan Forum, 2002). This reformation also stated by Abe (2009) that the Japanese educational system was reformed after World War II. The old 6-5-3-3 system was changed to a 6-3-3-4 system (6 years of elementary school, 3 years of junior high school, 3 years of senior high school and 4 years of university) with reference to the American system. \textit{Gimukyoiku} (compulsory education) time period is 9 years which divided into 6 years in \textit{shougakkou} (elementary school) and 3 years in \textit{chuugakkou} (junior high school).
In addition, Kawagoe (2007) supports that it is intending to make changes in the Education Law to allow schools to merge the 6-3 division between elementary and middle schools. The key purpose for this change is to allow elementary and middle schools to pool or share their resources, with special regard to making available specialist teachers of middle schools to elementary schools.

The core of these education reforms was the Fundamental Law of Education which was enacted in 1947. This law set out the fundamental principles of post-war education in Japan, and effectively replaced the pre-war Imperial Rescript on Education (JICA, 2004). Following the enactment of the Fundamental Law of Education, a number of educational laws and regulations determining the structure and management of the education system were passed, including the School Education Law in 1947, the Board of Education Law in 1948, the Social Education Law in 1949, and the Private School Law in 1949.

In pre-war Japan, like the pre-decentralisation era in Indonesia, authority had been concentrated in the Japanese Ministry of Education, and there was a feeling that education had been excessively dominated by central control (JICA, 2004). From the perspective of the democratization of educational policy decision-making and the advance of regional devolution of authority, American-style local Boards of Education were given big responsibilities. Each Board was responsible for educational administration in their local education area. At the time, these Boards of Education were composed of publicly elected citizens, and a superintendent who was responsible for the execution of the decisions made. Boards of Education were given authority over the establishment and closure as well as the administration and management of schools and other educational institutions, repair and preservation of school buildings, educational content and ways of dealing with it, the selection of textbooks, the appointment of educators, and the preparation and execution of educational budgets. Prefectural Boards of Education were also given authority over the issuing of teachers’ licenses, the authorization of textbooks used in all schools in the prefecture, and the provision of technical and specialist help and guidance given to municipal and local Boards of Education (JICA, 2004).

By 1948, Boards of Education had been established in each prefecture and in the five largest cities. The establishment of Boards of Education continued and by 1952 coverage extended throughout Japan. However it soon became apparent that all was not well with the legislated
system of educational governance. For example, there were problems associated with the unit of establishment, the methods of nominating and electing members of the Boards, the relationship between general administration and educational administration. In 1956, the government began the task of re-examining the system of Boards of Education. As a result, the Board of Education Law, which had been enacted after the war, was annulled, and in its place, the “Law concerning the Organization and Functions of Local Educational Administration” was enacted. By virtue of the new law, the authority of the Boards of Education was revised in terms of direct public election of Board members, total number of Board members, appointment of the superintendents, the power of Boards of Education and their authority to appoint teaching personnel.

Parallels can be made between the Japanese and Indonesian experiences. Basically, the education system in Japan is similar to that in Indonesia, namely a 6-3-3-4 system (six years of elementary school, three years of junior high school, three years of senior high school and four years of university or higher education). Both also have a compulsory education system covering nine years that consists of six years in elementary school and three years in junior high school.

The regulatory structure of the Boards of Education in both Japan and Indonesia is another similarity. They both perform at the local bureaucracy/government level or region. Boards of Education in Japan perform at the municipality and prefecture level, while in Indonesia, Boards of Education perform at the district, provincial and national level (Note: The Indonesian National Board of Education has not been established yet; it still in the process of being established).

Roles and Responsibilities
In Indonesia there is a clear difference in meaning between roles and functions. Role means a function or work performed especially in a particular operation or process. A different understanding about its meaning comes from Carr (2009). He determines that a role is a comprehensive pattern of behaviour that is socially recognized, providing a means of identifying and placing an individual in a society. He also states that a role remains relatively stable even though different people occupy the position. Meanwhile, according to Luthra (2009), role means prescribed or expected behavior associated with a particular position or status in a group or organization.
To accomplish their goals and objectives, Boards of Education or Education Councils should play their roles effectively and efficiently. As noted above, the roles of Boards of Education or Education Councils vary. The key differences tend to be about priorities and emphases. Most of them have responsibility to formulate policy and exercise governance over the public education system. Most also have responsibility for hiring and directing the Superintendent and reviewing school improvement and school performance reports.

The first priority for Boards is improving educator quality and capacity. This can be done through initiatives such as working with the educator preparation programs to ensure better candidates, recruiting candidates through alternative routes, piloting alternative teacher compensation models, including differentiated career roles, and providing professional development based on student, teacher and administrator needs. This professional development includes ensuring that teachers know how to use data and technology to improve instruction (State of Board of Education of Ohio, 2007).

Early childhood education is also a significant priority. According to the State Board of Education of Ohio (2007), it takes a leadership role in the implementation of the recommendations and strategies outlined in the School Readiness Solutions Group report and implementation plan. These strategies address creating a high quality, results-driven early learning system to promote children’s development and readiness for school; improving the quality, health and safety of all early education settings; expanding the pool of highly qualified early childhood professionals; encouraging families to become more involved in the education of their children; and creating a reliable financing mechanism for early learning services and strengthening accountability for public and private investments in early education.

Boards need to consider their responsibilities in terms of the new global economy. The State of Board of Education of Ohio engages stakeholders, particularly in the business and political communities, in strategic conversations about the role of education in the new global economy and ensures that Ohio’s academic content standards reflect high expectations for all students so that they can compete globally (State of Board of Education of Ohio, 2007).
Boards should also be concerned with student outcomes and poor academic performance in particular. The Board is required to pursue initiatives designed to build the capacity of low performing schools and districts to improve academic achievement universally to close achievement gaps, research effective intervention initiatives and develop data systems to facilitate the creation of individualized education plans for all students.

Finally, Boards have responsibility for funding and resource management. They are required to improve and align state funding mechanisms; define, and advocate for, needed financial resources and funding-related policy changes; and promote strategies and tools to promote effective and efficient resource management practices by schools and districts.

Examples of Board Responsibilities

In California, the State Board of Education is the governing and policy making body of the California Department of Education. The State Board of Education sets K-12 education policy in the areas of standards, instructional materials, assessment, and accountability. The State Board of Education adopts textbooks for grades K-8, adopts regulations to implement legislation, and has authority to grant waivers of the education code (California State Board of Education, 2007).

The roles and responsibilities of the Education Council in New Brunswick, Canada are a little bit different. According to the Handbook of Districts Education Council of New Brunswick (2008, p.2), the DEC is responsible for hiring and directing the Superintendent, managing and controlling school property, managing the budget (cannot run a deficit), using policy governance to develop district policies, facilitating community use of schools, initiating school establishment and closures, developing district education plans, reviewing district performance reports, reviewing school improvement and school performance reports for each school in the district, maintaining linkages with Parent School Support Committees (PSSC), monitoring trust fund expenditures, identifying capital construction project priorities, and providing training for PSSC members. However, the DEC is prohibited from setting the school calendar or curriculum, setting provincial standards, developing provincial budgets, and intervening in daily operations of the school district.

In Japan, as mentioned by JICA (2004, p. 60), the Board is an administrative organ of a local public entity, and is independent, operating under a representative system. Another point is
that Boards of Education are established in prefectures as well as in cities, towns and villages. However, it is possible for towns and villages to combine together and form an association, and for that association to establish a Board of Education.

The Board of Education administers and implements matters concerned with education, science and culture that were formerly the responsibility of the prefectural governor or the mayor of a city, town or village. Personnel matters in respect of elementary and lower secondary school teachers come under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education (JICA, 2004). Hiroshima Prefectural Government (2006) stated that each prefecture and municipality in Japan has its own Board of Education to oversee matters related to education, culture and sports. These boards of Education have been organized as agencies of a representative system which is independent from either Mayor or Governor so as to maintain the neutral nature of educational administration and the sense of continuity. The Board of Education is responsible for the administration of the schools within a corresponding municipality and a prefecture as well as implementing policies in various fields related to education. Each Board of Education takes the form of a representative council (administrative board) made up of between three and six part-time members which deliberates and makes decisions pertaining to education, culture and sports matters.

The main administrative functions and the list of educational administration bodies and powers in the current system of educational administration in Japan are presented below:
Figure 3
The Main Administrative Bodies and Power

Source: JICA (2004, p. 69)
Figure 4
The List of Educational Administration Bodies and Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Administration Bodies</th>
<th>Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ministry of Education/Minister of Education | - School establishment criteria  
- Textbook authorization  
- Curriculum criteria  
- School enrollment criteria  
- Supervision of teacher licensing  
- Ordinances, instructions, circulars, notices  
- Jurisdiction over national universities and schools  
- Financial help to private universities  
- Jurisdiction over private and public universities and granting of permission to establish them |
| Prefectural boards of education          | - Exhibiting of authorized textbooks  
- Granting permission for exemption from compulsory school attendance  
- Issuing of teachers’ licenses  
- School administration rules and regulations |
| Municipal boards of education            | - Selection of textbooks  
- Setting, notifying and getting approval of educational planning criteria  
- Educational planning formulation  
- School enrollment enforcement and exemption  
- School administration regulations |
| Municipal schools                        | - Lesson planning formulation  
- Notification to boards of education of non-attendance or delinquency among children |

Source: JICA (2004, p. 69)

Membership and Chairs
In Ohio the State Board of Education of Ohio has 19 members, 11 of whom hold elected seats and 8 of whom are appointed by the Governor with advice and consent of the Senate. Each elected Board member serves a four-year term and represents a district consisting of the territory of three contiguous Senate districts. Four of the appointed members represent rural school districts, and four of them represent urban/suburban districts (State of Board of Education of Ohio, 2007, p. 10).

It is almost the same with the Massachusetts Board of Education where the Board consists of nine members, six of whom are appointed by the governor for staggered five-year terms. The three statutory members of the Board are the Chancellor of Higher Education, the Commissioner of Early Education and Care, and the Chairperson of the State Student
Advisory Council, a high school student who is elected by other students on the council to serve a one-year term (Massachusetts Department of Education, 2007). The composition of the Board is as follows:

- The chairman of the student advisory council;
- The chancellor of higher education;
- The commissioner of early education and care;
- One representative of a labor organization selected by the governor from a list of three nominees provided by the Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL-CIO;
- One representative of parents of school children selected by the governor from a list of three nominees provided by the Massachusetts Parent Teachers Association;
- One representative of business or industry selected by the governor with a demonstrated commitment to education;
- Three additional members selected by the governor.

The governor is responsible for selecting the chairman of the Board. The Board is responsible for selecting a commissioner of education, who also serves as secretary to the Board (Massachusetts Department of Education, 2007).

In Washington, the State Board of Education consists of sixteen members, five of whom are elected by local school directors (three from the west side of the state, two from the east side of the state); one from the private school body elected by the members of state-approved private schools; the superintendent of public instruction; seven Governor appointees; and two students selected through a process by the Washington Association of Student Councils (Washington State Board of Education, 2007).

In Hawaii the Board consists of fourteen members. Seven of the members are elected according to geographic distribution. One non-voting student member also serves on the Board (State of Hawaii, Department of Education, 2007). In California the State Board of Education has eleven members, all appointed by the Governor (California State Board of Education, 2007). The Florida the State Board of Education consists of seven members who are all appointed by the Governor to staggered 4-year terms, subject to confirmation by the Senate. Members may be reappointed by the Governor for additional terms not to exceed 8 years of consecutive service (Florida State Board of Education, 2007).
In New Brunswick, Canada, as stated in the Handbook of Districts Education Council of New Brunswick (2008, p.2), the DEC is a body corporate that can sue and be sued, and consists of volunteer members. They are elected or appointed from the community to serve four-year terms of office. DEC elections occur at the same time as municipal and hospital authority elections. As soon as possible following elections, a provincial orientation session is held for all DEC members. The Council of DEC Chairs directs the DEC Administrator to develop the program with input from DEC members, the Department of Education, and other stakeholders.

In Japan, in 1956, under the Organization and Functions of Local Educational Administration Law, the public election of Board of Education members, which had been a major pillar of the previous Board of Education Law, was abolished, and a system was introduced whereby members were to be appointed by the head of the administrative organization concerned (JICA, 2004, p. 62). In order to achieve a greater level of moderation, each board member would now be appointed by the Governor or Mayor. This appointment is subject to approval by the prefectural or municipal council. The Organization and Functions of Local Educational Administration Law also stipulated that the membership of the Board of Education would now number 5 people, but in the case of town and village boards may be 3 people (JICA, 2004).

In order to carry out its duties, each Board was to be headed by a superintendent. The superintendents of the prefectural Boards of Education would be appointed by the prefectural boards, subject to the approval of the Minister of Education. Meanwhile, the superintendents of the city, town, and village Boards of Education would be appointed by the city, town, and village boards from among the members of these boards with the consent of the prefectural Boards of Education. With regard to daily activities, the Board of Education would establish an office to deal with clerical matters and each prefectural Board of Education would have a section concerned with research and statistics, and a section concerned with educational guidance (JICA, 2004, p. 62).

Another study by Muta (2000) stated that the Superintendent of the Board of Education oversees the specific execution of the Board's affairs. The Secretariat is the organization under the Superintendent's jurisdiction in charge of handling these affairs. Currently, a
The superintendent of the municipal Board of Education is chosen among the Board members by the Mayor, and a superintendent of Prefectural Board of Education is appointed by Governor.

**Remuneration and Budgets**

In the United States, most of the Board of Education members are voluntary and not paid. According to the State Board of Education of Ohio (2007) and the Massachusetts Department of Education (2007), in Ohio and Massachusetts Board of Education members will receive reimbursement for all expenses such as transportation and accommodation. In Florida, members of the State Board of Education serve on a voluntary basis but are entitled to reimbursement of travel and per diem expenses (Florida State Board of Education, 2007).

In relation to budget funding, the Handbook of Districts Education Council of New Brunswick (2008, p. 6-7) states that district bank and trust accounts are held in the name of the DEC. Funding for district operations, capital construction projects, and repairs is provided by the department following budget approval by the Legislative Assembly. District budgets are provided based on government-established guidelines and funding norms. Once the operating budget funding has been received, the DEC, working with the Superintendent, establishes and approves the District Expenditure Plan. The DEC cannot run a deficit, but can retain surpluses of up to $100,000 per year. Surpluses in excess of $100,000 must be returned to the Department of Education. The DEC is required to submit a balanced District Expenditure Plan to the department by July 1st each year.

The Districts Education Council of New Brunswick (2008, p. 6) also reported that as volunteers, DEC members do not receive compensation for their work. Members can claim expenses for travel and other specified out-of-pocket costs related to District Education Council activities. Then, the Superintendent approves the expenses for reimbursement.

In Japan, with regard to the educational budget, the Boards of Education prepare their own budget of required costs, and receive a budget from the head of the local public entity, and where there is a difference of opinion, the estimate prepared by the Board of Education is attached to the estimate of the head of the local public entity, and the estimates are submitted to the local assembly, which makes the decision (JICA, 2004, p. 60).
Meeting Arrangements

In Ohio, to maintain the Board activities, regular meetings are held in January, April, July, and October. Special meetings are called in other months to conduct Board business as needed (State Board of Education of Ohio, 2007). Meanwhile, in Massachusetts, to organize and maintain the Board, regular meetings are held at least ten times a year, generally on the fourth Tuesday of the month, but special meetings are also called on the basis of needs (Massachusetts Department of Education, 2007).

Another example of meeting arrangements is that used by the Hawaii State Board of Education (2007). The Board conducts public meetings on the first and third Thursday of every month, and special meetings are required for the purpose of transacting official board business such as receiving requests and petitions from the public, receiving reports from the Superintendent of Education, the State Librarian, board committees, commissions, and student representatives.

In New Brunswick all DEC meetings are open to the public. Parents and interested community members are encouraged to attend to observe the meetings. However, some DEC meetings may be held in private. For example, during discussions about individual pupils, personnel or legal matters, the Chair is required to exclude all members of the public from the meeting. Also, when the Chair of the DEC is of the opinion that it is in the public interest to hold a meeting, or any part of a meeting, in private, the Chair may exclude any or all persons, including the Superintendent from the meeting. Decisions related to these closed meetings are to be made part of the public record by reading only the results of any such motion into the minutes of the next meeting that is open to the public. Annually, the Council of DEC Chairs’ sponsors a provincial symposium for DEC members and a limited number of PSSC members. Attendance at these sessions is strongly encouraged. Expenses are covered under the provincial DEC budget. Each DEC also provides identified training and policy development opportunities for their members, often through member retreats. They offer training/information sessions for PSSC in their districts, generally on an annual basis. Parent forums are held by many DECs to address specific issues, gather feedback, and provide information on pertinent district initiatives (Districts Education Council of New Brunswick, 2008, p.12).
In Japan, even though there is no clear information regarding meeting arrangements, JICA (2004, p. 66) indicated that on many occasions, Board of Education meetings were entirely taken up with formalistic discussion on agenda items that required a practical resolution, so that there was insufficient time for discussion or examination of such matters as to how to respond to a wide variety of educational problems.

**Key Themes Emerging**

From the studies above, several key themes emerge. Firstly, most of the findings indicate that Boards of Education or their equivalents have authority and responsibility for policy making and developing standards. In Ohio, the Board of Education has three specific powers: leadership, regulatory and administrative powers (State Board of Education of Ohio, 2007), whereas in Massachusetts, the Board of Education has authority and responsibility to establish state-wide policies and regulations relating to the education of students in public elementary, secondary, and vocational-technical schools (The Massachusetts Board of Education, 2007). The Hawaii State Board of Education has a dual mission: to set education policies and standards for the public school system and to set policies and standards for the public library system (Hawaii State Board of Education, 2007). Moreover, in California, the State Board of Education is the governing and policy making body of the Californian Department of Education. The State Board of Education sets K-12 education policy in the areas of standards, instructional materials, assessment, and accountability (California State Board of Education, 2007). In Canada, as stated in the Handbook of Districts Education Council of New Brunswick (2008), DECs are responsible for hiring and directing the Superintendent of schools, managing and controlling school property, budgeting and spending money. They are also responsible for implementing policy governance to develop district policies, facilitating community use of schools, initiating school establishment and closures, developing district education plans, reviewing district performance reports, reviewing school improvement and school performance reports for each school in the district, maintaining linkages with PSSC, monitoring trust fund expenditures, identifying capital construction project priorities, and providing training for PSSC members.

The literature also suggests that there is no pattern of selection to the Boards of Education or their equivalents. In some State Boards of Education, for example Ohio, Massachusetts, and Hawaii some members are elected and the rest are appointed by the Governor. In other States, for example in California and Florida, the Board members are completely appointed by the
Governor. In New Brunswick, Canada, the DEC is a body corporate and consists of volunteer members who are elected or appointed from the community. In Japan, Boards of Education members in some provinces such as Hiroshima, Yamanashi, and Fukushima Prefecture, are appointed by the Governor or Mayor.

Thirdly, Board of Education (or its equivalent) members are mostly unpaid but they are entitled to reimbursement of travel and per diem expenses. In Ohio, Massachusetts, Hawaii, California and Florida, Board of Education members are not paid but they receive small amounts of money in every meeting and reimbursement of all expenses such as transportation and accommodation. In New Brunswick, Canada, as volunteers, DEC members do not receive compensation for their work. Members can claim expenses for travel and other specified out-of-pocket costs related to District Education Council activities.

Fourthly, there is no clear financing pattern for the Boards of Education in the United States. In New Brunswick, Canada, the funding for DEC operations, capital construction projects, and repairs is provided by the department following budget approval by the Legislative Assembly. DEC budgets are provided based on government-established guidelines and funding norms.

Fifthly, all the Boards of Education in Ohio, Massachusetts, Hawaii, California and Florida conduct meetings regularly and announce the progress of the Board activities and outputs. In New Brunswick, Canada, all DEC meetings are open to the public. Parents and interested community members are encouraged to attend to observe the meetings.

From these readings, a number of key themes emerged. I was inspired to introduce them to the work of Boards of Education, either at the district, provincials or national level. Most of the findings are applicable and can be used as references for Indonesian perspectives. This intention will be described later in Chapter V.

3.3 Boards of Education in Indonesia
Decentralization of education in Indonesia has brought a lot of changes and one of the most important is community participation in education. This is clearly outlined in Law Number 20/2003 on the National Education System in Part 3 Article 56 (1) which stipulates that:
The community shall take part in the quality improvement of educational services, which includes planning, monitoring, and evaluation of educational programs through Board of Education and School Committees (MONE, 2003, p. 24.)

Further, Part 3 Article 56 (2) also stipulates that:

The Board of Education, as an independent body, is established and participates in the quality improvement of education by providing advice, directions and support for personnel, facilities, and equipment, and monitoring at national, provincial, and district/city levels, without hierarchical relationship (MONE, 2003, p. 24.)

The establishment of the provisions for Board of Education and School Committees set forth in the paragraphs above was then further stipulated in detail by the Decree of the Ministry of National Education Number 044/2002 on Boards of Education and School Committees. This Decree also established School Committees as part of the governance structure for education in Indonesia. This project focuses on the operations of the District Board of Education although I acknowledge that for improved educational outcomes for Indonesia there needs to be a good working relationship between the District Board of Education and School Committees. For that reason, in some cases, the exploration of the Board of Education is followed also by comments from School Committees’ perspectives.

Decree Number 044/2002 contains several crucial parts, which stipulate its roles, functions, name, scope, status, characteristic, objectives, membership and organization, establishment/formation, and relationships.

Law Number 20/2003 in Part 3 Article 56 (2) clearly outlines that the Board of Education is established at the national, provincial, and district levels. As a consequence of its roles to participate in the quality improvement of education by providing advice, directions and supports for personnel, facilities and equipment, and monitoring, an important question is raised: What is the current condition of the Board of Education for each level?

National Board of Education
The MONE has followed up the establishment of the National Board of Education by putting this issue into MONE Planning and Strategy 2005-2009. This Planning and Strategy states that one of the key development milestones is that a National Board of Education will be established in 2009.
Some activities for establishing a National Board of Education have been prepared and anticipated. Each year, in Board of Education Workshops, this issue is always raised by most Provincial and District Boards of Education. The establishment of a National Board of Education still needs a legal framework (Suparlan, 2008). Law Number 20/2003 in Part 3 Article 56 (4) clearly states that the establishment of the provisions for a National Board of Education shall be further stipulated by Government Regulation.

In Indonesia, as a legal formality, once a Law has been issued, it will be followed up by several Government Regulations. At the time of writing, some Government Regulations have been issued, for example Government Regulation Number 19/2004 regarding Educational National Standards. Unfortunately, a Government Regulation on Managing and Administering Education, in which the National Board of Education will be accommodated, has not been issued yet (Suparlan, 2009).

To deal with the establishment of a National Board of Education, the Directorate General of Management of Primary and Secondary Education (DGMPSE), MONE held a Preparation for Establishing a National Board of Education Workshop at the beginning of May 2009. The meeting was attended by bureaucrat representatives from MONE, the Ministry of Home Affair (MOHA) and the Ministry of Religious Affair (MORA). In addition, some educational experts at the national level, private organizations concerned with education, representatives from the national teacher association, which is Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia (PGRI), and Provincial and District Boards of Education who have contributed effectively to quality improvement in education in their territory (based on their performance determined by DGMPSE) also were attended.

The intention of the workshop was to establish three committees. These three committees would be responsible for establishing a National Board of Education, speeding up the Government Regulations, and revising the Ministerial Decree. Then, the composition and candidates for the three committees and their next agenda would be submitted to the Minister of National Education through the Director General Management of Primary and Secondary Education for his approval and direction. Once the Minister has approved the committees, they will start to conduct three simultaneous workshops. The final objective of these workshops is to have qualified candidates for the National Board of Education. Then, these candidates’ names will be proposed to the Minister. When the Minister has no objections
regarding the candidates, he will determine the composition of the National Board of Education by issuing a Ministerial Decree regarding this matter.

**Provincial Boards of Education**

The Ministerial Decree No. 044/2002 only mentioned the development of District Boards of Education and School Committees. It did not state how the Provincial Boards of Education should be established and how they will contribute to the improvement of education quality. Meanwhile, a year later, as explained above, Law Number 20/2003 clearly stipulated that Provincial Boards of Education, like the National Board of Education, should be established.

Since the Indonesia Government has not issued the Government Regulation on Managing and Administering Education yet, it has consequences not only for delaying the establishment of a National Board of Education but also implications for some provinces who want to establish Provincial Boards of Education. Dealing with accommodating community participation in education is demanding, and some provinces have taken the initiative to establish Provincial Boards of Education by themselves, without waiting for the issuing of a Government Regulation.

The progress of the establishment of Provincial Boards of Education is provided in Table 5 below:

Table 5: The Progress of The Establishment of Provincial Boards of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Board of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Established</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DGMPSE (2008)

This table shows that in 2003, a year after issuing the Ministerial Decree, only one of thirty two provinces (3.1%) had already established a Provincial Board of Education. This was *Jawa Barat* Provincial Board of Education. Then, there was a sharp increase in the number of Provincial Boards of Education established in 2004, with fourteen of thirty three provinces (42.4%) establishing Provincial Boards of Education. They were *Jakarta* Special Territory, *Jawa Barat*, *Jawa Tengah*, *Yogyakarta* Special Territory, *Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam*,


Jambi, Lampung, Kalimantan Selatan, Sulawesi Selatan, Sulawesi Tenggara, Nusa Tenggara Barat, Bengkulu, Banten, and Kepulauan Bangka Belitung. In 2006, the numbers of Provincial Boards of Education increased to twenty (60.6%). This percentage indicates that more provinces took up the challenge to establish Provincial Boards of Education. The six additional provinces which established Boards of Education were Sumatera Utara, Sumatera Selatan, Kalimantan Selatan, Nusa Tenggara Timur, Nusa Tenggara Barat and Sulawesi Barat.

The remaining provinces reported at annual Board of Education workshops that they were waiting for the government to issue the Government Regulation on Managing and Administering Education before establishing Provincial Boards of Education in their provinces.

**District Boards of Education**

As stipulated in the *Panduan Umum Dewan Pendidikan dan Komite Sekolah* (Handbook for District Boards of Education) by DGMPSE, 2005, the purpose of establishing District Boards of Education were as follows: (a) associating and channeling the aspirations and initiatives of the society in creating education policies and programs at the districts/town and school, (b) increasing the responsibility and active participation of all layers of society in delivering education, (c) creating a transparent, accountable, and democratic atmosphere and condition in delivering and serving a quality education at the district/municipality and school level.

In a personal interview with, Prof. Slamet PH (an experienced international consultant and senior professor member of UNY in Yogjakarta) 2006, he stated that the District Board of Education should be a kind of education community organization having commitment, loyalty and caring in terms of improving the quality of education in a district. He argued that District Boards of Education can be developed on the basis of the districts’ different characteristics such as culture, demography, ecology, and traditions. For this reason, District Boards of Education should be developed to reflect local social models. It means District Boards of Education should have an orientation to client, power sharing and partnerships. This orientation should focus on quality education service in the district. He also suggested that Boards of Education rarely met these expectations.
Characteristics of Indonesian District Boards of Education

The District Board of Education is an independent body as it does not have a hierarchical relationship with governmental and other institutions. Thus, the District Board of Education and other governmental institutions all follow the authority given to them in accordance with relevant regulations, including Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002 and Government Regulation Number 38/2007.

In an interview in December 2004 with officers and consultants at the MONE who were in charge of developing District Boards of Education, it was suggested that District Boards must be independent in the following ways: First, the District Board of Education should be independent in terms of its institutional existence. Second, it also should be independent in managing its daily activities. Third, it should also have financial independence.

During the research, I found that some factors work against Board independence. First, the formation of District Boards of Education was facilitated initially by the MONE through Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002. Second, even though the formation of District Boards of Education should follow relevant statutes, at the outset membership was often determined by the local mayors. Third, the Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002 allows up to five members of the District Board of Education to come from representatives of the local bureaucracies, such as the DEO and district parliament members. Fourth, in many cases, the District Board of Education offices are provided by the local government. Moreover, they are frequently located in a certain room in the DEO building. Fifth, to manage its daily activities, District Boards of Education are still having difficulties without technical and support contributions from DEOs. This occurs in the Bekasi District Board of Education, which I will explore later in Chapter V. Sixth, many District Boards of Education still need financial contributions from government budgets - either central or local - to survive. Otherwise, they do not have the ability and capacity to maintain their roles and functions. This means that District Boards of Education remain vulnerable to local political influence which creates problems for independent decision-making and action.

Roles of District Boards of Education

To achieve their objectives as stipulated, District Boards of Education should play their roles effectively and efficiently. DGMPSE (2005) states that one of the roles played by the District Board of Education is as an advisor in formulating and implementing education policy. More
specifically, the District Board of Education should identify the educational aspirations of the community. The District Board of Education also should have input into education policy, decision making, and make recommendations and disseminate policy decisions about education programs in the district. In terms of resource management, the District Board of Education should give advice concerning qualifications, appointments, rotation of teachers and principals, school technical standards, and budget resources.

In addition, according to DGMPSE (2005), the District Board of Education has a role to play in supporting financial, planning, and human resources in delivering education. To play this role, the District Board of Education should identify experts in the community to support education manpower, and mobilize experts at the community to increase the education manpower and capacity. The District Board of Education also should mobilize voluntary teachers to help prevent a shortage of teachers, mobilize financial assistance from the community to supplement the education budget, and evaluate the implementation of community financial assistance. The District Board of Education also has a role as controller or auditor in terms of transparency and accountability in the delivery of education. Regarding this role, DGMPSE (2005) stated that to play this role effectively, the District Board of Education should control the process of decision making in education, control the process of education planning at the district level, control allocation of program implementation funds, monitor the GER, NER, repetition, drop out and transition rate, and monitor the final examination results.

The last role of the District Board of Education is as a mediator between government, parliament and the community. To play this role effectively, the District Board of Education should become a mediator between the DEO and the community, local Parliament and schools respectively. The District Board of Education also should deal with complaints regarding policies and programs of education, communicate complaints from the community to the relevant institution in the field of education, and mobilize community assistance for education.

**Functions of the District Board of Education**

The most important function of the District Board of Education is to support the growing attention and commitment of the community towards quality education implementation (DGMPSE, 2005). The District Board of Education is also responsible for maintaining
cooperation with local communities, commerce and industry, government and parliament, in connection with quality education implementation. Other functions of the District Board of Education are to:

- accommodate and analyze the aspirations, views, claims, and needs of the community;
- give input, considerations and recommendations to local government, parliament and schools, concerning policy and education programs, local education performance criteria, education personnel criteria, (especially teacher/tutor and head of school), education facilities criteria, and other business related to education;
- support parents and communities to participate in education and raise funds for the delivery of education at the school level.

In management of educational resources such as human, material, and financial resources, District Boards of Education offer advice to the education policy makers in the district. There is a need to manage teacher qualifications and to improve the quality of teachers. Another function of the District Board of Education in managing the teachers is to give advice on the teacher rotation within the region. As well, the District Board of Education also has a function in managing education facilities, namely in giving advice concerning school facility requirements. In stipulating the education budget, the District Board of Education also has a function to advise the region about its budget (DGMPSE, 2005).

Financial resources also need serious consideration. Schools that have limited funds will experience difficulties. Therefore, a School Committee has as one of its functions to generate funds for the school. School Committees will, in coordination with the District Board of Education endeavor to obtain assistance from the community. The District Board of Education will monitor the progress of the school committee in doing this (DGMPSE, 2005).

The deployment of education budget resources that are available in the community is important. In this era of education autonomy, that places a high priority on school autonomy, the school should be a significant part of the community, and each community should have a feeling of ownership toward the school.

An important part of management is controlling. The role of District Boards of Education as controlling agencies will of course be different from what is being done by the Local Parliament. Several functions of the District Boards of Education are important for
controlling the process of planning and decision making in the education service environment, as well as evaluating the quality of existing policy. One of the important functions of District Boards of Education is to monitor the implementation of DEO programs to see whether it is consistent with agreed policies. For example, to monitor how the funds are allocated and how the resources for the program are implemented (DGMPSE, 2005). Another example is the implementation of the nine years basic education program. At present the measurement of success is the final examination. In connection with this, the District Board of Education has an important role in monitoring the evaluation of the final examination results.

This control function of the District Board of Education is done via coordination with School Committees because the evaluation conducted by the School Committee of the educational output in the schools will become a significant information source for the Boards of Education in mapping problems in equity and outputs. Also considered important in judging the success of education is how the educational outcomes are reflected in increasing skilled manpower numbers. However, any results take some time to be seen, as planners must wait for graduates to enter the workforce. In addition, increase in workforce participation may not only be a function of education, other matters such as local economics may have an effect.

In education management, coordination, involvement, and participation are important activities in planning. As stated in Panduan Umum Dewan Pendidikan dan Komite Sekolah (DGMPSE, 2005), as a mediating agency, the Board of Education has a function to become a link between the DEO and the community, Local Parliament, and schools. The link should be developed as a good network because one of the handicaps encountered by the DEO is the minimal involvement and participation of the community in education planning. On the other side, a problem encountered by several Districts Education Offices is a lack of harmony in their relations with local parliament members.

Membership of District Boards of Education

According to the DGMPSE Handbook (2005), the membership of District Boards of Education is seventeen persons at the most and the number should be odd. The requirements, rights, obligations and period of membership of District Boards of Education are stipulated in its statute. The members of District Boards of Education consist of community members and bureaucracy/parliament representation can be added. Community representatives can be from
Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) of education, community leaders (Moslem religious leaders, cultural observers, local leaders, etc), as well as community members who have an interest in education quality, experts in education who have an interest in improving education quality; educational bodies (schools, courses, and Islamic schools), representatives from business/industry/professional associations; professional organizations of education personnel and representatives from School Committees.

A maximum of five representatives from the bureaucracy, such as the DEO and the district’s parliament members who are expert in education can be involved as members of District Boards of Education. Again, the issue emerges: how can the District Board of Education be independent when some of its members come from representatives of the bureaucracy?

**Chairs of District Boards of Education**

There is a lack of clarity about selection and appointment of chairs of District Boards of Education. Key Board positions should be stipulated by regulation/statute. The regulation should stipulate procedures for appointment to the following positions: chairman, secretary and treasurer. In addition, a special officer to handle administrative matters should be appointed. If considered necessary, the District Board of Education can be staffed with certain specialist members according to local needs. The office bearers should be chosen democratically from and by the members. To avoid potential conflict of interest, the Board of Education chairman must not be from the local government or the District Parliament. According to GOI policy the requirements, rights, obligations, and membership period of District Boards of Education should be stipulated in its statutes (DGMPSE, 2005).

**Establishment/Formation of District Boards of Education**

According to DGMPSE (2005), all steps in the formation of Boards of Education should be conducted transparently, accountably, and democratically. Conducting transparently and accountably means that District Boards of Education should be formed openly and with full knowledge of the community, starting from the phase of preparation and forming the committee, the socialization and preparation of the committee, the criteria for candidates, the membership selection process, the announcement of member candidates, the election process, and the delivery of the election result. All these things must be conducted openly and accountably. Conducting democratically means that selection is conducted by discussion and consensus. If considered necessary, the committee election can be conducted via voting. The
preparation committee should deliver a report of performance responsibility and the expenditure of committee funds.

The formation of a District Board of Education commences with the formation of a preparation committee by the community. The preparation committee has at least five persons consisting of education practitioners (teachers, principals, education practitioners, education observers, NGOs concerned with education, community leaders, religious leaders, business and industry leaders) and the parents of the students.

**Performance Indicators of District Boards of Education**

As stated in DGMPSE Handbook (2005), the performance indicators for District Boards of Education are related to their roles as advisor, supporter, mediator, and controller. The performance indicators for each role can be summarized as follows. As an advisor, District Board of Education provides productive and relevant advices to DEO. As a supporter, District Board of Education provides contribution to DEO in the form of financial, human and material resources. As a mediator, District Board of Education is able to mediate effectively between DEO and other local stakeholders in education, for example industry and commerce, district parliament members, and community leaders. As a controller, District Board of Education is able to control both program and financial accountability of the DEO.

In its advisory role, the District Board of Education has a continuous function in decision making. This begins by identifying the aspirations of the local community concerning education in their region. This matter is important, because with the current move to regional autonomy, the participation and involvement of the community becomes a measurement tool for the success of policy and programs in several fields, including education. Therefore, a District Board of Education plays a very crucial role as a bridge in identifying and analyzing the aspirations of the society, which then become a consideration for the education policy makers.

District Boards of Education decisions should certainly be made public, so that they become more transparent and can encourage community feedback for the education policy makers.

In its role as mediator, the Board of Education is in the position to facilitate inputs from the community to policy and the education programs of the DEO. The Board of Education should
also be able to communicate complaints from the community to the relevant educational institution. This provides input for the policy maker, and can lead to revisions of education policies and programs. For the Board of Education, the results of policy and program improvement should also be communicated to the community, so that there is feedback about the improvements to the quality of education. The education resources available in the community are quite extensive, but their utilization is too often less than optimal. This underlines the fact that the role of the Board of Education as a mediator is to empower the community and to provide assistance by coordinating with the various parties connected with education.

Growth and Development of District Boards of Education.

The progress towards the establishment of District Boards of Education is provided in Table 6 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts:</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number¹</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Board of Education Established²</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:
1) MOHA (2008)
2) DGMPSE (2008)

Table 6 indicates that the number of District Boards of Education significantly increased between 2003 and 2008. Oral communication with District Board of Education members indicates that most of the remaining districts that have not yet established District Boards of Education are new districts created after separation from original districts.

Although a Handbook exists (*Panduan Umum Dewan Pendidikan Kabupaten/Kota*), it lacks sufficient detail and clarity to provide effective operational guidelines for Boards of Education.

School Committees

In a similar way to the establishment of District Boards of Education, School Committees as stipulated in Law Number 20/2003 in Part 3 Article 56 (3), are independent bodies,
established to provide advice, direction and support for personnel, facilities and equipment, and to monitor schools. While the District Board of Education is established to provide advice, direction and support to DEO, the School Committee is doing similar things for school. The relation between the two is coordinative in nature and not in any hierarchical way. Although it is not well-defined in the law, District Board of Education is voluntarily supposed to provide advice to, and encourage better coordination with, School Committees.

School Committees should act as advisors in formulating and implementing education policy at the school level, provide a financial support, and provide suggestions on manpower matters in delivering education at the school level. They also act as a controller in terms of transparency and accountability in the conduct of the school and as a mediator between government and community at the school level.

In line with this, members of school committees must come from the local community. The total number of School Committee members is a minimum of 9 (nine) people and the total should always be an odd number. Requirements, rights, obligations, and membership period of School Committees are stipulated in their statutes (DGMPSE, 2005). In addition, representatives of the teacher council, and foundation/institution of education representatives, can also be involved as members (maximum 3 persons).

School Committees are elected by community representatives, namely parents, interest groups in education, teachers’ association, community leaders, practitioners in education such as school principals and school supervisors, local government officers, education academics, student representatives, and school alumni representatives. The School Committee members are elected democratically and by law, every school must inform the public on election outcomes (DGMPSE, 2005).

### 3.4 Concluding Observations

Based on the above reviews of Boards of Education in different states in the United States and in Japan important lessons for Indonesia may be learned:

1. The literature that has been assessed indicates that Boards of Education have authority and responsibility for policy making and developing standards. This is appropriate in the context of the United States, but for Indonesia it is not totally applicable at the
present time for at least two reasons. First, Law Number 20/2003 on National Education System in the Republic of Indonesia, Part 3, Article 56 (2) stipulates that:

The Board of Education, as an independent body, is established and participates in the quality improvement of education by providing advice, directions and supports for personnel, facilities, and equipment, and monitoring at national, provincial, and district/city levels, without hierarchical relationships.

Second, District Boards of Education in Indonesia were established in 2002 based the Decree of the Ministry of National Education Number 044/2002 on Boards of Education and School Committees. The Boards are still young (seven years) and they are not yet sufficiently mature, capable or autonomous to play roles as policy makers and standards developers as in the USA. However the literature does provide useful insights and possible directions for Boards in Indonesia.

2. Internationally it is difficult to determine any pattern of selection of the Board members. In some USA State Boards of Education, some members are elected and the rest are appointed by the Governor. In other States, the Board members are completely appointed by the Governor. But there is a lesson to be learned for Indonesia here. The Board members in the USA must represent geographical regions. I think this idea may be adopted for Indonesia for the following reason. If the Board members are selected to represent geographical regions, the members will be more aware of problems, issues, aspirations, and challenges of education in the area they represent.

3. Board members are mostly unpaid but they are entitled to reimbursement of travel and per diem expenses. This model is appropriate for Indonesia given the limited financial resources available for education. In addition, the duty of the District Board of Education in Indonesia is in essence only advisory, demanding less time as compared to policy making. But this might not be as professionally rewarding; sound local advice should be acknowledged.

4. There is no clear financing for the United States and Japanese Boards, that is, who finances them, how much, and for what. For Indonesia, especially in the early years, there must be a clear source of funds for the Boards.

5. All the Boards in the United States conduct meetings regularly and announce the progress of the Board activities and outputs. This is a good lesson for Indonesia. Regular meetings, hearings, petitions, and other means of encouraging public transparency and accountability must be implemented by Indonesian District Boards of Education.
Based on these conclusions, the next chapter will explore the main three dimensions of the existence of Boards of Education which I am examining, namely the recruitment and selection, roles played, and contribution to education development of their local districts. This Chapter will draw information from four case studies based on the town/districts I visited. Each case study will contain objectives of the study, on the spot descriptions, information sharing, and findings. Case 1 will describe the field visit to the town of Yogyakarta. Case 2 will explore more detail about the performance of District Boards of Education in the field visit in the Lombok Tengah district. Case 3 will describe the field visit to Bekasi district. Case 4 will explore the field visit to Tangerang district.
CHAPTER IV

IMPROVING THE PERFORMANCE OF DISTRICT BOARDS OF EDUCATION

Based on the Planned Schedule and Research Duration as outlined in Chapter II, this Chapter is organized into four case studies. The case studies will be based on the districts I visited. Each case study will explore the main research objectives which I am examining, namely the recruitment and selection, roles played, and contribution of District Boards of Education. Each case study contains research objectives, on the spot descriptions, information sharing, and findings. Case 1 will describe the field visit to the town of Yogyakarta. Because this case study was the first field visit, I just brainstormed with informants about the current status of the District Board of Education in Yogyakarta town, and then compared it with the national data from the MONE. (This provides preliminary insights and threads for later studies). Case 2 will explore more detail about the performance of the District Board of Education based on the field visit activity in Lombok Tengah district. Case 3 will describe the field visit to Bekasi district, and then Case 4 will explore the field visit to Tangerang district.

Before looking at the case studies, this chapter will start with some introductory paragraphs containing some preliminary observations about Boards of Education and their operation. Then, it will be followed by an outline of the current status of recruitment and selection, roles played, and contributions of the District Boards of Education which I have already examined. This chapter also includes comments relating to the National Board of Education Workshop held in 2005 with which I was involved. Although it was not directly part of the four case studies that form the central part of this project it has been included in this chapter because it was an excellent opportunity to clarify data that had been collected in the first two case studies. It was also a good opportunity to gain an insight into the national picture.

Although this research has been divided into four case studies, the division between these case studies is somewhat arbitrary. The research has been organized into case studies in order to assist the reader to understand the dynamic and complex nature of District Boards of Education and the project.
4.1 Preliminary Observations about Boards of Education

The District Boards of Education in Indonesia were only established in 2002. They are in an embryonic state and there has been insufficient time for a proper analysis of their contribution to educational outcomes in Indonesia. However, Boards of Education are not new. As noted in chapter III they have existed, in various forms, in many countries for many years.

Although the Boards have only existed in Indonesia for almost seven years it is possible to make five preliminary generalizations about Boards of Education and their operation based on my literature review and current GOI documents. First, as a consequence of Law Number 22/1999 on Local Government, the Ministry of National Education enacted the Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002 on Boards of Education and School Committees. As indicated in the previous chapter, the main purpose of the Decree was to increase community participation in education development because it was realized that education is a cooperative endeavour. The Decree formulates the processes for the selection of the Board of Education members and identifies four roles to be played by the Boards of Education indicating that Board members shall be selected from community members and government representatives, but it does not mention representatives from sub-districts. (For me, this selection system poses questions regarding Board awareness of the problems and issues of education in the sub-districts.) The roles to be played by the District Board of Education were highlighted, namely as an advisor, supporter, mediator, and controller. The four roles are supposed to be able to increase community contribution to the development of education at both district and school levels.

Second, the current practices of the District Boards of Education in terms of their selection system, roles played, and contributions require changes. District Board of Education members should be selected in a manner so that they also represent congressional sub-districts as well as representing relevant community groups. This requires revision of the Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002 in order to accommodate representatives from congressional sub-districts.

Third, the roles played should be revised in order to add additional Board responsibilities, because in reality, the four roles formulated by the Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002 were not sufficient for the District Boards of Education to do their jobs effectively.
Fourth, there is a need to clarify District Boards of Educations’ contributions to district education development.

Fifth, at the implementation level, there must be a sharp distinction between the District Board of Education’s roles and the DEO’s roles. The District Board of Education should have an advisory role and not have an administrative function, while the DEO should have the responsibility for administrative functions in all of its education business at the district level.

4.2 Research into the Current Status of District Boards of Education

The intention of this section is to explore facts and information about the current status, problems, issues, and challenges of District Boards of Education, covering their recruitment and selection, roles played and contributions. To achieve this intention, data was collected from October 2004 to August 2005 using the methods outlined in Chapter II including:

1. reviews of literature on the current development of District Boards of Education in general,
2. in-depth interviews with officers and consultants at the MONE who were in charge of developing District Boards of Education in December 2004,
3. visits to selected schools to get general perceptions with regards to District Boards of Education, and
4. an analysis of documents which were collected from DEOs and District Boards of Education in August 2005.

This initial data collected mainly focused on an exploration of the current status of the District Boards of Education. In general, the initial data was categorized into current progress, problems and issues confronted by the District Boards of Education in the areas of recruitment and selection, roles played by the Boards, finance, coordination, and the contribution of the Boards to district education development. In essence, the initial data will provide preliminary insights and will evolve over time; the real problems and issues will come out during data collection. However, I must eventually focus on selected significant problems, and therefore, not all problems of District Boards of Education will be discussed thoroughly in this research phase.
Based on those concerns, the following will describe succinctly the current status of District Boards of Education in terms of recruitment and selection, roles played, and contributions to district education development.

**Recruitment and Selection**

It is a truism that the right person in the right place is an ideal placement of personnel/staff in any organization, including District Boards of Education. Obviously, the right person in the right place comes mainly from the right selection. In essence, recruitment and selection becomes an important focus for this research because of its strong influence on the capacity (the ability to do the job) of District Boards of Education in the future. Qualitative data which was collected from different sources on the recruitment and selection of District Boards of Education is outlined below.

Data was collected from the MONE by using in-depth interviews and document analysis (guidelines, reports, regulations, etc.) regarding the current status of recruitment and selection of District Boards of Education members. In the MONE, the data was specifically collected from the project manager who is in charge of developing District Boards of Education and his consultants at the DGMPSE in the MONE.

In terms of recruitment and selection of District Boards of Education members, the project manager who is in charge of developing District Boards of Education mainly agrees that Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002 on Board of Education and School Committee was used as the criteria. *We follow the criteria of recruitment and selection as defined by the Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002,* he said. Likewise, the Consultants for the project for District Boards of Education development at the MONE confirmed that, *As a rule of the thumb, legal aspects in the form of Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002 is a mandate; not negotiable.* The Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002 stipulates that:

- the board members are recruited and selected from: (1) community representatives covering NGOs, community leaders, education leaders, school foundations, industry and commerce, professional associations, education professional organizations and school communities; and (2) representatives from government and the legislature (maximum 4-5 persons). The maximum total number of education board members was 17 persons (p. 11.)
The biggest problem that I faced during the data collection process was that there were no consistent Annual Reports on District Boards of Education. The only available Annual Report that related to my research was the 2004 Report. (Other Annual Reports do exist but are not related to my research.) The Annual MONE Report (2004) of District Boards of Education Performance did not report specifically on the recruitment and selection of the District Boards of Education members. But it reported that, *The roles played by the boards were still under performance and at the time, the community expected boards to perform very highly* (Annual MONE Report of District Boards of Education, 2004, p.95). Obviously there were several factors affecting the District Board of Education performance and one of them was the recruitment and selection system. However, the 2004 Report did not address recruitment and selection of the District Boards of Education members although based on research data I considered it a very important factor. What to improve and how to improve the existing recruitment and selection system has been the concern of this research.

**Roles Played District Boards of Education**

As detailed in Chapter III, by law, the roles performed by District Boards of Education have been written in Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002. The Board of Education shall act as: (1) an advisor in policy formulation, implementation and evaluation, (2) a supporter in the forms of financial, intellectual and/or skills in running education, (3) a controller in an effort to improve transparency and accountability as well as output of education, and (4) a mediator between executive, legislative and community. I will explore, not only how to maximize these roles played by the Boards, but I will also explore other roles as deemed to be important by the District Boards of Education in order to be able to contribute more to district education development.

To do this, I looked for documents relating to the development of District Boards of Education. Unfortunately, there were very few recent reports that related to my research focus; in fact the only available report was the 2003 MONE Report. This report (The 2003 Annual Report of District Boards of Education) summarized succinctly perceptions of the roles played by the District Board of Education as an advisor, supporter, controller, and mediator as seen from Table 7 below. One hundred and ninety two districts were used as a sample taken from a total of 353 districts (in 2003) or roughly 50% of existing Boards. The District Boards of Education were asked to fill in questionnaires already prepared by the
MONE team. The results may be seen in Table 7. The performances of their roles were categorized into four categories: A = Very good, B = Good, C = Fair, and D = Fail.

Table 7
Performance of the District Board of Education as an Advisor, Supporter, Controller, and Mediator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>Roles Played As (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In terms of roles played by the District Board of Education, national data as tabulated in Table 7 above indicates that the District Boards of Education played their roles quite well except for their role as a mediator. This table indicated that a few District Boards of Education played poor roles as advisor, supporter, and controller. Meanwhile, 14.1% of District Boards of Education performed poorly as mediator. On the other hand, the percentage of District Boards of Education which played better than average roles as advisor, supporter, and controller was higher than their role as mediator.

This less than positive assessment of roles played by District Boards of Education encouraged me to explore why this situation had arisen, especially their poor performance in their role as mediator.

Contributions
A national survey on the contribution made by District Boards of Education was conducted by the Division of Planning, Directorate General of Management for Elementary and Secondary Education in 2004. I was involved in this survey because one of my main tasks in the Division of Planning is to monitor and evaluate the work of District Boards of Education.

In 2004, from the total number of 407 District Boards of Education being surveyed, 324 of them returned the questionnaires. Two variables were used to measure the contributions of
the District Board of Education, namely: (1) participation in education by local government, by community, and by industry/commerce, and (2) contributions of the District Board of Education to school committee development in the forms of workshops and data base development. In general, it was found that the degree of participation was good, particularly participation by local government in the form of partnerships (Annual Report on District Board of Education, 2004, p.94). In terms of financial contributions, there were mixed responses and the financial contribution to district education development varied from district to district. Contributions by the District Boards of Education to school committees, in the form of workshops and data base development were also low.

In order to provide some more current data on how District Boards of Education are performing, I will now outline the findings of my field research. Almost all discussions were in Bahasa Indonesia and I have translated respondents’ comments and answers. Their responses are included in the text below in italics.

4.3 Case Studies

4.3.1 Case Study 1: Yogyakarta

In August 2005, I began to collect data during a field visit to the town of Yogyakarta in the Daerah Istimewa (Special Region) in Yogyakarta province. It is the second smallest in area of the provinces in Indonesia, after the Jakarta Capital Region. However it has, along with adjacent areas in Jawa Tengah, some of the highest population densities of Java. It is located on the island of Java (South-Jawa Tengah) and is surrounded by the province of Jawa Tengah and the Indian Ocean in the south. It is the only province in Indonesia that is still formally governed by a pre-colonial Sultanate, the Sultanate of Ngayogyakarta Hadiningrat. The Special Territory of Yogyakarta province has a total area of 3,185.80 km² with a population in 2003 of approximately 3,000,000 (Yogyakarta District Board of Education, 2007.) (See Figure 3.1-1 on page 297 in Portfolio for the location of Yogyakarta on Indonesian Map.)

The city of Yogyakarta is the capital of the province. It is renowned as a center of classical Javanese fine art and culture such as batik, ballet, drama, music, poetry and puppet shows. It
is also famous as a center for Indonesian higher education. It was the Indonesian capital during the Indonesian National Revolution from 1945 to 1949.

Because it was the first field visit, my intention was to brainstorm and capture preliminary impressions and some detail about the current status regarding the implementation of education decentralization, especially the existing condition of Yogyakarta Board of Education. I was one of the team which visited Yogyakarta. It consisted of three RMIT University Indonesian doctoral students: Mr Didik Suhardi, Mr. Agus Haryanto, and myself and two RMIT supervisors, Dr. David Hodges and Dr. Bill Vistarini plus one local supervisor, Prof. Slamet, PH, from the State University of Yogyakarta.

Besides the intentions above, the visit aimed at gaining an understanding of the progress that had been made and to consult with local education officials. In addition, the visit gave me an opportunity to identify the existing practices of the Board of Education in terms of its recruiting and selection practices, the roles it performed, and its contribution to local education. Then, I expected to generate/brainstorm new ideas for recruiting and selecting, for roles played, and the contribution of the District Board of Education members.

According to Yogyakarta District Board of Education (2007) and follow up discussions with the Yogyakarta District Board of Education members by phone on August – September 2007, the following snapshot was provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yogyakarta District Board of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Hayam Wuruk Street, 11 Yogyakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>+62 274 376031, +62 274 512956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having Own Office</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Dr. Wahyuntana Kusumabrata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of members</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of membership</td>
<td>Elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of sub districts</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Period</td>
<td>2007 - 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Meeting Times</td>
<td>6 times/year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by researcher

Figure 5
Yogyakarta District Board of Education
I also obtained the following information:

Table 8
Education Profile of Yogyakarta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Population in Aged School</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>45,466</td>
<td>31.815</td>
<td>142.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Secondary School</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>24,263</td>
<td>19.296</td>
<td>125.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Secondary School</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35,525</td>
<td>29.996</td>
<td>118.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As indicated in the table, the NER in elementary schools is very high, 123.45%, whereas at the national level the NER is still 95.14% (MONE, 2009). Normally, the NER of the district is below 100%, with the assumption that the number of students aged 6-12 years old is less than number of the population aged 6-12 years old. Uniquely, this is not happening in Yogyakarta. Highly regarded as an education centre, Yogyakarta attracts many students from outside the area to study in Yogyakarta. Consequently, the number of students aged 6-12 years is more than the number of the population aged 6-12 years. This causes the NER in elementary schools to be more than 100%.

In the meeting session between the team and the Yogyakarta Education Office staff, I was disappointed because the participants from the Yogyakarta side were not as representative as I had expected, although the field visit had been communicated to the Yogyakarta Education Office and then officially confirmed. Only the Head of the Yogyakarta Education Office and his staff participated in the discussion. There were no representatives from the Board of Education. With regards to the recruitment and selection of the Board of Education members, the Head of the Yogyakarta Education Office stated: We do not want to break the rules. We follow the regulation which is Ministry of National Decree Number 044/2002. All we did about the Board of Education have been matched to the Decree. We do not have other
choices. Unfortunately, I could not gain a second opinion from other Board of Education members’ perspectives because of their absence at the meeting.

When I asked about Board roles and contributions, the Head of Yogyakarta Education Office answered that: *They play good roles and their contributions are also good. We share with each other on how to improve the quality of education in Yogyakarta.* I was interested when he continued, *At the provincial level, the performance of Board of Education is good also. At the time, the former Chairman of Provincial Board of Education was Rector of the State University of Yogyakarta. There is no doubt that he is a very productive academic. His articles on education issues are very often issued in news - both at local and national levels. Now, the Chairman still has an academic background also. He comes from State University of Yogyakarta too.*

I was surprised with his explanation because the former Chairman of the Provincial Board of Education and Rector of the State University of Yogyakarta had been recently appointed in my office as Director General for Management of Primary and Secondary Education. Because he and I are in the same office in the MONE, I was hoping that I would have an opportunity to gain his ideas and intellectual contribution in terms of improving the performance of District Boards of Education and, hence, assisting my research and education in general.

During my earlier consultation with him in January 2006, I realized, importantly, that my research questions should be widely modified in order to gain more exact information about the current status of District Boards of Education. By designing modified research questions, I expected to gain a greater understanding of District Board of Education that will make it easier to introduce the new practices into the work of District Boards of Education. As a consequence, as outlined in Chapter I, I modified the research questions to:

a. What was the current status of recruitment and selection, roles played by and the real contribution of the District Boards of Education to the development of education at the district level?

b. What new practices of recruitment and selection and roles should be played by the boards in order to maximize the contribution of the boards to the development of education at the district?
c. How can Board of Education members be better selected in order to get the right person in the right place?

d. How can Boards of Education be more effective in supporting the DEO in planning, managing, financing and delivering education?

e. How can Board of Education members’ capacity be developed in order to help them to do their jobs effectively and efficiently?

f. What kind of guidelines (portfolios) are needed to support the boards in order to play their roles and contribute optimally to the development of education at the district level?

4.3.2 Case Study 2: Lombok Tengah

In August 2005, I was one of the team members from MONE who visited Praya in Lombok Tengah to conduct formal consultations for the Decentralized Basic Education Project (DBEP). DBEP is funded by the Asian Development Bank (ADB). The aims of the visit were to gain an understanding of the progress that had been made and to consult with local education officials. In particular, the visit provided an opportunity to:

1. observe any general education improvements,

2. identify any problems relating to management of the system,

3. evaluate the project implementation, identify any associated problems and seek solutions to these problems,

4. strengthen central and district relationships, and

5. identify the existing practices of recruiting and selecting the District Board of Education members and generate/brainstorm new ideas of recruiting and selecting the District Board of Education members.

In addition to my role as an official from the MONE, I travelled to Praya as a researcher. In this role, I was keen to gather information related to my research project. From my perspective, this field visit was a good way to explore facts about the current status of the District Board of Education, covering selection and recruitment, roles and contributions of the Board.

As an official from the central office, our visit was facilitated by personnel from the provincial office who accompanied us, arranged transport and invited all the project
stakeholders from within the district. I was planning that the meeting could also be used as a
way of gathering information from the selected district related to my research questions. As
was indicated in Chapter 2, Lombok Tengah, together with the three other districts that form
the central part of this study, was selected for two reasons. Firstly, because of its active role
in the decentralization process. Secondly, for convenience – as a representative of the
MONE, at central level, I had to select districts on the basis of my ability to interact with the
participants. I took this opportunity to explore facts about the current status of District
Boards of Education in Lombok Tengah District covering recruitment and selection, roles
played, and its contributions to education development in that district. More importantly, it
was the best way of showing our accompanying two supervisors from RMIT the education
conditions in the field. We were also accompanied by Prof. Slamet PH, my local supervisor
from State University of Yogyakarta.

Given the importance of the District Boards of Education and the need to evaluate their
effectiveness under the new decentralized education regime, it is important to illustrate the
profile of this district and the current status of community participation before proposing any
improvements.

*Praya* is the capital city of *Lombok Tengah* District within *Nusa Tenggara Barat* Province in
the central part of Indonesia (see Figure 3.1-1 in Portfolio.) *Praya* is approximately 70
kilometers, or an hour and a half’s driving time from *Mataram*, the provincial capital city.

Compared to other provinces in Indonesia, *Nusa Tenggara Barat* is a relatively poor
province. The *Lombok Tengah* District is poorer than its neighbouring districts, especially
*Mataram* City. As stipulated in the Profile of *Lombok Tengah* District, *Pendapatan Asli
Daerah* (Local Genuine Income) is only Rp.13,654,922,917 (equivalent to US$ 1,393,359)
and *Pendapatan Per Kapita* (Per Capita Income) is only Rp.1,661,205 (equivalent to US$ 170). In comparison, as outlined by *Badan Pusat Statistik* (2005), at the national level, Per
Capita National Income was Rp.11,193,855 (equivalent to US$ 1,142.) The *Lombok Tengah*
District’s economic disadvantages can also be demonstrated by the total number of television
and telephones, which number 6,000 in a total population of 821,989 (DEO of *Lombok
Tengah*, 2006.)
In terms of education, the *Lombok Tengah* district faces some daunting challenges. Table 9 provides an educational snapshot of *Lombok Tengah* District.

**Table 9**

**Education Profile of Lombok Tengah**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Population in Aged School</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>NER</th>
<th>Transition Rate</th>
<th>Drop Out Rate</th>
<th>Repetition Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>29,250,987</td>
<td>25,772,500</td>
<td>113.50</td>
<td>92.93</td>
<td>97.83</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Secondary</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9,374,350</td>
<td>13,415,200</td>
<td>69.88</td>
<td>76.14</td>
<td>71.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Secondary</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5,022,688</td>
<td>13,357,000</td>
<td>37.60</td>
<td>34.21</td>
<td>46.10</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For the purpose of this research project, two points are particularly relevant. First, as indicated in the table, the repetition rate in elementary schools is a still high 4.07 %. The table also reveals that the drop-out rate for Elementary Schools in *Lombok Tengah* is 0.38 %. These percentages are convincing evidence that *Lombok Tengah* is economically and socially disadvantaged, especially at the elementary school level. Secondly, the national GER target for Junior Secondary School is 95%. The table reveals that the GER for *Lombok Tengah* is a little more than two thirds of the target. The low enrolment rates in Junior Secondary School has a predictable impact on the enrolment rates in Senior Secondary Schools – if students are not completing junior secondary education they are hardly in a position to enter and complete senior secondary education. Overwhelmingly, the figures reveal that participation rates are low in comparison to other districts, a fact that was commented upon by a number of the participants during the field visit.

What the table above does not reveal is the human dimension of the economic, social and financial disadvantage. As a predominantly farming district, many children are not able to attend school during the rice harvest and at other times of intense farming activity. As a consequence of their participation in essential family activities – activities that ensued that the family survives – it is reasonable to conclude that their learning is interrupted. Traveling
to school is an issue which is likely to be exacerbated as the young student transitions to junior secondary and particularly to senior secondary schools.

This profile clearly indicates that there is still more work to do to improve the education capacity of this district. The gap between district profile and national profile is still large. Obviously, to reduce the gap requires concerted and collective efforts from all education stakeholders in *Lombok Tengah* District, including the District Board of Education. Compared to the national profile average, the performance of the District Board of Education in *Lombok Tengah* district in terms of roles played (advisor, supporter, mediator and controller) is still lower than the national parameters, except in the area of mediation (MONE, 2003.)

**What Happened?**

Upon arrival at the *Lombok Tengah* Education Office, we were treated as if we were Very Important Persons (VIPs) by the Head of the DEO and other district officials. The Head of the DEO greeted us, saying *Selamat Datang* (Welcome). This hospitality is typical of these occasions and was a way for the local officials to show their respect to the central government officers. On other occasions, greeting parties have also included local school students – on occasions students lined the roadside to greet their guests.

After shaking hands, we were led up the stairs into a large meeting room. Everybody took his/her seat, each person seated according to their importance or the hierarchy of their roles. The Head of the DEO sat at the front table together with the Mr. Didik Suhardi, Deputy Director of Programs in the Directorate of Junior Secondary Education, Prof. Slamet PH, the DBEP project team leader and our two supervisors. I sat in the front row along with other senior district officials. The level of role importance decreased as one moved further away from the front table. The level of importance was also indicated by the food. Senior officials and the distinguished guests received better food than the less important. The seating arrangements and the food are simple indicators of the importance of hospitality and respect in Indonesia. It is also an indication of the importance of hierarchy. Respect and hierarchy may have been beneficial to local communities in the past. However, in the context of decentralization and the need to increase participation by stakeholders it could be a hindrance.
The people at the meeting were mostly connected with the DBEP and included staff from the Lombok Tengah DEO, Board of Education members, school principals, and community representatives. The meeting commenced with a welcome by the Head of the Lombok Tengah DEO, then Mr. Didik Suhardi addressed the meeting and was followed by Prof. Slamet PH and then by general discussion (See Working Document # 2.2 in the Portfolio.)

After the welcoming, I started to gain information by asking questions to those people attending the meeting. From those interviewed on recruitment and selection of the District Board of Education members in Lombok Tengah, it was found that the District Board of Education members were not elected on a one from each sub-district, but from community groups such as academics, commerce and industry, teacher associations, community leaders, and government representatives (personnel from the DEO and the local government office). At first, it was difficult to determine whether each sub-district was represented. Therefore, I asked the following question to District Board of Education members, *Can you tell me about problems of education in each sub-district?* Everybody was quiet at first, no body answered the question, but then one of the District Board of Education members answered: *No, I do not know the real problems of education in each sub-district because I am not from there and that is why I am not familiar with education problems in that place. We are not selected on the basis of congressional sub-districts.* In the case of the District of Lombok Tengah where the total number of District Board of Education members is 17 people and there are 12 sub-districts, there are only five District Board of Education members representing five sub-districts and the other 12 are from the capital city of Lombok Tengah District, namely Praya *(Lombok Tengah District Board of Education, 2005.)*

During the course of the visit, I also interviewed three school principals and their school committee members who came to the meeting. (This was in addition to the three school principals and school committee members for three schools I visited.) The idea of the interviews was to get their perceptions regarding the reality and expectations of District Boards of Education. For each interview, I asked whether they knew about the recruitment and selection of the District Board of Education members or not. From the interviews, I found that most of them were not well aware of the importance of recruitment and selection of the District Board of Education members. It seemed that they did not know how to recruit
and select the District Board of Education members. Or, perhaps, on reflection, they knew it but they did not have the authority to do it.

Clearly, this current system of recruitment and selection of District Boards of Education poses questions and requires an improved system, and that is, District Board of Education members must represent sub-districts and must be selected on the basis of congressional sub-districts. Another issue that emerged was that they were a mix of elected and appointed representatives. They were first proposed by the community, but they were then scrutinized by the team assigned by the *Bupati/Walikota* (Mayor) on the basis of defined criteria developed by the assigned team. Finally, the District Board of Education members were formally appointed by the Mayor. This appointment also poses critical questions about the independence of the District Board of Education. For example, in one of the cities in North Sulawesi, the independence of the Board of Education is questionable when it seems that the Mayor did not like an existing Board of Education and tried to dismiss it. Another city in Jawa Timur had two different District Boards of Education. The Mayor felt incompatible with the first District Board of Education. Then the Mayor formed another District Board of Education which seemed to have the same ideas as the Mayor. These are clear demonstrations of the lack of independence of District Boards of Education.

When I asked respondents from the District Board of Education about the proposed new recruitment and selection system, they were reluctant to respond. *We only follow the rules, nothing else,* said one member of the District Board of Education from Lombok Tengah District. It was clear that respondents were apprehensive; what was not clear was whether they were daunted by their visitors from Jakarta or their colleagues and superiors.

To collect more data on the roles played by the District Board of Education, I conducted interviews with several local District Boards of Education members. I asked: *How much time do you spend on District Board of Education development?* The answers were mixed, some indicated that they spent many hours and others said they did not have much time for the District Board of Education. But when I asked: *Are you busy with your own works?* most of them answered, *Yes.* Being a member of the District Board of Education is considered voluntary work, not an obligatory function because they have to make a living from their own jobs, not from the District Board of Education. It sounds logical, but why has this happened? I also managed to interview District Board of Education members who were retired civil
servants. I asked: *How much time do you have for the District Board of Education activities?* Mostly they answered that they had lots of time to dedicate to the District Board of Education activities.

I also managed to interview the District Board of Education members and analyzed documents with regard to their advisory roles. In terms of the amount of advice given, the District Board of Education was productive. It was frequently involved in policy decision making with regards to access and equity, quality and relevancy, and efficiency in district education development. In terms of support, the District Board supported the policy of education in the district through meetings and focus group discussions. In terms of mediator, the District Board of Education was able to mobilize companies to support the schools through building renovation, book procurement, and personal support. (DGMPSE, 2005). Lastly, in terms of control, the District Board of Education was very active in controlling programs and finances through auditing and meeting regularly (Meeting Agenda of the Board, 2005). However, this data was fairly general and superficial due to limited meeting and interview time.

During the visit, I did try to determine the contribution of the District Board of Education members to the development of education in their district. I was unable to explore this with all members of the District Board of Education. However, both the Chairman and the Vice Chairman did respond to this query and stated that their main contribution was intellectual in that they tried to gain and analyze the aspirations, views, claims, and needs of the community.

Due to limited time, I was not able to gather all the data that I would have liked. However, in November 2005, and the next couple of months I conducted follow-up interviews with the Chairman of the District Board of Education to complete the data and gain relevant news. As part of this follow-up discussion, he stated that the District Board of Education had a new program namely, *GRAHA LIDI* (*Gerakan Peduli Pendidikan/Education Concerning Movement*). In Indonesia term, according to Echols and Shadily (1994), suggests that *Lidi* means a broom made of splintered bristles. The *Lidi* has a philosophy that individuals do not sweep effectively; sweeping is more effective if people work together. Likewise, in educational matters, improvement in the quality of education can be achieved only if District
Boards of Education, DEOs, District Parliament members, principals and educational staff and other stakeholders have the same commitment and work diligently shoulder to shoulder.

Based on the interview above and another interview with one of the Lombok Tengah District Board of Education members by phone in February 2007, I was able to put together a brief outline of the Lombok Tengah District Board of Education as provided in Figure 6 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Lombok Tengah District Board of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Rinjani Street, 16 Praya, Lombok Tengah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>+62 370 654050, +62 370 655273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having Own Office</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Dr. H.L. Ma’ruf Misbah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of members</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of membership</td>
<td>Elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of sub districts</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Period</td>
<td>2006 - 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by researcher

Figure 6
Lombok Tengah District Board of Education

4.3.3 National Workshops of Board of Education

Although the Board of Education National Workshop was not directly part of the four case studies that form the central part of this project, it has been included in this chapter because it was an excellent opportunity to clarify data that had been collected in the first two case studies. It was also a good opportunity to gain an insight into the national picture.

In 2005 and 2007 fiscal year, one of the main programs of the Directorate General for Management of Primary and Secondary Education, MONE was a workshop for District Boards of Education. This workshop was held over 2 periods, each being 3 days in length. The main purposes of the workshop were to:

1. improve the level of coordination between Boards of Education and school committee facilitating teams at the central level and Boards of Education at the provincial and district levels,
2. identify problems encountered by Boards of Education,
3. share experience and information in order to improve the performance of Boards of Education,
4. better understand and implement the policies of the Directorate General for Management of Primary and Secondary Education.

The total participants were 160 Boards of Education members covering both Boards of Education at the province and district levels throughout Indonesia. Those participants were divided into two groups and each group was scheduled to attend separate workshops. The first national workshops was held on August, 2005 in Bogor and attended by 80 Boards of Education members from western provinces and districts. The second national workshop was held on April 2007 in Bogor and attended by 80 Boards of Education members from eastern provinces and districts.

The objectives of the national workshops for Board of Education members were to:
1. identify problems and alternative solutions on the implementation of Boards of Education,
2. develop action plans based on high priority problems, and
3. get inputs from respondents to finalize the draft Government Regulations for Community Participation in National Education.

As a consequence of my role as a senior staff member at the Secretariat for the Director General of Management for Elementary and Secondary Education under the Division of Planning, my main tasks were to provide direction and guidance, develop regulations/standards, and monitor and evaluate the development of District Boards of Education. These tasks were in line with my objectives to collect information regarding the existing practices and the importance of recruitment and selection of District Boards of Education members. For these reasons, I distributed questionnaires to District Board of Education members during the First Board of Education workshop. The purpose of distributing questionnaires to them was to collect information regarding the existing practices and the importance of recruitment and selection of District Board of Education members across Indonesia. In the first national workshop on August 2005, I distributed 80 questionnaire to them asking nine questions (see Exhibit 2.5 in Portfolio); 69 questionnaire sheets were returned. Meanwhile, in the second national workshop on April 2007, I also distributed 80 questionnaire sheets to them and 76 questionnaire sheets were returned. One of the questions referred to recruitment and selection as follows: If you are asked to select District Board of Education members, who are you going to select? Interestingly, they
mostly answered that the District Board of Education members must come from community groups such as academics, community leaders, industry and commerce people, and the like, and do not necessarily represent sub-districts. Most of the respondents were comfortable with the current criteria for recruiting and selecting the District Board of Education members. Less than 5 percent of respondents were not comfortable with it and they proposed to change the current criteria of recruiting and selecting the District Board members.

As well during the workshop, I conducted in-depth interviews with District Board of Education members from Jawa Barat. I asked them: *What kind of new criteria for recruitment and selection of District Board of Education members would be appropriate?* There was a range of responses: eight participants said that they should be selected by gender balance; seven participants said that it should be composed only of school committee representatives; seven participants said that the new criteria should be decided by local government, and four participants had no opinion. But, when I offered new criteria for selecting the board members, that is, the District Board of Education members should be selected on the basis of congressional sub-district representatives, almost all of them fully agreed. The main reason for this proposal is that representatives must understand the real local education problems and develop relevant solutions for the areas they represent and they must be able to serve their constituents more effectively from sub-districts they represent.

*Introducing New Practices*

The objective of this section was to examine the performance of District Boards of Education and to suggest changes or new practices based on reviews of literature and my preliminary research. Although, it is a bit difficult to introduce changes to something that is so new, I needed to introduce these changes to get thoughts, ideas and agreement/disagreement from participants about the results of my reviews of literature on initial ideas regarding new practices for District Boards of Education. To achieve this objective, I collected data from District Board of Education members during the three days of the national workshop on August 2005 and April 2007 in Bogor. Sometimes I conducted interviews privately to get independent ideas and discussed personally with participants in order to get real data. I called it real data because sometimes if we had group discussions, some participants did not want to speak openly due to either being afraid, nervous, shy, or for other reasons. Normally, they might be afraid and nervous because they did not want to be part of a minority opinion.
Perhaps they might feel worried that they would be regarded or treated differently from those who supported MONE policy.

As mentioned earlier, based on discussions during the national workshop of District Boards of Education, several problems were identified by Board members. They are outlined in the following Table 10.
Table 10
Matrix of Problems Raised by Workshop Participants
With Regard to the Implementation of District Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Proposed Alternative Solutions</th>
<th>Ideas Originated From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Legally Boards of Education are not very powerful even if they were a part</td>
<td>Government Regulations and Local Government Regulations related to Boards of Education should be</td>
<td>Board of Education from Jawa Timur, Jawa Barat and Jawa Tengah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of National Development Program, Ministry of National Education Decree and Law</td>
<td>published soon&lt;br&gt;There was a need to synchronize all of those legal aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Functional relationship between Boards of Education and government, parliament</td>
<td>Need to arrange coordination meetings with other related institutions</td>
<td>Board of Education from Jawa Timur, Jawa Barat, Jawa Tengah and DIY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and other related institutions has not yet been developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There is no clear source of funds for Boards of Education</td>
<td>Need to clarify sources of funds from both Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara (APBN)/Central Government Budget and Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah (APBD)/Local Government Budget</td>
<td>Board of Education from Jawa Timur and Jawa Tengah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is no coordination between Boards of Education and Directorate General</td>
<td>Need to arrange coordination meetings for all institutions related to Boards of Education</td>
<td>Board of Education from Mojokerto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Youth and Non Formal Education, Directorate General of Local Development,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directorate General of Islamic Education and National Planning and Development Agency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There is a negative influence from uneducated television programs and other</td>
<td>Boards of Education may provide input to government and other related institutions with regard to television programs and provided accurate information to media</td>
<td>Board of Education from Wonogiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Most Board of Education members are busy people resulting in less time and</td>
<td>Commitment shall be a requirement to Board of Education membership</td>
<td>Board of Education from Jawa Timur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less professionalism for Board work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to Table 10, the following Table 11 summarizes data on new ideas/new practices/change in practices which were collected from participants of the three day workshop of District Boards of Education conducted in August 2005 and April 2007 in Bogor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants/Data Sources</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Questionnaire and in-depth interviews, in a group and privately | • August 2005  
• April 2007   | • District Board of Education members during 3 days workshop in Bogor | • To get thoughts, ideas and agreement/disagreement from participants about the results of my reviews of literature on initial ideas regarding new practices for District Board of Education | • New practices of the District Boards of Education should be agreed by participants and be incorporated into guidelines |

Follow-up questionnaires were also distributed to District Board of Education members during the workshop. The purpose of distributing these questionnaires was to collect additional information regarding new thoughts, ideas, changes, and new practices to improve the current practices of the District Board of Education in terms of selection, roles played, and contributions of the District Board of Education to district education development. I distributed 80 questionnaires asking the following: What changes/new ideas/new practices do you want in order that the current practices of the District Boards of Education can be improved? A mosaic of answers was found and mostly they proposed stronger legal aspects, stronger coordination among stakeholders in education, clear sources of funds, better commitment by the District Board of Education members, District Board of Education members should represent the constituents and therefore must represent congressional sub-districts, additional roles such as a facilitator, encourager, advocator, and mobilizor must be included, and contributions must not be limited as presently written in the Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002, but also include moral obligations, commitment, dedication and other in-kinds contribution as deemed important for developing education at the districts.

During the workshop, I also conducted in-depth interviews with several district board members to triangulate the answers from questionnaires. I asked them: What changes/new ideas/new practices do you want to introduce in order to improve the performance of the District Boards of Education?
The answers were varied, but there was a fair degree of similarity. However, when I offered new criteria for selecting District Board of Education members, that is, members should be selected on the basis of congressional sub-district representation because they must understand the real education problems and develop relevant solutions for the areas they represent and therefore serve their constituents more effectively there was general agreement. I also suggested additional roles that could be played by the District Boards of Education as a result of my research such as a facilitator, mobilizer, encourager, and advocate for education in their districts. Again, there was general agreement with this. Likewise, also resulting from my research, when I suggested additional contributions could be made such as moral obligations, commitment, dedication and other in-kind contributions, they mostly agreed with me.

Overall, the data collected indicated that the respondents felt that the District Boards of Education required stronger legal support and guidelines, stronger coordination among stakeholders in education, clearer sources of funds, and greater dedication from District Board of Education members. The Board members should represent their constituents and therefore must represent congressional sub-districts. It was agreed that contributions must not be limited to the Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002 but should also include moral obligations, commitment, time dedication and other in-kind contributions as deemed important for developing education at the district level.

Since the findings were still a general mosaic, it was necessary to look for other data in order to clarify and support my findings. Data from more districts was still needed.

Although it was still too early to conclude the research findings, nevertheless a rough pattern seemed to be emerging. For example, District Board of Education members should represent congressional sub-districts, and additional roles to be played by the District Boards of Education should be included. Contributions of the Boards to district education development should be expanded. Stronger legal frameworks, stronger coordination among stakeholders in education, clearer sources of funds, better moral character of the Board members and as a consequence better capacity building, were all required in order to improve the performance of the District Boards of Education.

As my research progressed, I learned more about the complexity of the District Boards of Education. It was clear that there were many factors influencing the performance of the District Board. If the Boards were going to improve their performance, it would require improvement of factors related to the actual performance of the District Boards of Education such as selection,
capacity building of the members, and coordination between all local education authorities, just to mention a few. But, I also realized that the success of the District Boards was not only dependent on input factors as mentioned before, implementation of their education responsibilities was another factor to explore in order to improve their performance.

4.3.4 Case Study 3: Bekasi

Reflecting on my findings from the field visit to Lombok Tengah in the middle of August 2005, I joined an education decentralization team that visited the DEO of Bekasi, Jawa Barat on February 23, 2006. The team consisted of me, two others Indonesian doctoral students at RMIT, Dr. David Hodges, my supervisor from RMIT, and Prof. Slamet, PH, my local supervisor.

Cikarang is the capital city of Bekasi District within Jawa Barat Province in the central part of Indonesia (see Figure 3.1-1 in Portfolio.) It is approximately 100 kilometers, or an hour and a half’s driving time from Bandung, the provincial capital city and a one hour drive from Jakarta.

Even though it is close to Jakarta, Bekasi has a poor educational profile when compared with national level benchmarks. More than 60% of elementary schools are run down because of lack of maintenance. Even though the GER at Elementary Schools is more than 100%, the GER at Junior Secondary Schools is only 78.5% (the national level is 95%). The average period of study in elementary school is 7.4 years. More detail about the education profile of Bekasi District is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>247,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Secondary School</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Secondary School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18,348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DEO of Bekasi, 2006

This visit had three main objectives. First, it was a good opportunity to explore the progress of decentralization of education in Bekasi district. Second, it was a good way to identify the existence of District Boards of Education as a part of the decentralization of education in Bekasi district.
Third, it was an opportunity to follow up the findings from the field visit to Lombok Tengah and the Board of Education workshop discussed above.

To arrange the visit, on February 21, 2006, the Director of Junior Secondary Schools sent a letter to the Head of Bekasi DEO, regarding the forthcoming study visit of the education decentralization team. He proposed that the DEO would hold a focus group discussion between the education decentralization team, DEO staff, District Board of Education members, and other stakeholders on Thursday, February 23, 2006.

Because I live in Bekasi, which is not far from the DEO, I felt it more convenient to go there directly from my house. I planned to be there at 09.00 hours in order to have some extra time to discuss my research project informally with the staff.

From my perspective, to obtain accurate data and information, I decided to divide the discussion into two kinds of meetings: formal and informal. Of course, the formal meeting was conducted in the meeting room in a formal atmosphere. Sometimes, statements in formal meetings are not fully honest. Moreover, in formal meetings, many people feel under pressure when they speak. They have to speak positively and carefully in order to avoid negative statements or offending other participants or their superiors. Based on previous experience, I suspected that many of the formal responses did not accurately reflect the reality or the true views of the participants.

Meanwhile, the informal meetings could take place anywhere in a relaxed and informal atmosphere where often people find it easier to discuss issues relating to the District Board of Education. For this reason, I planned a one-hour informal meeting. I prepared several questions which related to my research questions to more deeply explore the performance of District Boards of Education in terms of their recruitment and selection, roles played, and the contribution made to teaching and learning in their district.

In the informal meeting, I met with the Head of Administration Affairs and the Head of the Non Formal Education Section. At the beginning of the discussion, they commented, *This DEO building is relatively new. We moved into this new building in the middle of 2003.* Because of this, they offered the following excuse: *It was understandable that some policies were not implemented as well as when we were in the previous building.* For me, this statement did not make sense. The implementation of the policies should not depend on the dimensions of time and place. Even if
sometimes, moving offices can be disruptive, their functions for delivering services to education at
the district level must continue as if nothing had happened.

With regards to the District Board of Education, I asked them: What is the background of the
District Board of Education members? They answered: Currently, the Chairman of the District
Board of Education is a Head of a Faction from the District Parliament. The Vice Chairman is a
member of a Non Government Organization (NGO) committee. They continued: Most of the
members of the District Board of Education are already busy with their own schedules. Mostly, they
could not attend the invitation for coordination meetings together with the DEO which were
sponsored by the DEO. We are really disappointed about this lack of coordination. Moreover, we
have already provided a car to support these activities. In addition, we are sure that they do not
have regular internal meetings.

Their answers were surprising to me, especially the last sentence. I could not imagine that District
Boards of Education do not have regular meeting. Then, I asked some questions to myself: How can
they improve the education quality at the district if they do not have much time to coordinate with
other education stake holders? What are their strategies for playing their roles if they do not have
meetings for themselves? Other questions were still occupying my thinking when my colleague
began arriving ready for our discussion.

As requested, the focus group discussion, which I categorized as a formal meeting, started at 10.00.
Unlike in Lombok Tengah, the discussion was held in the Head’s meeting room with a round table
meeting style. There was food and fruit at the table and there was no distinction between food and
fruit for the hosts and the guests. After shaking hands, the education decentralization team and then
the DEO staff introduced their members.

At this discussion, the DEO side consisted of the Head of the DEO, some Heads of Sections and
some District Board of Education members. Unfortunately, the discussion was a very formal and
polite discussion between the education decentralization team on one side and DEO Staff on
another side. This was because of the hierarchical obstacles. In many topics of discussion, the DEO
Staff just followed and answered the questions asked by us. Generally they did not take any
initiative to raise a topic. It seemed that they avoided this because they were afraid of making a
mistake.
As a follow up to my findings in Lombok Tengah, I asked them: Do the District Board of Education members represent their congressional sub districts? All agreed and said, No. Clearly, as a researcher, I was suspicious of this sudden agreement and attempted to dig deeper, I asked, Do you agree that there are many education problems in each sub district? Again, they all agreed, Yes, we do. My next question was: In terms of the performance of the District Board of Education, who should have the responsibility for identifying and solving the education problems which arise in each sub district? Nobody answered my question and discussion became quiet. This indicated that they understood that there are many problems in each sub district but they really did not know how to solve the problems or who has the authority to do this.

Then, I wanted a response from the Secretary of the District Board of Education: Is it a good idea for the membership of the District Board of Education to be made up of one member for each sub district? I further emphasized my question with the following explanation: It means that each member should be a representative of his/her sub district. Consequently, the number of members should be the same as the number of sub districts in Bekasi. But, the number of members still should be odd as stipulated in Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002. He answered gently, It sounds good, but I have no idea how to do it.

Following our discussions, both District Board of Education members and DEO staff agreed, We want to have an efficient, democratic and transparent selection process so that the elected members are highly credible and fully dedicated to the improvement of education quality in Bekasi district. We will consider your argument regarding representation from each congressional sub district.

To gain some information regarding the roles played by the District Board of Education from the DEO perspective, I asked them: What do you think about the performance of the Bekasi District Board of Education? They stated that, We feel sad about the performance of the District Board of Education. We are disappointed that the roles played by the District Board of Education are still limited and the Board is little more than a symbol. One person from the DEO side continued: As a partner of the DEO, the performance of the District Board of Education did not really meet our expectations. To justify the judgment, I quickly asked the Secretary of the District Board of Education, Do you know about the roles of District Boards of Education? Simply, he answered, No, I do not know exactly. Then, I explained that as stipulated in Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002, it has roles as a mediating, advising, controlling and supporting agency. He understood apparently because then he mentioned, Most members have a poor understanding of their roles and how to
achieve and maintain a constructive partnership with the DEO. His last statement surprised me. Clearly, to improve its performance, the District Board of Education should develop its partnership with the DEO. To develop a good partnership, the District Board of Education should, as a first step, be familiar with its roles. Then, this should be followed by developing its abilities and competencies to build a constructive relationship with the DEO and other stakeholders.

With regards to the contribution of the District Board of Education, the Head of the DEO said, *It is not really independent yet. It is still depends on the DEO for both programs and financial support.* His staff continued, *In some case, its activities come from the DEO’s activities. For example, Bapak Angkat - the Foster Daddy mentoring program.* He explained that the *Bapak Angkat* program means giving an opportunity for those who have greater financial capacities to contribute funds to the students who lack financial support. He continued, *Even though the Bapak Angkat has become the District Board of Education’s program, its members take no serious responsibility for the program. They did not know how to make it successful.* A man beside him also claimed, *In fact, they do not care about financial support for the program. The DEO should take over this program to make it sustainable.*

As I was driving to my office after this meeting, I could not help but think about the challenges of fostering the performance of the *Bekasi* District Board of Education. Later, as a consequence of discussions with my RMIT supervisors and other team members, I became aware of the low performance of District Boards of Education in general. Although it was too early to reach final conclusions about the effectiveness of District Boards of Education, I had gained some useful understandings from both meetings. I gained at least five findings from both meetings. First, the District Board of Education has little understanding regarding its roles, clearly a very fundamental issue. Second, the members of the District Board of Education admit that they have a limited understanding of the real problems confronting schools in their district. Given this, it is unlikely that they would be able to provide real assistance. Third, there is no constructive relationship between the DEO and the District Board of Education. Fourth, the DEO is not fully satisfied with the contribution from the District Board of Education. Fifth, a good selection mechanism for District Board of Education membership for the next period will be needed.

In 2007, when I called the *Bekasi* District Board of Education, I got some new information. The membership of the *Bekasi* District Board of Education had changed as shown in Figure 7. But in terms of representing all the districts, apparently nothing had changed.
Following the visit to Bekasi, the education decentralization team visited the Tangerang District Education and Culture Office on February 24, 2006. On this visit, my other supervisor from RMIT, Dr. Bill Vistarini accompanied us to gain more understanding regarding the complexity and challenges facing implementation of education decentralization in Tangerang district.

Like Bekasi District, Tangerang District is very close to Jakarta. It is about twenty kilometers from Jakarta. Tigaraksa is the capital city of Tangerang District within Banten Province in the central part of Indonesia (see Figure 3.1-1 in Portfolio.) Banten was one of the new provinces which were formed as a consequence of the implementation of decentralization. Previously, it was a part of Jawa Barat province. The other new provinces were Kepulauan Riau, Kepulauan Bangka Belitung, Sulawesi Barat, Gorontalo, Irian Jaya Barat, and Maluku Utara.

Using the same preparation as with Bekasi, the Director of Junior Secondary School sent the same letter to the Head of the Tangerang District Education and Culture Office requesting a focus group discussion between the education decentralization team, District Education and Culture Office staff, District Board of Education members and other stakeholders in education. The focus group discussion started at 09.00 am and was finished by 11.30 am before Friday prayers.

Because the Tangerang district area is relatively far away from my house, I planned to be there earlier to have a few minutes to conduct an informal discussion as I had done in Bekasi.
Unfortunately, I got into a traffic jam on the toll way. (Traffic jams very often happen on the Jakarta Inner Ring Road; a toll way which connects Bekasi – Jakarta – Tangerang). The distance from Bekasi to Tangerang is only about 40 kilometers but I needed more than two hours to get there. I was at Tangerang District Education and Culture Office almost at 9.00 am. (This is a very common dilemma for all those living and working in Jakarta.)

We were greeted by one of the heads of divisions in the District Education and Culture Office who lead us to the meeting room. About twenty participants were already waiting in the meeting room. They represented District Education and Culture Office staff, members of the District Board of Education, REDIP (Regional Education Development Improvement Project) project officers, and some school principals. There was a lot of food and drink on the tables, and like in Bekasi, there was no distinction made with the provision of food and drinks.

After the formal welcome, Prof. Slamet, PH introduced the education decentralization team and then explained the objectives of the focus group discussion. He stated, *These are some of our important objectives. First, to gain information from the key persons regarding the current state of the implementation of education decentralization. Second, to share with you how education decentralization is being implemented in Tangerang. Third, to deeply explore what are the problems facing education in Tangerang district? And fourth, to gain an understanding of the selection and recruitment processes, roles played by, and contribution of the Tangerang District Board of Education.*

Then the Head of Tangerang District Education and Culture Office introduced the participants on his side. He then explained the organizational structure of Tangerang District Education and Culture Office as outlined in Figure 8 below.
Figure 8
Organizational Structure of Tangerang District Education and Culture Office

He continued on to provide much good information which consisted of some data which was provided in Table 13, including current issues, problems, and possible solutions. He presented it impressively using PowerPoint but did not give his staff an opportunity to explain more detail to follow his statements. Up to this point, I felt it was a one man show. From the district side, it seemed that he could not manage the meeting as a team. He absolutely dominated it. Perhaps he is a good worker individually because he had just completed his Masters degree cum laude from a university in Jakarta.

Table 13
Education Profile in Tangerang District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>450,805</td>
<td>110.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Secondary</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>137,833</td>
<td>72.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DEO of Tangerang (2006)
Because of his good presentation, I asked several questions regarding ways of implementing new practices for the District Board of Education. I described briefly new practices that we would like to introduce, namely that District Board of Education members should be selected to represent congressional sub-districts and I outlined the roles to be played by the District Board of Education. I suggested that the contributions of the District Board of Education to district education development should be expanded. As usual, I also suggested stronger legal aspects, stronger coordination among stakeholders in education, clear sources of funds, better moral character of the District Board members and capacity building were all required in order to improve the performance of the boards.

After listening to my brief description about possible new practices for the District Board of Education, I then asked them, *How can you effectively implement these new practices?* The chairman of the District Board of Education was quiet for a second and then he answered my question fluently. First, he said that, *This is about change. We have to change systems, people, and culture.* For the system, he proposed that in order to be able to implement the new practices, the existing legal aspects of the District Board must be revised in order to support the new practices, for example: selection procedures and requirements to be District Board of Education members. He stressed that to be a District Board of Education member, one must have competency and commitment. *They have to have competencies to run the District Board of Education.* Further he said that, *Do not run for the District Board of Education unless you think you can make a contribution to district education development.* He also claimed that, *The habits and behaviours of the current District Board that were not conducive to implementing the new practices must also be changed; we must be risk takers, innovative, and proactive.* For me this was an amazing answer for two reasons. First, the participant was suggested that there should be radical change – even to the extent that Boards of Education should become more innovate and proactive and should actually promote risk taking. At the time I thought that this would be radical in many bureaucracies. Second, no other participant had made such blunt and radical suggestion. I was so amazed that after the meeting I made a point of finding this participant and continuing the discussion. I was keen to hear more about his views. Finally, I was amazed because this comment seemed to be out of character of the typical Indonesian response. Indonesian society with its emphasis on harmony and stability does not normally appreciate radical changes and risk taking.
Then the Head of the District Education and Culture Office said that, *To implement new practices requires adjustment in order to be able to accomplish the required transformation.* He further claimed that, *It is not only minor change, but this is a fundamental change.* After a while, everybody was quiet and nobody spoke. I tried to get responses from other meeting participants, and finally a lady who was responsible for curriculum development at the District Education and Culture Office at Tangerang said, *We need new habits of mind and heart in order to implement new practices. New practices require concerted endeavour; they are relying on people to renew themselves.* This was another amazing idea, but how to do it? This was another question that I needed to find answers for because these ideas, although very encouraging, were too vague.

To gain a better understanding from a District Board of Education perspective, I asked the chairman of the District Board of Education, *Do you agree with the Head of the District Education and Culture Office’s statement, especially regarding the implementation of the new practices?* He answered, *I absolutely agree.* Further, I asked him, *Can you tell me, how you divide your time between District Board of Education activities and your own activities?* Gently, he responded, *Now, I am retired from the Directorate General of Non Formal Education, Ministry of National Education, I have much time to fully dedicate my life to improving the quality of education in Tangerang.*

In terms of the contribution, the chairman of the District Board said what they had done: *The District Board of Education has regular field visits to schools to meet principals and school committees. We use these visits to disseminate information about District Board of Education tasks and responsibilities and to discuss strategic issues on how to improve education quality in Tangerang district.* I was interested; this was a new thing that I had not found anywhere else.

A brief summary of Tangerang District Board of Education in 2007 is provided in Figure 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tangerang District Board of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td><em>Cendekia Street, Ciater, Serpong Tangerang</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>+62 21 7774547, +62 21 7563584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having Own Office</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Rizal Sikumbang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Encep Suhayat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of members</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of membership</td>
<td>Elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of sub districts</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by Researcher

Figure 9
*Tangerang District Board of Education*
Even though there was no chance to arrange an informal discussion, I gained some insights from the focus group discussion. First, the District Board of Education members have relevant competencies and a real concern to improve the quality of education in Tangerang district. They understood what and how the District Board of Education should be like. Second, the District Board of Education has a good relationship with the DEO. In many cases, the District Education and Culture Office invites the District Board of Education to attend its meetings that relate to relevant areas of education. Very often, the District Board of Education contributes good ideas, opinions, input and feedback at the meetings. In addition the District Education and Culture Office also believes that these ideas, opinions, input and feedback are very useful. Third, the chairman of the District Board of Education takes real responsibility for his position. At least, he always participates in the school visitation program. Fourth, the chairman of the District Board is dedicated to the Board performing its role smoothly and effectively, perhaps because of his background as a former bureaucrat in non formal education in Jakarta.

4.4 Follow up Discussion

The intention of this part of my research was to identify appropriate approaches to developing District Boards of Education in order for them to be able to do their jobs more effectively. This will be done by using in-depth interviews with the consultant responsible for district capacity building in education. In addition, I will also offer the results from reviews of the literature on capacity building for the District Board of Education. This was done in early 2007 at MONE when I interviewed the Asian Development Bank consultant for district education capacity building in twenty districts: Prof. Slamet, PH.

I interviewed my local supervisor, Prof. Slamet PH., who had been the consultant for district education capacity building in districts scattered around Bali, Nusa Tenggara Barat, and Nusa Tenggara Timur provinces for four years. He informed me that there were at least three levels of capacity building to be done. He suggested the following strategies:

First, we have to develop the capacity of District Board of Education members (human resources) so that they have ability and character to do their jobs. Ability is related to competency, while character has three components, namely moral knowledge, moral feeling and moral action. Moral knowledge has the following components: moral awareness, knowing moral values, moral reasoning and decision making, and self-knowledge. Moral feeling consists of conscience, self-
esteem, empathy, loving the good, self-control, and humility. Moral action has three components: competence, will and habit. He also informed me that District Board of Education members should play the roles of facilitator and motivator. (In presenting these points, Prof. Slamet acknowledged the work of Lickona’s 1991 writings.) As a facilitator, the board should facilitate the DEO to be able to improve access and equity, quality and relevancy, and efficiency of education. As a motivator, the Board should motivate stakeholders in education, especially in basic education – to meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) concerning nine years compulsory basic education.

Second, we have to develop institutional capacity in terms of its management, organization structure, and its internal linkages to other related institutions. As the functions of the District Board of Education change, its organizational structure should change as well. In the spirit of Frank Lloyd Wright’s dictum that form follows function, the District Board of Education has to change its management and organization structure on the basis of its expanded functions. Having restructured both its organization structure and its management, the District Boards will be more responsive and supportive in providing advice to DEOs. Likewise, the DEO should be more able to administer the recommendations given by the District Boards.

Lastly, Prof Slamet suggested that there must be capacity building for developing the District Board of Education system, including education policies and local education regulations. The District Board policies have to be able to influence the DEO in mobilizing local companies to support schools in the form of building renovation and book procurement. The District Board has to encourage local parliament members to produce and publish Local Government Regulations (Peraturan Daerah) to implement the Ministerial Decree Number 044/2002 consistently.

According to Prof. Slamet (2004), developing the capacity of District Boards requires skills analysis to determine capacity, followed by targeted training/capacity building. This training/capacity building will consist of carefully targeted training, workshops, comparative studies, focus group discussions, best practices and lessons learned, and readings on capacity building.

From this data collected from Prof. Slamet, it is clear that there are three capacity building levels to develop: (1) the system level covering policies and legal aspects, (2) the institutional level, covering management, organization, administration, etc., and (3) the people level which includes competency and moral values.
It was becoming clearer that these three levels of capacity building were needed to develop District Boards of Education: system (policies and legal aspects), institution (management, organization, funding), and people (competency and moral values).

I now had a better understanding as to why some District Boards of Education were not able to do their jobs. They did not have the necessary regulatory framework or the personal capacity or support to do their work effectively.

4.5 Action Will be Taken
In order to be able to implement changes and improvements, I will develop strategies to help the District Boards of Education to run their programs and meet their responsibilities. These strategies will be implemented by revising the legal framework for the District Boards of Education and providing guidelines for District Boards of Education so that they can perform their roles effectively. For these reasons, the portfolio will consist of relevant products and working documents.

The products of the research that would lead to action being taken include:

a. Significant inputs to Government Regulations Draft about Educational Management Standards which are currently being processed by the Ministry of National Education.

b. Operational guidelines on how to improve Boards of Education in terms of recruitment and selection, capacity to do their jobs, and strategies for improving Boards’ contributions to education development at the districts level;

The inputs above are very important because the Educational Management Standards will be one of the Education Standards that will lead MONE, DEOs and PEOs to do collaboratively in terms of improving the education quality (Government of Indonesia, 2004). The portfolio will also contain working documents which will include: relevant questionnaires, reports, meeting agendas, minutes of meetings, photographs, and relevant presentation.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

Based on my review of literature and intensive discussions on Indonesian decentralization with Mr Didik Suhardi, Mr Agus Haryanto, and my supervisors, Dr Bill Vistarini and Dr David Hodges, as well as my local supervisor and informant, Prof Slamet, I reached the conclusion that there was a range of powerful internal and external forces and factors influencing Indonesia’s decision to implement decentralization. The internal forces and factors such as the 1998 economic and political crises, local demands for more authority and responsibility, particularly in provinces with rich natural resources including Papua, Kalimantan Timur, Riau, and Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam, were among the powerful ones. There were also powerful external forces and factors coming from foreign donors and agencies, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. These forces and factors impacted on the too rapid introduction of Boards of Education at all levels.

During decentralization, districts were chosen as governing units, although this decision rose out of controversial debates among political scholars, government officers, the military as well as police forces. As cited by the World Bank (2000), districts were chosen as the main level for autonomy because of the military’s strong objections to provincial autonomy. The military feared that provincial autonomy would enhance rather than abate centrifugal forces.

As should have become apparent from this research and as suggested in Context 3.1 in Portfolio, the management and implementation of decentralization in Indonesia has been very complex because of:

- its population size and density variations,
- the fragmentation of the nation over numerous islands causing communication difficulties,
- historical tensions and changes in direction
- its bureaucratic complexity, and the complex processes of decentralization due to political and donor driven forces,
- implementation complexity involving various actors and arenas,
- ethnic diversity
- the decision to implement decentralization rapidly which meant that everything was attempted at the one time,
- simultaneous political, administrative and fiscal decentralization,
Given these complexities, it has been difficult to implement decentralization in Indonesia generally, to decentralize education specifically, and to promote community participation in education more specifically. Given that the focus of my research was on improving District Boards of Education, all of these factors have contributed to the challenges that I have faced.

Decentralization in Indonesia has brought a lot of changes and challenges, especially to community participation in education. The requirement for community participation is clearly outlined in Law Number 20/2003 on the National Education System, Article 56. (Further details on this Article may be seen in Chapter III). The general area of my research was on improving community participation in education and, more specifically, I narrowed my focus to improving the performance of District Boards of Education in this era of decentralization. The reason why I chose to examine the roles and performance of District Boards of Education was because they should have a pivotal role in the management of the decentralized education system and because they are part of my responsibility in the MONE. I also have the authority to work with personnel in the DEOs and to access their opinions and data.

This research explored the three research issues as outlined in Chapter I, namely what is the current status of District Boards of Education, ways to improve Boards by introducing new practices and the development of formal strategies to improve the performance of District Boards of Education.

As indicated in Chapter I, it is sometimes very difficult to decide in which RMIT outcome category the following comments are located. For example, it has not been easy to decide whether greater insights into the functions and responsibilities of District Boards of Education should be placed under the heading: more knowledgeable researcher, or under the heading: contribution to professional knowledge. In fact, it could appear in both. As a consequence, some of the placements below are somewhat arbitrary. I have tended to locate knowledge that is of significant importance to the broader system of education under the second heading, contribution to professional knowledge, although it may very well have added to my knowledge.
More Knowledgeable and Skilled Researcher

In terms of changes in my skills as a researcher, I now understand that changing the research questions during the research is understandable and not prohibited. I had thought that in traditional research especially in quantitative research, there was limited possibility to do this. Initially, in order to achieve the aims of the research, I formulated three research questions. Then, after having more interaction with the personnel who have responsibilities on Boards of Education in several districts, I felt it more appropriate to change and redefine my aims into five research questions (This is one of the strengths of research by project). The main aim of changing the research questions was to gain a deeper understanding about the current status and the new practices needed if the Boards of Education were to meet their charter and to contribute to improving education in their districts.

I now understand much more the governance of District Boards of Education, their status, their stated goals and the endeavors undertaken to achieve their goals. When I started my research on District Boards of Education, like many of my colleagues, I was confused about their governance status. Was it executive, legislative, or judicial? The Decree of the Ministry of National Education number 044/2002 about Boards of Education and School Committees, Article 2 indicates that the District Board of Education is an independent body. But when I asked from whom is the District Board of Education independent, it become apparent that the District Board of Education had limited independence because it still gets financial assistance from both central and local governments respectively although in varying amounts. In addition, Article 4 says that the roles of District Boards of Education are as advisor, supporter, mediator, and controller. The last word, controller, is a strong word meaning to oversee, check, and govern. This also suggests a lack of independence and the potential for tension and confusion between District Boards of Education and local assembly/district parliamentary members.

I consider public school governance not to be a miniature of the Indonesian governance system which consists of a tripartite check and balance system with three separate and coequal branches: the executive, legislative and judicial. Each should act as a check upon the other towards the end that no one branch or any dominant person within each branch can assume too much power. A District Board of Education is currently not equal to the parent district (local), province and national governments because checks and balances are relevant only when the branches of government are coequal. (This also explains some of the challenges facing the effective functioning of Boards.) My careful observations found that the District Board of Education is more or less part of the district executive branch and should be seen roughly as a district education council. Thus, the status of the
District Board of Education is actually as an advisory agency and its main role is as an adviser to the DEO, although extended roles are welcome as long as they fall within the legal jurisdiction of District Boards of Education. (It should be clear from these observations that there is a real lack of clarity about Boards roles, functions, authority and responsibilities.)

I am now more aware of what is appropriate to provide technical assistance to the development of District Boards of Education. There is not only increased awareness, I now feel more obligated to do what is right in supporting the provision of technical and material assistance to the development of District Boards of Education. I am fortunate to be doing this research because I was able to assist District Boards of Education drawing upon what I had learnt from my research. For example, after extensive consultation I designed a strategy or guidelines, with advice from Board members on how to improve the performance of District Boards of Education. (See: Product # 1.2 in the Portfolio.) My observation is that there are a lot of people who know what is right but feel little obligation to act accordingly. As I mentioned in chapter V, when I asked respondents from District Boards of Education about the proposed new recruitment and selection system, many were reluctant to respond. *We only follow the rules, nothing else*, said one Board member from Lombok Tengah District. This fairly representative response may have been because of a lack of interest, but it was more probably because of a lack of information and expertise. At least, as indicated by their uncertain response regarding the need to establish District Board of Education and also their quiet response regarding the real education problems in each sub-district respectively.

In addition, it was, at first, very difficult for me to play double roles as researcher and practitioner at the same time. When I first visited the District Boards of Education and DEOs, officers considered me as a central bureaucrat who usually provided direction, guidance, regulation, monitoring and evaluation. Sometimes they were a little frightened. But I eventually managed to convince them that my frequent visits were to undertake research, with the intention to improve the overall performance of the District Board of Education by providing advice and information to them on how to improve education in their districts.

I became more aware of the ethical dimensions of research when doing this research. The ethical framework for this research was approved by RMIT in 2004. This research pays careful attention to ethical considerations as outlined by RMIT. For example, the human rights of those respondents being researched were protected. This research did not violate the existing laws in Indonesia, and plagiarism was avoided. Prior to interviews all interviewees were given an official letter from
RMIT, identifying the interviewer, indicating the purpose of the research and indicating that their privacy would be guaranteed. In questionnaires, the interviewees also were given an understanding that responses would be anonymous.

I also gained positive experience while doing this research when I gave a presentation at The 10th Asia-Pacific Programme of Educational Innovation for Development (APEID) International Conference Learning Together for Tomorrow: Education for Sustainable Development, in Bangkok, Thailand, from 6 to 8 December 2006 which was held by UNESCO Bangkok. Together with my colleagues, Mr. Didik Suhardi and Mr. Agus Haryanto, we presented a paper titled Improving Planning, Service Quality, and Community Participation in the Indonesian Decentralized Education System (Abduh, M., Haryanto, A., & Suhardi, D., 2006.) At the time, I was also co-author of Dr. David Hodges, who presented a paper titled Facilitating Educational Development: The RMIT Research by Project Program (Hodges, D., Vistarini, B., Abduh, M., Haryanto, A., & Suhardi, D., 2006.) (See: Working Document #2.8 in the Portfolio.) This international conference also encouraged me to become more confident. I also contributed to the presentation to donors in Jakarta as is detailed in the Portfolio. These presentations and the supporting research also gave me more understanding about how to undertake good research and to be a good researcher and confident presenter.

Gaining more understanding in education decentralization in other countries from the APEID International Conference was also valuable learning which made a real contribution to my thoughts in comparing education decentralization in regional countries and in Indonesia. I also gained ideas about broader aspects of education management and improvement. For example, a presenter from the University of Malaya, Malaysia presented a paper titled Education for National Development: A Difficult Road Ahead. He argued that the Malaysian Education Act of 1996 states that the purpose of education is to equip individuals with a command of the knowledge, skills, and values that is prerequisites in a highly competitive global economy. Education is recognized as an important tool to achieve sustainable development. It is deemed significant as it is a means to achieve the nation’s vision of a fully developed nation. He continued, however, to point out that recent developments indicate that the education system is not entirely effective in achieving the stated aims. There are, he said, a number of challenges and obstacles to be overcome. His paper examines the difficulties that have been encountered and suggests some possible alternatives (Tie Fatt Hee, 2006). His paper also encouraged me to consider the links between education, education decentralization and national development in Indonesia. These Conference papers were particularly important to me in my very
new position as Head of Section of Evaluation and Reporting, Directorate of Technical and Vocational Education, Ministry of National Education.

**Contributions to Professional and Scholarly Knowledge**

The expected functions of District Boards of Education are to provide intensive and extensive advice to DEOs in terms of increasing access and equity, improving quality and relevancy, and strengthening good governance of education at the district level including such things as improving participation, transparency, accountability, professionalism, and democracy. A variety of strategies to improve the functioning of District Boards of Education were achieved through clarifying their governance, improving selection procedures, improving and extending their roles and functions, developing capacity, and increasing their real contributions to the development of education at the districts.

In addition, my research contributes to the development of District Boards of Education in terms of clarifying governance, improving selection, improving and extending roles and functions, developing capacity, and increasing their real contributions to the development of education in the districts in the forms of civic awareness, encompassing intellectual, moral, financial, material, and equity dimensions. Workshops based on the handbook developed during this research will make a significant contribution to these improvements.

In terms of governance, my research contributes to clarification of District Boards of Education governance. Currently, a lot of District Board of Education members have differing interpretations on the governance of District Boards of Education. Some consider District Boards responsible for policy making, policy adoption, and improvement of education. Others perceive that the District Boards should focus on administrative functions. Still others consider District Boards as institutions providing advice to the DEOs. My research clearly suggests that District Boards are advisory agencies representing district communities consisting of both members coming from the education community, who work or are involved in the education field directly, and the educated community, who work or are involved in the education field indirectly.

In terms of selection of District Board of Education members, the current system does not consider representativeness and inclusiveness from a geographical stand points. As indicated in Chapter V, District Board members are selected on the basis of their representativeness of the education community and educated community regardless of their geographical location. Thus, not
surprisingly, many District Board members do not know the real problems and challenges of education faced across different sub-districts. Conceptually, District Board of Education members should be selected on the basis of geographical representation, in addition to the other requirements/qualifications/criteria as defined by Ministry of National Education Decree Number 044/2002.

In terms of roles played, it became apparent that there are four general roles played by the District Boards; namely those of adviser, supporter, mediator, and controller. This is not precisely accurate. As suggested earlier, the role as a controller is not appropriate for Indonesia because control of DEOs is the right of local assembly/district parliamentary members. Conceptually, the roles of District Boards should include advisor, supporter, mediator, facilitator, counselor/guidance, motivator, mobilizor, contributor, promoter, and enhancer. District Boards should leave the role of a controller to the local assembly in order not to create role conflicts between District Boards of Education and the local assembly.

In the current requirements for District Board of Education members, no mention is made of capacity building, consequently, there are variations in capacity within the District Board members in education matters. With this reality, ideally, continuous capacity building for District Board of Education members must be done in order to increase their capacity to function properly. The handbook/guidelines will contribute to this process.

In terms of contribution to education, my research found that there were very limited contributions provided by District Boards of Education to DEOs. When I conducted in-depth interviews with several District Board of Education members, I asked questions like, How much time do you spend on District Board of Education development? The answers were mixed; some said much and others said that they did not have much time for the Board. But when I asked the following question, Are you busy with your own work? Most of them answered, Yes. Meanwhile, my short interviews continued with the chairman and the vice chairman of the Lombok Tengah District Board of Education about the contributions of the District Board to the DEO in order to able to develop education in Lombok Tengah. They quickly answered that the contribution given to the DEO was mostly in the form of an intellectual contribution. Ideally, though it should provide advice, guidance and facilitation. A District Board of Education is supposed to be able to provide real contributions to a DEO in the form of intellectual, moral, financial, and material contributions, and provide
support to the achievements and development of teaching and learning in the district for which they are responsible.

Changes in Practices

Change in practice in Indonesia is a challenge. A District Board of Education’s value as an organization depends to a large degree on how effective it is in fostering support, advice, guidance, and cooperation with the DEO in matters pertaining to education development at the district level. Based on my research findings, I believe that substantial changes in the practices of District Boards of Education are required for them to function properly. Changes required include changes to governance, selection, roles and functions, capacity building, and to their contributions to the development of education in the districts. From the four districts (Tangerang, Bekasi, Yogyakarta, and Lombok Tengah) that I researched, I discovered that not all of them were successful in introducing new practices. The noticeably good introduction of new practices was in Tangerang, Yogyakarta, and Lombok Tengah Districts, respectively. Tangerang District Board of Education members have regular field visits to schools to meet principals and school committees. They use these visits to disseminate information about the Board’s tasks and responsibilities and to discuss how to improve the education quality in Tangerang District. In Yogyakarta, the District Board of Education has a partnership with the DEO to collaborate on some activities in the education field. Lombok Tengah District Board of Education played the important role as a mediator as seen from the number of companies and community groups which were mobilized by the Board to support education in its district. However, the District Board of Education in Bekasi was still struggling due to the inactivity and lack of attendance of some members. This inactivity suggests a lack of interest or capacity amongst Board members. This, of course, relates to poor initial selection practices.

When I started doing this research, governance of District Boards of Education was open to multiple interpretations. Was it executive, legislative, or judicial? It was not clear. However, through my research, I consulted many sources; I had a lot of discussions, brainstorming sessions, and focus group discussions with research participants. It was agreed that a District Board of Education is an advisory agency for a DEO. The District Board of Education should represent the district community and consist of members coming from the education community such as teachers, principals, staff of DEO, school supervisors, and academics; and from those who have a good level of education such as representatives from trade and commerce, community leaders, non government organizations, professional organizations, sub-distRICTS, and other lay people interested and concerned with educational matters. Now, District Boards of Education in Tangerang, Yogyakarta,
and Lombok Tengah have been introducing a representative model for their District Boards of Education suited to their local community development and conforming to Indonesian norms including regulations, standards, and policies of education.

In addition, when I started doing this research, the system of selection of District Board of Education members did not take into account the district’s population or geographical distribution. There is information to suggest that this is the situation across Indonesia. As indicated in Chapter V, District Board of Education members should be selected on the basis of representativeness from the education community and the educated community regardless of geographical distribution. Now, changes have happened and District Board of Education members are being selected on the basis of geographical distribution in addition to other requirements/qualifications/criteria as defined by each District Board of Education. Further, each District Board of Education is now aware that there must be qualifications criteria for District Boards of Education members covering points such as educational qualification, educational experience, representation of the community, interest in high-quality education, and the possession of certain personal characteristics essential to the success of District Boards of Education, such as personal integrity, responsibility, and maturity of thought and action. The District Board of Education in Lombok Tengah District now requires geographical representation as well as suitable qualifications and personal attributes for its Board members. However, it is apparent that little thought as yet has been given to female student or parent representation.

At the beginning of my research, I found that the criteria for District Board of Education members mentioned nothing about qualifications and experience in educational matters. Some District Board of Education members were well informed about education matters, while others knew little, and still others knew nothing. In addition, there were frequent changes in District Board of Education members’ period of service based on the Board of Education’s rules, namely Anggaran Dasar/Anggaran Rumah Tangga (statute/regulation/rules of association). These rules are implemented at the district level. Thus, the biggest challenge has been (and continues to be) increasing the capacity of District Board of Education members in order to provide excellent advice and guidance to the DEO. Consequently, relevant capacity building for Board members is not only important, but it is a necessity in order to avoid the District Board of Education members being puppets or a rubber stamp for Heads of DEOs, and to prevent conflicts between District Boards of Education and DEOs arising because of the ignorance Board members have about education matters. The District Board of Education in Lombok Tengah District is an excellent example of
undertaking capacity building efforts for its members. It conducts, among other things, training, workshops, comparative studies, focus group discussions, advice on best practices and lessons learned, and readings on capacity building.

My early research found that there were very limited contributions by District Boards of Education to DEOs in terms of ideas, information, moral guidance, and financial and material support. Now, through its provision of advice, guidance, facilitation, etc., an increasing number of District Boards of Education are able to provide real contributions to DEOs in the form of policy making, policy adoption, education regulations, strategic planning, and improved implementation of plans and programs. Through this advice and guidance, the better DEO is now able to address key components and issues in developing education. Again, an example of good practice of a District Board of Education contributing to a DEO may be seen from the District of Lombok Tengah in the Province of Nusa Tenggara Barat, particularly in the way it is providing linkages between industries/companies and schools around them.

Once again, it must be stressed that implementing change in bureaucracies is a challenge. It is acknowledged that improving the performance of District Boards of Education will be slow and incremental. More thought must be given to improving communication, accountability and the provision of appropriate incentives.

As mentioned earlier, the outcome of this research project was the development of Operational Guidelines for District Boards of Education in Indonesia. These Guidelines were formerly adopted by the MONE. A Bahasa Indonesia version of the Guidelines that is being used in Indonesia can be found in the Portfolio. The Guidelines are divided into 14 sections which are:

1. The Establishment of the Preparation Committees;
2. Seven Steps in Establishing the Board of Education;
3. Principles to be followed in the Establishing Boards of Education;
4. The Publishing of Regency/Mayor Decree and Ceremonial Event in Establishing and Validating the Board of Education;
5. Government Officials in Education Cannot be Chairman of The Board of Education;
6. The Board of Education is to be regarded as an Autonomous and Independent Agency;
7. The Chairman of Board of Education Cannot Interfere in Election to the Board of Education;
8. Possible Candidates for Board Manager and Board members;
9. Community members Who Reside in Other Region Who Can be Board of Education members;
10. The Board of Education Regulations Must Stipulate the Process for Selecting Board Members and Board Procedures;
11. Content of Board of Education Regulations;
12. Other Appropriate Terminology;
13. Regulatory Arrangements;

Recommendations

The following conclusions and recommendations are based on the findings derived from exploration of these research issues. In addition, both conclusions and recommendations are organized in accordance with the aims of research by project: they indicate how I became a more knowledgeable and skilled researcher, the contributions made to professional and scholarly knowledge, and changes in practices within the MONE and, more broadly, in DEOs across Indonesia. These recommendations spell out actions that grew out of this research and that will continue after its completion.

The practices of District Boards of Education have to be changed if they are going to function properly and to contribute optimally to the development of education in the districts. My research indicates that change in the current practices of District Boards of Education is necessary if teaching and learning is to improve. In addition, my research has indicated that a range of strategies or recommendations would also contribute to improving Indonesian education. It is not envisaged that implementation strategies for all of the recommendations will be developed here. However, I believe that they are important to record; my research indicates specific strategies for implementing the following recommendations.

First, future District Boards of Education should improve their membership selection criteria. The past District Boards of Education did not have criteria setting out qualifications, inclusiveness, and representativeness of their membership, and there was no representation covering geographical population distribution in local districts. In the future, representatives from local sub-districts should be included, as is the situation in Lombok Tengah District.
Second, a clear District Board of Education governance model should be developed. A District Board of Education is an advisory council, functioning to provide advice and guidance to a DEO in education matters and not as a policy making institution.

Third, District Boards of Education should expand and have rigorous and coherent role descriptions. All defined roles must be fully functioning.

Fourth, District Boards of Education should in the future have clear and high quality strategic and annual plans and conformance to the plans. The plans should focus on providing specifications for future activities. The quality of conformance to the plans should deal with whether or not the processes and procedures outlined in the plans are being used and are effective. In other words, they outline strategies for improving teaching and learning across the district for which they are responsible.

Fifth, District Boards of Education should, in the future, offer rich and rigorous contributions to the development of education at the district level. Types or forms of contributions should include ideas, information, moral, financial, and material resources. It is expected that through its advice, guidance, facilitation, etc., the District Board of Education will be able to provide real contributions to the DEO in the forms of policy making, policy adoption, education regulations, strategic planning, and improved implementation of plans and programs.

To assist in the implementation of the recommendations above, two products have been produced as a part of the accompanying Portfolio. Recommendation 1 has been followed by a letter to the Ministry of National Education regarding significant inputs for the Government Regulation Draft about Education Management Standards which is being processed by the Ministry of National Education as Product # 1 in the Portfolio. (See 1.1 A Letter as An Input for Government Regulation Draft about Standards of Management Education.)

Last, but not least, strategies for implementing recommendation 2, 3, 4 and 5 can be found in operational guidelines on how to improve the performance of District Boards of Education (recruitment and selection, roles played by and possible contributions) as Product # 2 in the Portfolio. (See 1.2 Operational Guidelines for District Boards of Education.)

In closing, I quote a statement from Illinois State Board of Education in its 2006 Annual Report:
We must continue to expand our partnership beyond the education community to build collective energy, ideas, and resources focused on helping all students reach their full potential.

I agree, educating our children requires a concerted and cooperative effort between parents, educators and the rest of society. Together, we can educate our children effectively, brilliantly, excellently and greatly. When the Ministry of National Education, DEOs, and Boards of Education all play their roles effectively and efficiently, the dreams of Indonesian Education will become true and contribute to a golden future. It is envisaged that my research will help transform this dream into a reality.
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