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Yogyakarta One of Provinces/towns in Java Indonesia
Abstract

Decentralization of education administration is becoming a common thread in public governance as more developing and developed countries are trying to implement it in order to devolve some of their educational decision making processes. Precipitated by the economic and political crisis at the end of President Suharto regime in 1998 Indonesia passed its first decentralization law in 1999 (Law 22/1999). Not only strongly impelled by internal forces such as competing regions demanding more authority in managing natural resources, the country was also pressured by external forces, especially the International Monetary Fund in relation to debt resolution. Indonesia was given little alternative and was forced to decentralize most of its governing authorities (excluding defense, religious, security, fiscal, judicial, and foreign affairs) to local government.

As a result of this ‘big bang’ policy, Indonesia was unable to prepare for and implement the decentralization process smoothly. District Education Offices which received the bulk of decentralized education authority were not properly prepared to exercise their new and bigger mandates. Their organizational structure, personnel capacity, managerial skills and, most importantly, their capacity to provide for school needs were not properly prepared in advance. As a consequence, the implementation process was fluid, complex and, sometimes, confusing to local personnel and managers. Ironically, improved service quality as one of the main motives behind decentralization was neglected, if not sacrificed.

Service quality can be understood as an organization’s ability to fulfill its obligatory functions or mandates in satisfying customer needs. In the Indonesian context, especially at District Education Office level, service quality is the District Education Office’s ability to fulfill its obligatory functions to satisfy school needs. Delivering services depends on many different factors. In this research, respondents also perceived these factors in many different ways, but in relation to District Education Office mandates, it is easier to use a system approach covering input, process, output, and evaluation. These elements are combined in a Minimum Service Standards discussed in this research.
Improving District Education Offices service quality certainly should involve improving all of the above mentioned factors. Targeted capacity building along with regular service quality assessment is two key strategies for improving District Education Offices service quality. Providing all the needed resources for District Education Offices and providing adequate training for its personnel is two important steps in capacity building. In addition, regular evaluation is needed to ensure that District Education Offices service quality keeps improving. In this case, service standards such as *Standar Pelayanan Minimal* or Minimum Service Standards are needed. The latest Government of Indonesia Minimum Service Standards as an instrument to assure District Education Offices service quality is considered no longer adequate. A new set of Minimum Service Standards as proposed by this research is needed to implement the latest law and regulation revisions and improve the performance of District Education Offices. If service quality of the District Education Offices is to improve, appropriate Minimum Service Standards developed during this research must be implemented and then regularly assessed. This, in turn, would contribute to the quality of teaching and learning processes at school level and finally to the quality of education in Indonesia.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In education decentralization there is an assumption that the quality of schooling will automatically improve after educational decision making processes are shifted closer to the school level (Behrman et. al., 2002). Unfortunately, many developing countries are still experiencing problems in improving education service quality after implementing decentralization. Several years after the decentralization law was enacted, the Indonesian education sector has been attempting to manage some of the impacts of this rapid reform. One of the impacts has been criticism from many quarters that DEOs have not been able to perform their new functions. As a consequence, research or study is needed to really understand and anticipate the emerging problems in the education system. As a civil servant working in the central education office, I took an opportunity to conduct research focusing on decentralization and its impact on public service delivery, especially in the education sector. This chapter explores in brief the initial stages of this research, especially illustrating the Indonesian decentralization process, DEO (District Education Office) service quality as the main focus of this project, the research approach adopted and how this project was implemented.

Decentralizing Indonesia

Decentralization, of some form or another, has been a constant feature of Indonesian politics since the colonial era. Too often decentralization policies were implemented to maintain the power of the ruler rather than to distribute power or improve service delivery. During the thirty year Suharto regime, the Indonesian system of government became increasingly centralized and autocratic (Usman, 2001). However, as a consequence of the 1997 economic crisis, a significant change occurred. A combination of grass roots protests, high-level political maneuvers and international pressure led to President Suharto’s resignation in May 1998 (Perdana
Soon afterwards, vice president BJ Habibie was sworn in as President. To respond to the pressure, Habibie implemented a fundamental change in the Indonesian government system by stipulating Laws 22/1999 on Regional Autonomy and Law 25/1999 on fiscal balances marking the beginning of the Indonesian decentralization era.

Despite the initial public optimism, many observers admitted that the decentralization process envisaged in the 1999 legislation was still far from perfect and many parts of the process still needed to be improved (Brodjonegoro, 2004). According to Usman (2001), there were some flaws in the laws that sometimes led to confusion and conflict between the three levels of government. The two critical decentralization laws were revised in 2004 during Megawati’s presidency. But as the decentralisation process continued, more weaknesses have become apparent. For example there is now some discussion at the national level about whether provincial governors should be directly elected or centrally appointed because they are considered by some in Jakarta as representatives of central authority in a province. In addition, it is being suggested that local elections are considered too expensive when compared to the funding needs for local development.

When the first decentralization laws were being prepared in 1998, there was debate as to whether authority should be handed to district or province level. Finally it was stipulated that districts and municipalities should be the focus because it was thought at the time that increasing the power and authority of the provinces could eventually prove to be the first step toward the break-up of the Indonesian state (Kreuzer, 2006). Fragmentation of the nation had to be avoided.

Managing the decentralization process is difficult at the best of times. After experiencing a long period of centralization, it is understandable that managing the process in Indonesia would be particularly challenging. Most government employees were accustomed to being the implementers of highly centralized government policies (Usman, 2002). Despite the change in legislation and accompanying regulations, many sections of government, at both the national and sub-national level continued to do business as usual.
Prior to the 1999 legislation Indonesia had a three-tier unitary government structure, with 26 provinces and 330 local governments (districts or municipalities) (World Bank (2000b). By the end of 2009 the number of local governments had increased by approximately 50% (MOHA, 2009). Although the formation of new districts may promote local political participation it does add to the challenges of improving educational services. This is why President Bambang Susilo Yodhoyono has called for a moratorium on pemekaran (new territories) to avoid further excess in local government practices such as corruption, collusion, and nepotism that might worsen public service delivery.

Although decentralization has the potential to improve service delivery and increase participation in decision making, its implementation is challenging and not as simple as expected. Without strong commitment and control from local stakeholders and communities, autonomy or decentralization failure is likely to occur because regulation and direction from the central authority is not as strong as before (Kreuzer, 2006). It is important that all levels of government recognise that local communities are entitled to a satisfactory level of public services and that public service output should be a source of local satisfaction and pride. This research suggests that clearly developed DEO minimum service standards (MSS) are an effective tool for evaluating the performance of local governments (Barter, 2006). If the decentralization process in Indonesia is to succeed, continuous control over public service delivery is a necessity. (Please see collaborative paper in portfolio; exhibit 34).

**Focusing on DEO Service Quality**

Decentralization in Indonesia was actually ignited by massive groups of students and people protesting against Indonesian centralized governance in 1997. Centralization was seen as a prime cause behind the turbulent economic, social and political crisis in Indonesian. Most people assumed that decentralization would be the panacea to overcome the chaos. People started to believe, that under such a decentralized system many government function, especially public service delivery would run more
smoothly. Forced by external factors - mainly the IMF, the Banks and other donor institutions - and demand by internal forces, mainly dissatisfied provinces, President Suharto finally stepped down. Habibie, who was the vice president, was appointed to lead the country, and one of his fundamental decisions was to decentralize government authority to district level. His decision was implemented by enacting Law 22/1999 on Local Governance.

Since 1999 Indonesia has decentralized all public functions, including education, to local governments (provinces and districts), except for the following: foreign affairs, defense, security, justice, monetary and fiscal policy, and religious affairs. Thus, since 1999, many aspects of education have been devolved to local governments, particularly to districts. Education management is now mostly in the hands of DEOs. Districts have more power to direct, guide and control education in their areas than during the centralized era. They have more control over curriculum management, teachers, facilities, finance, and service delivery, to mention a few.

Basically the Indonesian education system consists of three tiers (central, provincial and local or district level) as a chain of services. Immediately after decentralization DEOs became the most critical point in the chain because most of the authority for local operational management was handed down to this level. The functions included local policy and planning; local resources management (facilities, funding, and personnel); local curriculum development, implementation and its supervision and local educational quality assurance. This is why DEO service quality and their ability to serve schools their main stakeholders is now vitally important. Unless DEO service quality is improved, people will perceive that decentralization has only brought complexity and confusion, not quality education provision across Indonesia. And this could be seen as an indicator of broader government failure.

Problems did start to emerge. On many occasions, I met people from provinces, district offices, and school personnel who asked whether in the long run decentralization would improve education quality. They had good reasons for asking this question. First; during the centralized era, most DEOs under the Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) were considered incapable of managing elementary education properly. The condition of many elementary school buildings was very poor,
especially in rural areas. On the other hand, Ministerial Education Offices at district level (*Kandep*, under the MONE) were considered to be more successful in managing junior and senior high school buildings. (Junior and senior high school buildings generally were better maintained.) When comparing the conditions of junior and senior high to elementary school buildings in centralized era, many school personnel were afraid that soon the junior and senior high school buildings would deteriorate after decentralization. Secondly, teacher deployment or mobility across districts was difficult. District or local government would only accept teachers from within its own area. Teacher promotion and teacher migration across districts were also facing the same problems. And, most importantly, many school personnel felt that district offices were not as responsive as before during the centralized era. In addition, after decentralization, school operational budgets not only decreased, but it also became more difficult for schools to gain reimbursement. These are only some of the problems that emerged from the decentralization process in the education sector. As a consequence of these difficulties, many educational services at the school level deteriorated.

Providing quality service became a challenging process for most DEOs. This was because the DEO faced many competing forces and factors. For example, DEO managers were mostly recruited by District Chiefs who had won the recent local election. Accordingly, DEO managers have been very much influenced by local politics. Professional standards for the recruitment of DEO managers were often neglected and political winners dominated DEOs. The right person in the right place as a standard for recruitment of DEO managers was not the norm. Besides, DEO management was very complex as it was influenced by many different stakeholders.

After decentralization, although the DEO was technically under the Ministry of National Education (MONE), at the same time administratively it reports to the Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) through its local government. As a consequence, the system is now under a “mixed” management and leadership regime because DEOs are not only subordinate to the MONE, but they are also subordinate to the District Chief who is under MOHA.
To complicate management even further each DEO was also influenced by the Provincial Education Office (PEO), the local House of Representatives, the local Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA) office, and community organizations such as the local Board of Education (BOE). This restructure contributed to the creation of uncertainty and lack of consistency in education management and, as a consequence, poor education service quality. (See figure 1-1 below)

Figure 1-1: Mixed Management and Leadership in DEOs.

![Diagram of DEO Administration After Decentralization](image)

(Designed based on the current situation by researcher)

Other forces and factors influencing DEOs will be discussed in later chapters, but it is apparent that there were real challenges to the provision of quality education services at the district level. As a consequence, ensuring that each DEO provides adequate educational service has become an important issue in decentralization. Considering this situation, I continually questioned myself, why is decentralization which was first considered to be the panacea and savior of Indonesia now turning out to be the source
of problems during the implementation stage? What is actually meant by decentralization? How does decentralization influence public service quality? What is actually meant by service quality? What factors influence public service quality? How can current DEO service quality be improved? And so on, and so on.

Hoping to be able to answer all these questions, in 2003 I enrolled as a doctorate student in Jakarta State University (Universitas Negeri Jakarta/UNJ). After finishing all required courses and passed the comprehensive examination, then it was time to write a dissertation. To my surprise, my proposal which was based on the above questions was considered to be unusual. Most students usually propose doctoral dissertations with statistical analysis in them. At that time, path analysis was favored by most students and their supervisors. So, my proposal was dumped, and the questions about decentralization and service quality kept lingering. After applying to several overseas universities, finally at the end of 2004, I was informed that RMIT, one of the prominent universities in Melbourne Australia, had invited me together with my colleagues, Mr. Didik Suhardi and Mr. Mochamad Abduh to conduct a first review before we were accepted to be formally enrolled as students of RMIT. That was my first encounter with Research by Project, Practitioner Research and Action Research (will be elaborated in chapter 2). In the following section, the Research by Project approach supported by RMIT is discussed in more detail.

**Adopting RMIT Research by Project**

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 service quality in district offices still exist. Unless these problems are resolved, the decentralization process will be far from successful. No doubt, research was needed to explore the current status of education service delivery at the DEO. As a result of this research, the need for new practices and standards in service quality at DEO were also identified and serious efforts were (and still are being) made to improve the quality of service. DEOs were selected as a research focus simply because devolution of education was mostly to the district level.
Based on this situation and some discussions with supervisors, Research by Project was finally adopted as an appropriate approach for this research. Some of the important reasons for selecting Research by Project include: existing problems that need to be resolved which are located within the researcher’s workplace; innovations or developments that are needed to foster better practice in the real world, and the fact that the research output would contribute to both professional and practical knowledge. As RMIT regulations suggest:

The purposes of the RMIT Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) 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).

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 as illustrated in Figure 1-2.

Unlike a traditional research approach, this approach directly links the university activities to the workplace of the students 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 side, 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, p. 38). In more detail, the general aims of the project can be described as follows:

**Figure 1-2:**
RMIT Research by Project Program.

![Diagram](image)


**More Informed Practitioner**

Unlike a classical model of research approach that could 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 day to day real life as a practitioner. He or she is immersed in the research on a day to day basis. In addition, Research by Project involves the student in more intensive self reflection about the student’s work environment, resulting in a more informed practitioner. By undertaking Research by Project, this researcher would be a more informed practitioner in the area of education service quality in general and district education service quality in particular.
Attempting to separate the roles of researcher and practitioner/manager has created a number of challenges, mainly because a researcher has to be objective and, if necessary, be critical of the current situation within their workplace while, at the same time, working within the organization. In addition, from time to time, the researcher finds himself simultaneously acting in an administrative role and as a researcher. This creates challenges for the researcher and those being researched and managed. (It also raised challenging ethical dilemmas.) On the other hand, the continuing reflection on each phase in this kind of research, certainly contributes to uncovering the problems faced by the student as a practitioner and focusing on the activities undertaken.

**Contribution to Knowledge**

In addition, the efforts in understanding the real world from the perspective of the theoretical world, whilst being immersed in the real world would certainly contribute to professional knowledge. The researcher expected that this Research by Project would contribute to an improvement in education service quality, particularly in DEOS, and contribute to the development of knowledge in the context of the decentralized education system in Indonesia and in other countries in the region.

**Change in Practice or Body of Work**

Since the study was based on real problems in the student’s work situation within the MONE, the study should improve and change practices in the workplace and contribute to the skills and knowledge of colleagues. The research on improving DEO service quality is detailed in the following section.

**Researching DEO Service Quality**

As it was mentioned before, one of the most significant impacts of decentralization in education has been on the service quality of DEOs. The work of DEOs was chosen for this research because they have deeper impacts on schools where teaching and learning processes happen. I have the responsibility of traveling around Indonesia and meeting with school principals, teachers, education boards in districts, school boards and school supervisors to discuss service quality delivered by DEOs. These activities
gave me a perception that something had to be done to encourage DEOs to serve schools better. This project was inspired by the fact that school administrators and school teachers experienced real difficulties in keeping the schools running as a consequence of the decentralization process, due in large part, to the poor service quality provided by DEOs.

It was questionable why many DEOs could not provide better services after being given more control over local education management in district level. As a consequence, the overall research question to be answered from this research is: How to improve service quality at the DEO within the environment of the decentralized education system in Indonesia? This overall research question was broken down into the following four sub-research questions:

- What is the current status of service quality at the DEOs?
- What factors influence DEO service quality?
- What efforts are needed to improve DEO service quality?
- What guidelines are needed to improve DEO service quality?

As a consequence of the Research by Project approach, it was understood that these preliminary questions (described in a more detail in chapter 2) might change and evolve during the course of this project.

Based on the above questions, this research is intended to develop strategies for improving service quality at the DEOs in this decentralized era. To achieve this outcome, the researcher will undertake a series of actions to explore DEO service quality problems and suggest a number of probable solutions including:

- collecting information on the current status of service quality to map out stakeholders’ perceptions on how DEOs attempt to fulfill school needs;
- gathering information on factors relevant to service quality, to identify better practices in service delivery;
- identifying ways of improving service, and
- producing guidelines to implement effective or improved service quality.

The proposed guidelines will make a significant contribution to helping DEOs improve their service quality which, in turn, will contribute to better teaching and learning across Indonesia. The findings of this project will be implemented in the many DEOs willing to improve their service quality to schools.
In order to be able to answer the above questions, and to formulate the intended strategy above, adequate data was needed and was collected during this research from 2004 to 2008. This research on improving service quality provided by DOEs to schools is based on data collected from the main DEO stakeholders, including DEO staff members, schools personnel (including principals and teachers), and education board members. Although most data were collected from workshops of those groups of respondents, much of the data were gathered from field visit to four districts/municipalities (Yogyakarta, Central Lombok, Bekasi, and Tangerang), discussions, consultations, and responses to questionnaires distributed during workshops of DEO personnel, BOE members, and school personnel.

Based on the earlier discussion of DEO service quality and the RMIT Research by Project approach, this research has two different sets of aims: general and specific. The general aims, relate to the RMIT Research by Project objectives (more skilled practitioner, contribution to professional knowledge, and improvement in practice), and while the specific aims relate to the current issues of DEO service quality as follows:

- assess service quality meanings and the current situation;
- identify factors influencing DEO service quality;
- develop strategies to improve DEO service quality;
- develop improved Minimum Service Standards Guidelines.

The aims of this Research by Project are important because of their potential to produce new knowledge about, and improvements in, service quality for the decentralized education system in Indonesia.

At the same time, this Research by Project has the potential to improve DEO service quality and, as a consequence, will contribute to improving the performance of schools, teachers and students. To date, there has been no research on DEO service quality improvement. Service quality is a common terminology in the private sector, but it is still a relatively new paradigm in public bureaucratic services, especially in developing countries. Unlike profit oriented organizations, whose motivation is improved by a vision of increased profit or by the fear of bankruptcy, services in the
public sector are relatively difficult to improve because of the complexity of the organization and its multiple stakeholders. I was lucky to get involved in the MSS National Team (as a reference group) activities; otherwise my research would not heard and contribute nothing to the MONC. However, research leading to the drafting of appropriate Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for DEOs is a necessity. These SOPs will indicate how DEOs should respond to the needs of schools and other education stakeholders.

As required by the RMIT research guidelines, this Research by Project will produce three outcomes: a portfolio (product) that is a guideline to improving or and implementing MSS in district level (in separate document), this exegesis (thesis), and presentation of the project. This exegesis is organized into five following chapters:

Chapter one; Introduction. This contains objectives of the study, why this study is so important, and how this writing is organized. In addition, chapter one contains a description of the research background, decentralization context, a brief outline of Research by Project, a brief outline of the project, the aims of the project, justification of the aims, the research questions and expected outcomes.

Chapter two; Research design. This chapter presents a discussion of the research approach or methodology adopted for this study, and how data and information were gathered to support and inform the study. It will also provide an overview of methodology and methods, sources of data, data types and collection procedures, data analysis, an outline of stages of research project and ethical considerations.

Chapter three; Contextual analysis, focuses on service quality in the context of a national program including decentralization, decentralization of education in Indonesia, education service quality in the era of decentralization, key factors affecting educational service quality, education service quality at the districts, and observations and reflection on service quality.

Chapter four; the story of the project, indicates the core of the research and describes the steps or stages of the research. Deciding on the number of steps or stages caused me some concerns. I decided to group the stages based on the types of activities that
occurred, the methods used to collect data and on the basis of the information that I was seeking. I finally decided to divide my research into 3 phases or stages. This final decision also reflects the growth in my understanding of my research projects.

Finally, chapter five presents the conclusions and recommendations. The conclusions relate to gathered data and the aims of this study and discuss the contributions to the development of knowledge of service quality and changes in practices regarding service quality at the DEO. This chapter also outlines the recommendations and develops guidelines needed to improve the service quality which will form part of the portfolio which is the product of this research.
Chapter 2
RESEARCH DESIGN

Considering the issues and questions raised in Chapter 1, research is undoubtedly needed on how to improve DEO service quality, to understand the situation and to seek appropriate solutions. The question is then; how should this research be designed? Which research methodology and methods are the most appropriate in this situation? And most importantly, how can this decision be justified? This chapter will describe the design and foundations upon which I based my research project.

To simplify their research design, researchers could use many different styles; Hodges (2005) for example uses DNA code or a chef’s recipe to describe how theoretical background is implemented by the researcher in the field. I prefer to use the concept of a ‘journey of knowing’ to illustrate the whole research process. Methodology could be considered as the ‘path or route’ giving direction to the researcher as to how to reach the destination and methods are ‘transit points’ where activities should be undertaken to collect necessary evidence. How this map, route and transit points are used is described in the following sections.

Mapping out the research areas.

At the outset this comparatively simple research steps suggested by Fehring (2005) was followed: Defining question, selecting paradigm, stating methodology and selecting data gathering technique.

Figure 2-1:
Research Steps

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Research Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Research Paradigm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Research Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Data Gathering Techniques</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fehring (2005)
Defining a research problem and its questions was relatively easy, but defining what epistemological stance, paradigm and methodology underpin the research is a challenging task. In other words, selecting a paradigm and methodology from the research theory shelves is relatively easy, but giving appropriate reasons behind the choice requires deeper thought. The reasons behind the choice are important because according to Hagyard (2006), part of the research process involves exposing the findings first to peer review and finally to public scrutiny. Consequently it is essential that anyone embarking on research is able to justify their methodology, identify appropriate methods and comment on the validity of their findings. In other words, researchers should be able to justify the rationale behind the methodology they use, and not just simply choose the most convenient method and methodology. And the reasons behind the choice of methodology used in a research are usually rooted in researcher’s philosophical views. The purpose of this section is to give a brief overview of the most relevant epistemology or research paradigms such as Crotty’s and Gasson’s and attempts to demonstrate its implications for conducting this research.

First, Crotty (1998) suggests that there are three epistemological principles; objectivism, subjectivism and constructionism. To the objectivist, meaningful reality exists apart from the operation of any consciousness. On the other hand, subjectivists believe that meaning is imposed by the subject on the object; that meaning does not come out of the interplay between subject and object. While to constructionists, meaning is not discovered, but constructed. Crotty (1998, p.9) elaborates the constructionists’ understanding of knowledge:

In this understanding of knowledge, it is clear that different people may construct meaning in different way, even in relation to the same phenomenon. Isn’t this precisely what we find when we move from one era to another or from one culture to another? In this view of things, subject and object emerge as partners in the generation of meaning.

Crotty’s view gives an understanding on how researchers follow certain ontological and epistemological stand points to justify their choice of methodology and methods they use. In relation to this research, decentralization and DEO service quality are phenomena that could also be approached in several different ways. But considering
the nature of the issue, where decentralization is all about human interaction within social and political life, in fact, decentralization is all about social-political science where meanings are socially interpreted and subjectively constructed. Considering these notions, it is more appropriate to put research on decentralization and service delivery within the constructionist approach.

Secondly, according to Gasson (2008), human position as the subject and phenomenon as the object causes two major paths in epistemological beliefs and knowledge acquisition. The first path suggests that phenomena are always there, independent from human sensing (Objective-Positivist). While on the other hand, the second path believes that phenomena emerge as a result of human sensing of objects (Subjective-Interpretivist). This divide also influences the researcher’s stand point in conducting research. With only two epistemological beliefs, Gasson’s is simpler than the three of Crotty’s views. In the following table Gasson tries to summaries the two dominant paradigms.

### Table 2-1: The Dominant Research Paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Positivist-Objective</th>
<th>Interpretive-Subjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontological</strong></td>
<td>External phenomena exist independently of the individual’s perceptions</td>
<td>The individual makes sense of their world by the way in which they perceive and define “external” phenomena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(beliefs about nature of reality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemological</strong></td>
<td>There are essential laws that relate to all aspects of existence, independent of the observer. These laws may be observed from outside the situation and deductively abstracted to provide models that are generalizable to all contexts.</td>
<td>There are no absolute laws of existence, but theories that are more or less useful, depending on the perspective of the researcher. Behavior (of phenomena and people) may be interpreted in context and inductively abstracted to provide theories that are generalizable to similar contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(beliefs about knowledge and how we know reality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Nature</strong></td>
<td>The behavior of phenomena and people enmasse can be viewed as determined by the external situation or environment.</td>
<td>Human beings have complete autonomy: their actions are dictated by free will (which may be constrained by external forces).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(how we account for human behavior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodological</strong></td>
<td>Scientific: Researchers derive abstract models or laws by the use of systematic protocol and technique to construct scientific tests regarding the nature of the “real world”.</td>
<td>Inquiring: Emphasizes subjective, insider accounts of situations that can only be obtained by personal involvement in the situation. The presence of the observer affects that which is being observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(beliefs about how we apply inquiry methods)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical</strong></td>
<td>Deductive: theory progresses through “conjectures and refutations”; theory can only be defended on an absence of falsifiability.</td>
<td>Inductive: theory progresses through “inductive generalizations”, in which one generalizes on the basis of a sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(beliefs about the role of theory in research)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gasson (2008)
The table above shows that each research paradigm is based on different ontological and epistemological positions. In Indonesia, at least, there seems to be a great divide between quantitative and qualitative approaches and as a consequence, these two epistemological positions open the possibility of multi-interpretation over the same phenomenon or object as illustrated by Hagyard (2006) below.

**Figure 2-2:**
The Relativity of World View

The figure above could illustrate both a white vase, or two silhouetted faces. What we see will be influenced mainly by what we expect to see, and the context in which we are looking at it. In this case, there is no “correct” answer, simply two alternative ways of observing and interpreting the same phenomenon. Hagyard’s illustration could be used in understanding why the same phenomenon is viewed in different ways by researchers. This is why over centuries the differences of human views over phenomenon will always exist. This difference, consciously or not, imprints the researcher’s ontological, epistemological and methodological stand points and results in two dominant views over phenomenon. In a popular way they are called quantitative (objective) and qualitative (subjective-interpretive).

Using Crotty’s and Gassons’s epistemological views the phenomenon of DEO service quality in a decentralized system (as an object of this research) could also be
approached using either objectivist-positivist and subjectivist-constructivist/interpretivist view. As Hagyard suggests, one might perceive the phenomenon or figure above either as a vase or as two faces. According to Interpretivist characteristics above, and the fact that any value or meaning related to decentralization is constructed among human actors as part of social science, I therefore consider that it is more appropriate to examine decentralization and service delivery phenomenon from a subjective-interpretivist stand point.

After finding an appropriate map to locate the starting point for the journey of knowing, in the following section the methodology as the route or path taken to find the most relevant evidence during this journey will be discussed.

**Finding the Research Path**

From the map of paradigm where the research issue could be pointed out as the starting point in this journey of knowing, the following question arises. Where should a researcher travel to continue the journey of knowing? This is significant in order for a researcher to find the justifiable answers, and in turn to gain the ‘true’ knowledge? As it was described previously, paradigms and research methodologies could be defined as ‘the basic belief system or world view that guides the research investigation’ (Krauss, 2005). Holding a proper map in hand, now defining suitable paths or routes to give the right direction is a must for a researcher. Which direction should I go to collect the necessary evidence! Which methodology is to be adopted?

As outlined by Hagyard (2006), the main aim of qualitative research is to discover how the research subjects or participants feel about their lived experiences. Usually the qualitative research questions are aimed to reveal broad social perceptions and are therefore broad and exploratory in nature. In data collecting, emphasis is given to how participants express themselves in their discourse, with particular attention being paid to the use of metaphor and imagery. This approach is significant to this research.

Concerning qualitative methodologies, Crotty (1998, p.5) enlisted some alternatives that could be chosen, such as ethnography, phenomenological research, grounded
theory, heuristic inquiry, action research, discourse analysis, feminism, etc. According to Crotty, qualitative researchers usually implement these methodologies in trying to uncover meanings and perceptions from people participating in a research. Researchers would try to see things from the perspective of research participants. In addition, according to Dawson (2002, p.14) a qualitative researcher usually explores participants’ attitudes, behavior and experiences through interviews or focus group discussions to get participants’ in-depth opinions. Dawson also enlisted some alternatives such as; grounded theory, ethnography, feminist research and action research.

To decide which way to go, which qualitative methodology is most appropriate among the above alternatives, two important things need to be considered. First, RMIT Research by Project requires that there should be a direct link between a student as a researcher and his workplace as an object of the research. This situation positions me as a practitioner researcher researching my own workplace. Brown (2002, p. 3) suggests that practitioner researchers should focus on trying to capture, reflect upon and learn from practice and lived experience. This situation leads any practitioner researcher into qualitative or naturalistic investigation which is in line with the characteristics of interpretivist or constructivist epistemology discussed before.

Second, it is also important to consider the nature of this research object: is decentralization and service quality belonging to the social sciences where meaning is not discovered but constructed among its actors. This contention is supported by Crotty (1998, p.9) by saying that in constructionism ‘meaning is constructed, not discovered.’ How should decentralization and service quality be studied then? Qualitative researchers, such as Krauss (2005) believe that the best way to understand qualitative phenomenon is to view it in its context. In this sense, the best way to understand what is going on is to become immersed in it and to move into the culture or organization being studied, and experience what it is like to be a part of it. According to Schwandt (1994), truth in constructivist paradigm is “a matter of the best-informed and most sophisticated construction on which there is consensus at a given time” (Plack, 2005, p. 229). In this case, it is suggested that the phenomena of decentralization and service delivery as socially constructed meanings of events
occur over time and are influenced not only by the individual’s actions, but also by history, society, and language. It is also suggested that the best way to know any qualitative reality is through experience and action (Krauss, 2005, p. 759).

It could be seen now that the discussion on Research by Project approach as suggested by the RMIT University and the nature of decentralization or education service quality above open me to the gate of qualitative practitioner research. Brown (2003) argues that practitioner research is an umbrella term for any research methodology that covers all forms of research methodology carried out by practitioner in his own workplace. After considering the title and the aim of this project, I prefer a methodology that would give me a chance to improve DEO service quality, a methodology that could change my workplace (even if the change is difficult or occurring in the future).

By adopting action research, I feel like I have found the right path or route that could bring me to answers for my research questions. And at the same time along the way during my journey of knowing, I could find necessary evidence. Hopefully in this journey of knowing, I can take some actions and have some experiences related directly to decentralization and service quality in my workplace. At the same time hopefully, I will achieve the aims of Research by Project which are to improve the competency of the researcher, to contribute to scholarly and professional knowledge and to improve practices of the workplace (RMIT, 2007, p. 38). In the following section, action research as an adopted methodology or as a chosen route in this research or journey of knowing will be discussed in a more detail.

**Adopting Action Research**

As a civil servant in the Ministry of National Education researching DEO service quality, now I have two roles; as a practitioner and as a researcher. This position gives me some advantages. If a researcher is to judge his or her findings as a ‘justified true belief’, then there is an assumption that the practitioner as a researcher is in the best position to judge his or her own work practices. McNiff (2000) argues further how practitioners:
… claim the right to be regarded as the best judges of their own work, supporting their claims with rigorously validated evidence; and this claim for epistemological and professional equality poses a challenge for conventional forms of professional education, where traditionally practitioners have been seen as the consumers of research knowledge, generated, usually in higher education context, by expert consultant and academic theories (McNiff, 2000, p. 97).

How then does action research relate to practitioner research? Kenneth M Zeichner and Susan E Nofke state that action research is also part of practitioner research traditions;

At least five major traditions of practitioner research in education have developed during the 20th century; the Tradition of Participatory Research, the British Teacher-as-Researcher movement, the Teacher Researcher Movement in North America, the Self Study Research by college and University Educators, and finally the action research tradition. (Zeichner and Nofke, 2001, p. 321-325)

From this point, it is clear that as a qualitative practitioner researcher I could adopt action research as a methodology to facilitate me in researching decentralization and service quality in my work place, MONE. Since this research project aims to improve DEO service quality, I believe that action research (research with action) as mentioned by Zeichner and Nofke above is more appropriate rather than just a research that only describes DEO service quality complexities. Action research is a more appropriate methodology in this Research by Project, mainly because it involves both research and action at the same time. The following discussion will elaborate on the characteristics of action research and how it was finally adopted as an appropriate methodology in this Research by Project.
Understanding Action Research

McNiff states that action researchers usually begin an enquiry by asking questions of the kind, ‘How do I improve my work?’ It then follows through a fairly systematic research process which may be expressed in the following terms:

- I reach a critical point in my practice;
- I feel the need to act;
- I act in a chosen direction;
- I monitor and evaluate my actions;
- I change the direction of my actions in the light of my evaluation.

(McNiff, 2000, p.202)

McNiff implies that when a worrying situation emerges from any workplace, immediate action is needed to resolve the situation before anything gets worse. In this case, after decentralization devolved most educational responsibility to the DEO level, educational managers were worrying that DEO service quality had not improved as much as expected. As a consequence, immediate action is needed to improve it. But before detailing actions taken, a number of questions need to be answered to understand more about action research. Where is it originally from? What paradigms support its existence? What characteristics does it have? What research methodologies are most useful? What changes might result from action research? And finally, what process or steps are entailed in this methodology?

According to Kock (2008), action research (AR) originated independently in the U.S. and England in the 1940s. In the U.S., AR emerged from the work of Kurt Lewin on a variety of topics, ranging from child welfare to group dynamics. Lewin was a German-born social psychologist, whom many see as the father of AR (as cited in Kock, 2008). “Kurt Lewin (1948) remarked that research which produced nothing but a book is inadequate. This means that any research ought to be fruitful and contribute something to the object or workplace being researched. AR is a more powerful tool for change and improvement at the local level” (as cited in Cohen, 2005, p. 226-227). In this case, AR should also contribute to improving DEO service quality.
Kock (2008) elaborates that action research can be conducted in ways that are aligned with most epistemologies, including the positivist, interpretivist, and critical epistemologies. Action research can have as its unit of analysis the individual, the small group, and even the entire organization. It can be used to address issues as varied as health concerns, environmental problems, engineering techniques, and business methods. But most importantly, one of the key characteristics that distinguishes action research from most other research approaches and also constitutes one of its main appeals is that action research aims at both improving the subject of the study (often called the research client) and generating knowledge, achieving both at the same time (Kock, 2008). This means that action research is consistent with RMIT Research by Project.

Some of the action research characteristics are also described by Zuber-Skerritt (1996) as follows: Critical (and self-critical) collaborative inquiry by reflective practitioners being, accountable and making results of the inquiry public, self-evaluating the practice and engaged in, participatory problem solving and continuous professional development (Zuber-Skerritt, 1996, p. 228). In relation to DEO service quality, I suggest that whenever DEO stakeholders are collaboratively critical of the DEO’s ability to serve schools, and continuously practice self-evaluation, DEOs will gain an improved ability to serve schools.

Concerning action research types, Hatten (1997) argues that there are at least three main types of action research; technical, practical and emancipatory. The goal of technical action research is the testing of an intervention based on a pre-specified theoretical framework. “The researcher is questioning whether the selected intervention can be applied in a practical setting. The researcher acts as an outside expert who aims to gain the practitioner's interest in the research, and agreement to assist in the implementation of the intervention” (Hatten, 1997). This is why if the MONE is to improve DEOs service quality, then this technical type of action research principle is appropriate, because researcher and participants should gain mutual understanding and agreement on what the problem of service quality is and how to resolve it.
If action research is to change something in an organization; what changes prove it’s an appropriate good action? Kemmis and Taggart in Hughes (2001) suggest that changes should be made across three categories: language and discourse (what is said in the situation), activities and practices (what is done in the situation), and social relationships and organization (who says and does what to whom). This notion is significant to my perception because all DEO stakeholders have to have the same level of understanding first on what service quality is all about before deciding on the necessary activities to improve it. Secondly, it is important that all stakeholders accept the same service quality improvement model. This is why it is very important for an action researcher to describe each specific change he or she plans to make.

Another important aspect of action research that needs to be understood is ‘collaborative participation’. Hughes (2004) in this context suggests that the word means ‘participation in decision making’. DEO stakeholders as co-researchers therefore, are those who engage in dialogue so that their contribution can make a difference to the questions asked, the action taken, the research design, the action plan and/or the dissemination of results. In this case, passive participation does not count and most importantly any information from key participants, especially DEO staff members, principals-teachers and board members needs to be valued properly.

Coorey explains in Cohen (2005) that action research is a process in which practitioners study problems scientifically so that they can evaluate, improve and steer decision making and practice. While according to Kemmis and Taggart, also in Cohen (2005), action research is to plan, act, observe and reflect more carefully, more systematically, and more rigorously than one usually does in everyday life. This is why action research is usually designed to bridge the gap between research and practice (Cohen, 2005, p. 226-227).

Based on the discussion of action research characteristics above, now I am more confident that by going on the action research path, I will have gone in the right direction in my journey of knowing and finding the right answers for my research questions. All of these discussions strengthen my judgment that action research is an appropriate methodology in researching DEO service quality improvement.
Following Action Research Steps

So far, key characteristics of action research have been identified. It is time now to focus discussions on the action research process. Peter (2002) for example, suggests an action research process using a DATA-DATA model.

DATA-DATA model is meant to serve practitioners as a guide to doing action research, a back and forth way of knowing in their practice. This way of doing action research forces practitioners to include themselves in their research. It is because they will not be able to escape the strongly reflective pull of the first view stages of the process. Their practical theory and self-knowledge will be better for the experience. (Peter, 2002)

The model consists of eight cyclic phases of action and reflection leading to a plan for designing and conducting an action research event. Each phase of the model corresponds to a letter in the acronym: In the first part of DATA-DATA; D=Describe, A=Analyze, T=Theorize and A=Action. In the second part; D=Design, A=Analyze, T=Theorize, and A=Action. The first DATA represent the reflective practice and the second DATA represent methodological aspects of research and the necessity of revising one’s practical theory based on the findings (Peter, 2002).

Unlike Peter’s model with a linear model of AR process above, Stringer’s model uses a cyclical model consisting of look, think and act phases. Stringer suggests that a spiral of looking, thinking, and action best reflect the action research process. Stringer calls this process as the interacting spiral shown in Figure 2-3 (see next page). This spiral model conveys that action research is not neat, orderly, and linear, but is a process of repeating and revising procedures and interpretations (Waterman, 2001).
Similar to Stringer, Kemmis and Taggart in Mountney (1996) suggest that to conduct action research requires the following activities in a cyclical and iterative way:

- to develop a plan of action to improve what is already happening;
- to act to implement the plan;
- to observe the effect of action in the context in which it occurs, and
- to reflect on these effects as a basis of further planning, subsequent action and so on, through a succession of cycles. (Mountney, 1996, p. 140)

Schmuck, in addition, suggests that there are two different models of action research processes. The two model of action research (proactive and responsive) differ primarily in when data are collected and analyzed during the cycle of events.
According to Schmuck, in proactive action research, action precedes data collection and analysis. While in responsive action research, researchers are careful to collect data before they try an innovative practice, because it is important to understand the situation before acting. There is a worry that the action taken might backfire because others did not understand the motivation behind it. The steps of responsive action research are described as follows:

Responsive action research process:
1. Collect data to diagnose the situation;
2. Analyze the data for themes and ideas for action;
3. Distribute the data to others and announce changes that will be tried;
4. Try a new practice to have a different effect on others;
5. Check to see how others are reacting;
6. Collect data to diagnose the situation (Schmuck, 1999).
After the fifth step, the sequence circles back to step 1 (collect data). However in this second data collection, the general method previously used will be supplemented with specific questions about the particular issue worked on.

Finally, another action research model is suggested by Mills (2000) suggesting that there are four steps for action research project called *dialectic action research spiral* as illustrated by the following figure. It is a ‘spiral’ because it includes four steps where researcher cycle back and forth between data collection and a focus, and data collection and analysis and interpretation as illustrated below.

**Figure 2-5:**

**Dialectic Action Research Spiral**

![Dialectic Action Research Spiral Diagram](https://example.com/diagram)

Source: Mills (2000)

In this model, according to Mills, first a researcher identifies an area of focus (1). The process involves defining an area of focus, doing reconnaissance (self-reflection and description), reviewing the literature, and writing an action plan to guide the research. Then the researcher collects data (2) by gathering multiple sources of data (quantitative or qualitative) and by using a variety of inquiry tools, such as questionnaires, interviews, or attitude scale. The action researcher then continues this phase with analysis and interpretation (3), and finally develops an action plan (4) (Mills, 2000).

From the readings on action research processes above (Peter, Stringer, Kemmis-Taggart, Schmuck and Mills), it seems that action research process could be
administered in many different ways. When first considering what to do to improve DEO service quality, I assumed that firstly I needed to know what is actually happening in the field. Secondly, factors influencing service quality should be analyzed; and finally, what actions are needed to improve the DEO services quality continuously. In other word, to improve DEO service quality, these several basic steps need to be administered; data collection, data analysis and interpretation, and finally develop an action plan. Although not a hundred percent similar, my steps in implementing action research below having some similarities to Mills’ model described above. Instead of using four steps, I use three phases of understanding the situation (combining Mills’s focus and data collection), formulating solution and finally finding best implementation. In addition, unlike Mills who uses a single cycle, I prefer Stringer and Schmuck model with their dynamic cycle showing that the process are supposed to improve and avoid arriving at the same point as before. Nevertheless, in some ways my action research phases could be said to be influenced or informed by Mills’s model.

**Implementing Action Research**

Inspired by the action research designs and steps discussed above, especially Mills’s model, now the journey of knowing of this Research by Project could be divided into several different transitional points or phases. These phases below emerged from the main activities taken during this research process in trying to answer my research questions as described in chapter 1: How to improve DEO service quality in this Indonesian decentralized era? The phases could be illustrated using the figure 2-6 on page 34 and grouped into three phases below;

1. Understanding the Issue,

   Understanding the nature of the DEO service quality problems after decentralization was a preliminary study. In this step, three major activities were undertaken; attending relevant meetings or discussions, conducting literature reviews or researching the printed word in articles, documents, laws or regulations, and collecting data or information from respondents. These
activities were mostly conducted during the end of 2004 to the middle of 2007.

Relevant literature and document reviews were continually undertaken during the whole process of this research, while the relevant meetings and discussions were held at the beginning of the project. When collecting data or information relating to service quality, three main DEO actors/stakeholders were identified; the DEO staff as service providers, Board members as observers or controllers and school masters or teachers as client or customers. The information was gathered through different activities or occasions by using various data collecting methods such as questionnaire, observation, interviews or FGDs. By the end of these activities, I was hoping to really understand the nature or context of service quality problems after decentralization.

2. Formulating a Solution,

In this phase, after collecting and analyzing data, themes relevant to the focus and aims of this research were identified. Based on those findings, efforts to improve DEO service quality was formulated, mainly the formulation of MSS (Minimum Service Standard). Building DEO service quality improvement concepts, especially Minimum Service Standard (MSS) is actually a very long process involving many different institutions. This was the moment when I finally met people who were really concerned about MSS and worked collaboratively; the MSS Team. MSS formulation was done during 2007 to 2008, and will be continued in conjunction with the identification of its budgeting scheme, implementation and legal issues.

3. Garnering Support,

Before the product was implemented, a trial was administered to introduce the concept of MSS and to gain responses from stakeholders. This phase consists of several different activities not only including FGD in local government and schools, but also consultations with different key personnel
at central level during 2009. The main intention of this phase was to explain the MSS model, persuade people that the model was in everyone’s interest, identify possible blockers or hindrances and seek the best possible implementation strategies. These three phases are reflected and detailed in Chapter 4 as ‘The Story of the Project’ which critically describes the action that I took during the research project which is illustrated in the following figure:

**Figure 2-6: The Journey of Knowing in Three Phases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE ONE UNDERSTANDING ISSUE</th>
<th>PHASE TWO FORMULATING SOLUTION</th>
<th>PHASE THREE GARNERING SUPPORTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Exploring the Context</td>
<td>4. Developing an MSS Framework</td>
<td>7. Checking the Concept to Policy Makers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: prepared by researcher

The three phases identified above only become clear in the second half of the project. Many of the data gathering activities were opportunistic; this opportunity only emerged during the course of the project. They were not obvious at the outset, for example when a workshop was held, the opportunity to collect participants perception raised and relevant questionnaires were distributed straight away.
Phase One:
UNDERSTANDING THE ISSUE

1. EXPLORING THE CONTEXT
   a. Readings Documents (Exploring the Printed Worlds, understanding decentralization and service quality, a continuous activity)
   b. Meetings (Hearing and catching what people might be saying, 8 meetings, on average 25 people each)

2. UNDERSTANDING DEO’s STAKEHOLDERS’ VIEWS (Questionnaires)
   a. National Board of Education Workshops, 71 from 110 possible respondents, 14 July 2005
   b. National Teachers and School Principals Workshops, 140 from 160 possible respondents, 25 July 2005
   c. National District Staff Workshop, 73 of 109 possible respondents, 10 October 2005
   d. Yogya Teachers and School Principals Workshops, 20 of 20 respondents, 24 August 2007

3. VISITING THE FIELD (Field Visits to observe, discuss and interview with DEO Officers, Board members and School personnel)
   a. Yogyakarta, 22, 23 August 2005, FGD, observe and interview DEO personnel, Board member, School personnel.
   b. Praya, 25, 26 August 2005, FGD, observe and Interview DEO personnel, Board member, School personnel.
   c. Bekasi, 23 February 006, FGD, observe and Interview DEO personnel, Board member, School personnel.
   d. Tangerang, 24 February 006, FGD, observe and Interview DEO personnel, Board member, School personnel.

Phase Two:
FORMULATING A SOLUTION

4. Developing MSS framework, Initial National MSS Team Meeting, Team Building, Friday, August 1, 2008. Attended by 18 people (donor representative, main unit representatives, proposed team members);
6. Testing the first Draft of MSS through FGDs, Finding the Basics of MSS
   a. NTB, Hotel Lombok Raya, Thursday October 16, 2008; 3 different groups (DEO staff, SD/SMP principals) about 60 people all.
   b. Sapphire Hotel in Yogyakarta (October 23, 2008); 3 different groups (DEO staff, SD/SMP principals) about 60 people
   c. Riau, Quality Hotel, Thursday October 30, 2008; 3 different groups (DEO staff, SD/SMP principals) about 60 people all.
Phase Three: GARNERING SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION

7. Consulting with policy makers, interviewed 15 key personnel, mainly in central level (MONE, MORA, MOHA, National Education Standard, and National Accreditation)

8. Gathering Feedback from Stakeholders. MSS Focus Group Discussion, Implementing MSS Instruments’ NTB December 17-20, 2008; 2 DEO FGDs, 4 School FGDs

9. Garnering Support; Board of Education Member Dissemination, Introducing MSS Discussion
   a. 1st Round, Purnama 2 Hotel, Cipayung, Bogor, West Java, March 11, 2009. South Meeting Room, 13.00 am, 99 members attended;
   b. 2nd round, Wisma Bahtera Hotel, Cipayung, Bogor, West Java, March 17, 2009. Grand Meeting Room, 13.00 am, 112 members attended;

Although the action research model looks nice and tidy, in reality it is not as neat as that. The three phases did not always occur in a linear way, because the action researcher could go back and forth from data collecting activities and data analysis process, and so on as illustrated by many arrows in the Mills figure above (To see a more detailed process of this action research, please see chapter 4).

In reality the efforts or activities needed for improving DEO service quality are messier than its simplified summary above and, of course, it is actually a never ending process. This research provides a mode to understand the phenomenon from its actor’s point of view and to seek some probable solutions. This is why further steps are needed to explore and assure that DEOs service quality would keep improving even long after this research is completed. To conclude this discussion, it is clear now that the research design or methodology of this Research by Project is conducted within the qualitative research area and by taking an action research path. The next discussion then would be focused on methods or data collecting procedures as the transit points in this journey of knowing.
Visiting Transit Points to Collect Data

Now that an action researcher holds a proper map and chosen route or path, the following decision need to be made; which transit points are available and feasible during the journey. If transit points are considered as a series of methods or data collecting techniques, some transit points need to be visited. In other word, a chain of available methods could be administered to collect necessary evidence, as suggested by Creswell and Stringer below.

Creswell suggests that an action researcher could adopt a series of data collecting procedures called “Three Es” as illustrated by his data collection technique figure below. The ‘3Es’ stands for Experiencing (observation or field visit), Enquiring (interview, questionnaire or group discussion) and Examining (analyzing document or record). In other words, to answer his research questions, an action researcher could combine several different data collecting methods during his journey of knowing such as document analysis, group discussion (including meetings and consultations), questionnaires, interviews, observations, field visits, etc.

Figure 2-7:
Creswell’s Taxonomy of Action Research Data Collection Techniques

Stringer offers a different approach for data collecting procedures. According to Stringer, data collecting procedures in action research are implemented in cyclical ways and consist of different methods as illustrated in the following figure.

**Figure 2-8:**
**Building the Picture: Emerging Accounts**

Compared to Creswell’s, I believe that Stringer’s data collection technique in action research is more appropriate and closer to reality. Mainly because based on the constructivism epistemology, the truth of reality is intersubjectively constructed. The knowledge or understanding about DEO service quality within the Indonesian decentralized education system is actually constructed, modified, clarified, enriched and enhanced among its involving actors over a period of time. This research has only tried to facilitate the process and at the same time offers a probable solution. The following methods or data collecting techniques were implemented.
**Interview**

Interview as it is defined by Bogdan & Biklen (1992) is an interaction and conversation between two persons in order to get information from the other. Further, they suggest that an interview was used to gather descriptive data in the subject’s or respondent’s own words so that the researcher can develop insights on how subjects interpret some piece of the world. Interviews were also appropriate to collect in-depth data about phenomena from the researcher’s and his respondents’ points of view. For this research, interviews were used to collect data from DEO staff, school principals, teachers, school committee, and district education boards regarding their view of the current status of district service quality, factors influencing service quality and probable solutions to the problem. At least 39 interviews were conducted with DEO personnel, Board members, school personnel and central level key personnel.

**Questionnaire**

Questionnaires are a data collection technique in the form of written questions or statements to gather opinion, ideas or other information from respondents. Questionnaires are valuable not only because of their capacity to gather opinions, but also to maintain confidentiality of respondent opinions or ideas, particularly when dealing with criticism of an existing situation.

In this qualitative action research, open-ended questionnaires were used. The questionnaires do not contain boxes to tick, but a blank section for the respondent to write in an answer. While closed-ended questionnaires are used to find out how many people use a service, on the other hand, open ended questionnaires might be used to find out what people think about it. As its answer is open, there is no standard answer to these questions. Consequently, data analysis is usually more complex because it is opinions which are sought not numbers. In this Research by Project, questionnaires were used to collect information, opinions, ideas and criticism from
DEO staff, school principals, teachers, school committee, and district education boards about their perceptions concerning educational service quality. Overall, questionnaires were distributed to 399 respondents and 304 returned.

**Group Discussions and Meetings**

Group discussion was conducted by the researcher with groups of respondents as if it were a collective interview. In case of education service quality, the respondents consisted of DEO staff, school principals, teachers, school committees and district education boards. The objectives of the discussions were to brainstorm and extract ideas regarding the current status of district service quality, proposing new alternatives and exploring strategies to achieve improved service quality. In many occasions I also attended meetings relevant to this research either at central or local level. In sum, there were 25 FGD and meetings during this research.

**Field Visit or Observation**

Visiting DEOs was one of the most important methods of data collection. Field visits were used to collect real and authentic data about service quality at the DEOs during this research (Bekasi in West Java Province, Tangerang City in Banten Province, Yogyakarta City in Yogyakarta Province, and Praya in East Nusa Tenggara Province). In these visits the researcher observed the situation, talked to respondents and collected written data regarding the real status of district service quality and probable activities to improve it. (To locate the sites of these districts please refer to Indonesian Map on appendix 6 page 273). While visiting those districts, I was not only observing the DEO offices, but also some schools in those areas.

**Written Data**

When official data or legal aspects (laws, regulations or decrees) were needed, then data was collected from relevant official documents. Unfortunately, not all documents were completely accurate and therefore it was important to cross-check or triangulate this written data with another source, such as interviews and observations. The written documents related to decentralization and education service provision
could be traced back to the time when the decentralization law was firstly passed in 1999. Soon after that, many complementary laws and regulations were also enacted. In addition, the documents could also cover any academic paper, article or reports related to decentralization or service provision after decentralization, either from studies within Indonesian institutions or abroad.

Having stopped at different transit points to seek necessary evidence, I realized that a lot of data had been collected to answer the research questions and to formulate the most promising solution. The following section will discuss briefly how that data was analyzed.

**Analyzing Data**

After passing all the defined transit points, a considerable amount of data is ready to be analyzed. It is important to note that in qualitative data analysis, the researcher and its participants are collaboratively constructing the meaning of reality as they feel and experience from the field.

According to Krauss (2005), the researcher should avoid imposing his or her views, should set aside any preconceived knowledge, and be open, sensitive, and empathetic to the participants’ responses. As the data were analyzed, knowledge and meaningful perceptions emerged. Krauss elaborates further that meanings are cognitive categories that make up one’s view of reality and with which actions are defined. In line with the principles of constructivism epistemology, in data analysis, this qualitative researcher was only constructing the meaning of decentralization and its service provision as perceived by respondents.

Finally, the researcher will develop themes and storylines featuring the words and experiences of participants themselves as an important result of qualitative data analysis, says Krauss. Thus, as an important learning facilitator, qualitative research and qualitative data analysis in particular could be adopted as a transformative learning tool through their ability to generate new levels and forms of meaning, which can in turn transform perspectives and actions.
Using RMIT Guidelines prepared by Mike Brown (2004), the process of qualitative data analysis generally covers several steps below;

1. Counting, categories data and measuring the frequency of occurrence of the categories;
2. Patterning, noting of recurring patterns or themes;
3. Clustering, grouping of objects, persons, activities, settings, etc;
4. Factoring, grouping of variables into a small number of hypothetical factors;
5. Relating variables, discovery of the type of relationship (if any) between two or more variables;
6. Building of causal networks, development of chains or web of linkages between variables;
7. Relating findings to general theoretical frameworks, attempt to find general propositions that account for the particular findings in this study. (Brown, 2004, p. 401)

Based on the steps above, the data gathered from DEO stakeholders are analyzed to identify emerging categories or themes. Those themes are then grouped to see the most popular ones according to respondents’ views. As a result, the respondents’ views relating to service quality are revealed and in turn probable solutions could be formulated. Before the solution is implemented, it is important to check again with respondents in case changes are still necessary.

Another way of analyzing qualitative data is suggested by Miles & Huberman (1984). They developed a data analysis process consisting 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 appear in written-up field notes.

Figure 2-9: Component of Data Analysis (Interactive Model)

Source: Miles & Huberman (1984)
Data display is an organized assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action taking. While conclusion drawing/verification is basically decided on what things mean, notion of regularities, patterns, explanations, possible configurations, causal flows, and propositions need to be explored. As illustrated by Miles and Huberman (1984), the reality of data analysis is actually more complicated or messy. Typing and interpreting respondents’ response is challenging, and so is the grouping and its identifying themes.

Considering Ethical Issues,
Code of Conduct during the Journey of Knowing.

In understanding this research project I was fully aware of ethical considerations. The foremost rule of ethics is that the 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, and personal integrity of the researcher is required. Bogdan and Biklen (1992) identify two very important ethical issues in research with human subjects, that is, informed consent and the protection of the subject from harm: (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.

Throughout the project processes, I took full ethical considerations. For example, I showed respondents my official letter from RMIT, I had to get permission from the respondents that I researched, before interview I explained the purpose of interviews, I asked them to put no name of the respondent in the questionnaire responses, I protected the respondents from harm and risks by keeping the names of the respondents confidential, and I had to practice integrity, that is, what I wrote happened, really happened, because falsifying data is unethical. Being aware of those above ethical issues, I followed RMIT’s ethical rules (see appendix 2).
To conclude this chapter, now I realize that when I firstly embarked on this Research by Project many years ago as a journey of knowing, little did I know about decentralization and education service quality. The long trip during the process of this research has provided me with an important understanding as to how to view the service issues from the DEOs stakeholder. Because change is needed to improve DEO service quality, I decided to follow the action research path to find necessary evidence to persuade people toward that change. After visiting key places and meeting different individuals during this exhaustive journey of knowing, eventually I realized that, despite my ambition to change the situation, borrowing Kraus’s (2005) idea, this in fact was only a small part of a social learning process for construing appropriating new or revised interpretations of one’s experience as a guide to better action. Additional research and or activities are still needed to improve DEO service quality.

Chapter 3 will explore the context of this research by project, mainly dealing with DEO’s service quality in this decentralizing Indonesia.
Chapter 3  
CONTEXT ANALYSIS:  
SERVICE QUALITY IN DEOs

Based on the Indonesian decentralization context and international experiences discussed in the collaborative paper (see exhibit 34 in portfolio), decentralization should hold some promise for improving the delivery of public services because decentralization theoretically brings authority closer to the stakeholder or customer. As a consequence, it is envisaged that customer or citizen satisfaction will be improved, because service providers are closer and more responsive to the customers’ needs. Decentralization promises reform in all public service sectors, including education but, unfortunately, improvements are not always guaranteed. This chapter discusses the relationship between decentralization and service delivery, what service quality really means, and how Indonesian decentralization deals with education service quality, and specifically, MSS.

Service Delivery and Decentralization

This section explores information about the impact of decentralization on service quality and service delivery. Information for this section is drawn from many sources, including articles, government reports, national or local newspapers, and from international experts and organizations. It is apparent that decentralization affects service quality at the local level and the impact varies from country to country. Indonesia is not an exception to this. It seems that decentralization could never guarantee service quality improvement. Some factors inhibiting service quality improvement are discussed below.

One of the motivations for decentralization is improving service quality (Ahmad, 2005). This is supposed to provide a customer focused approach. In other words proponents argue that there is a link between quality and decision making. Further, educational service quality is more likely to improve if decisions impacting on
quality are made as close to the customer as possible. Locally based decisions should improve quality! However notions of service quality are contested. One of the challenges of an attempt to improve service quality is to develop a common understanding of the components of the service and how these components should be improved. This project was no different.

Governments around the world have varied motivations for decentralization. For example, when the Ugandan Government embarked on its decentralization program in the 1995, an explicit aim was to improve service quality. Even when it is not explicit, improving service quality is an implicit motivation behind most decentralization efforts. In Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, for example political and economic transformation was the primary motive but improving educational service quality was a secondary motive. In Latin America, it was to reinforce the transition to democracy; in South Africa, Sri Lanka and Indonesia, it was a response to ethnic or regional conflict and in Chile, Uganda and Cote d’Ivoire, it was to improve the quality of basic services (Ahmad, 2005, p. 1).

While it is too early to assess success or failure, some common problems have begun to emerge. Regardless of the primary motivation, decentralization does affect educational service quality. Junaid Ahmad (2005) identified some effects that decentralization polices can have on service quality in education. First, it points up the lack of capacity at sub-national levels of government to exercise responsibility for public services. Second, there is often a misalignment of responsibilities, possibly because the process is incomplete, possibly for political reasons. Third, while decentralization was intended to strengthen the political power of the lower tiers of government vis-à-vis the centre, it has also increased the possibility of political capture within these lower tiers. In other words local elites take control of decision making at the expense of the broader local community. In addition, Satu Kahkonen (2001) suggests that even though decentralization holds great promise for improving public service delivery, its outcome depends on its design and on the institutional arrangements governing and supporting its implementation. He lists several factors that have kept decentralized service delivery from achieving its efficiency goals, including:
a. Local governments have limited authority;
b. Citizen influence at the local level is hampered by limited information;
c. Exit mechanisms have limited effects on public service delivery;
d. Local governments have weak capacity;
e. Decentralization can inhibit the delivery of some public goods.

One specific observation on the Indonesian context by USAID/AusAID (2006) argues that the service quality scene in Indonesia post decentralization is clouded. It poses the question: why is it that improvement or innovation in service quality appears to be much below what the general arguments for decentralization would suggest? The two international development agencies identified more than ten reasons for the gap between expected service levels and the reality in the field. These reasons can be grouped into four areas, although it needs to be acknowledged that these areas are interconnected.

First is, the lack of service delivery capacity of sub-national officials, including their concept of service coupled with their lack of technical skills. Second is, attitudes to power and how it is exercised. This could be divided into two separate but related areas: the preoccupation with extracting personal and organizational gains (legally and otherwise) by bureaucrats and front line workers, i.e., corruption in its many forms; and traditional attitudes towards power by position holders, wherein serving the public is not the driving motive behind the attainment of posts. The third area relates to the attitude and behavior of the clients at all levels. Individual citizens, local institutions such as schools and, in turn, local government are reluctant to make claims on service providers. Service will only improve if the client is both willing and able to articulate their expectations of providers. The fourth area relates to the total context including the fact that decentralization is still relatively new, but more importantly, the dynamic nature of Indonesian decentralization. The increase in the number of districts and other administrative changes is a good illustration of this dynamism. Finally, there appears to be a reluctance to use existing structures and skills especially at the village and sub-district level.

This report, funded by the USAID and AusAID, argues further, that perhaps it is unfair to expect rapid and extensive improvements in service delivery when central and regional governance is still fragile and problematic.
The lack of service improvements consistent with mainstream decentralization theory has been noted in a number of decentralizing countries, and has been attributed in part to weak local government capacities, capture by local elites, corruption and inequitable resource distribution.

Another observation on Indonesian service quality after decentralization is made by the World Bank (2006):

While Indonesia has made remarkable progress in improving services over the last decades, there are ample indications that not all citizens receive the basic services they need.

This report was based on seminar sponsored by Indonesian Ministry of Social Welfare and The World Bank (Making Services Work for the Poor in Indonesia, 2006). It suggests that decentralization and democratization have had a profound effect on the way services are managed. Below are some important points raised regarding decentralization implementation and service quality:

a. There is a widespread perception that service delivery deteriorated after Indonesia decentralized in 2001;

b. At the district level, decentralization has created an enormous variety of experiences;

c. Indonesia’s massive decentralization of service delivery in 2000 created unrealized fears of system collapse;

d. The evidence so far suggests that since decentralization some aspects of service delivery have continued to improve;

e. But some worrisome trend reversals occurred as well;

f. Decentralization has resulted in an entirely new paradigm for service delivery;

g. There is varying capacity to deliver services at the district level;

h. Decentralization has created a dynamic and heterogeneous environment;

i. The physical quality of basic services is often low.

This report suggests that even though there have been some improvements in service delivery, in general, local governments are still facing serious problems in improving service quality, including in the education sector. The variability of DEO capacities across the country is most probably the main factor behind the low quality of its basic services.

The first formal appraisal of Indonesian decentralization was done by the Asia Foundation and USAID (2002) on their project called IRDA (Indonesia Rapid
Decentralization Appraisal. Although this appraisal was undertaken in the early years of decentralization, it identifies important points related to service delivery:

a. System barriers. The lack of public service standards makes it very difficult for local governments to define quality services and determine whether they are providing them. This is further aggravated by the bad work ethic of some employees and the fact that there is little funding in the local government budget for public services;

b. Tension between revenue objectives and service objectives. Many local governments focus on increasing their income rather than improving public services. This is exacerbated when public officials engage in corruption that channels resources away from public service. Continuing tension between revenue and service objectives will prevent the sustainability of improvements in public services;

c. In the absence of public service standards from the central government, local governments need to establish their own regulations on these standards as soon as possible. At the same time, central government needs to start developing national minimum public service standards that local governments can use as a benchmark. With inputs from donor groups and civil society, these standards for local government performance could be used to develop criteria for identifying best practices;

d. Priority should be given to institutionalizing mechanisms for citizen feedback about local government performance and services, and for disseminating information about good practices that can be replicated;

e. A public service auditing system, for both central and local government, will facilitate service improvement. This is because the quality of public services is necessarily linked to the accountability of local governments in delivering such services. An accountability mechanism will open possibilities for feedback, both positive and negative, on public services. This in turn will stimulate public participation in decentralization.

This report also recommends the importance of using service standards to define DEO quality services and determine whether DEOs are providing them. Even further, the report urges the central government to start developing national minimum public service standards that local governments can use as a benchmark. In turn, the standards could be used as a public service auditing system to measure and assure DEO service quality in providing school needs. This reinforces the need for my research to develop relevant MSS for DEOs.

Another significant survey on Indonesian Service Delivery was undertaken by the World Bank. It argues that long before decentralization, the problem of service delivery existed. The question is asked about how people perceive service delivery
after decentralization. People’s perceptions towards service delivery are illustrated in a World Bank (2003) survey (below):

**Figure 3-1:**
**Household Perception of Service Quality in Education and Health**

![Bar chart showing household perception of service quality in education and health.]

Note: percent of households that perceives services to be worse/same/better than before decentralization.

Source: Governance and Decentralization Survey. This survey covered households in 144 kabupaten and kotas.


The initial results from a nationwide survey on service delivery conducted in 2003 are encouraging. Some 89 percent of households believe education services have improved or remained the same after decentralization compared to before decentralization (Figure 3-1). It might equally be argued that about 60% see the situation as the same or worse. The households have similar opinions on health services in their region. On average, only 6 percent (3 percent) of households believe education (and health) services have deteriorated after decentralization.

Overall, satisfaction with services is over 50 percent - with the exception of the police, a central service, which receives a satisfactory rating of only 35 percent (Figure 3-2). One possibility is that for most bureaucrats, decentralization was only for economic and political reasons following the fall of Suharto, and has nothing to do with service quality. Because of the merging of personnel from two different institutions (ministerial office and local government institution) at the district level, most bureaucrats were busy seeking better positions and neglecting their functions as public servants - they were too busy trying to survive.
Although this data is fairly general they do indicate some positive trends in local perceptions. The following comments provide more detail about how Indonesians perceive their own decentralization process related to service delivery.

Legowo (2006) observed that after several years of decentralization the quality of public service in general is still considered low because,

The Regional Governments have not been responsive enough to public complaints regarding the quality of public service. There is even indication that the spending of regional budget (APBD) on public service is lower than that for the bureaucracy. The huge structure of the Regional Government requires many civil servants enjoying high salary, allocating therefore, a big portion of the APDB roughly around 50.3 percent. The whole non-public service spending constitutes 70 percent of APBD while the public service simply enjoys the remaining 30 percent of the APBD.
At the implementation level, Legowo describes further the following weaknesses that were found:

a. conflict in the exercise of authority between different levels of government tends to interrupt public service;
b. establishment of institutions as Local Government’s arms was not strongly oriented toward enhancement of public services, leading to the creation of large, inefficient structures;
c. use of relatively more percentage of the local budget (APBD) for the Local Government apparatus and local legislative bodies, rather than for public services;
d. lack of harmonious relations between regional heads and local parliament (Local House of People’s Representative or DPRD), contrary to the principle of equal partnership.

Based on his observations above, Legowo suggests that serious problems need to be addressed and resolved to improve service quality in local government. These problems are probably the main reasons why service delivery remains stagnant and include: unclear division of authority among governance levels regarding public services; lack of focus and orientation to service quality; lack of adequate budgets for services and, finally, relationship problems between local governments (Bupati or Mayor) and their local house of representatives (DPRD) which may lead to neglect of their local public service responsibilities.

In addition, according to Legowo, most DPRD (local parliaments) are oriented to the interests of the government bureaucracy rather than to the general public’s interest. In almost all the research areas, IRDA found that increases in the retribution tariff (a tax on local public health) of public health centers (puskesmas) were two to six times higher than the previous tariff, the reason being that the region had no financial capacity to subsidize health services in puskesmas (local health centers).

Another observation by Baedhowi (2004) based on qualitative case studies in the Kendal and Surakarta districts of Jawa Tengah Province in 2003, suggests that the public service is still far from satisfying local needs, because several problems still exist after decentralization, mainly related to:

a. Low commitment of local government;
b. Unclear vision and mission of organizations;
c. Unclear concepts of service quality.
Rachmadi (2003) from Semarang, Central Java also explains some problems inhibiting service quality improvement after decentralization - mostly related to local government perceptions of autonomy and decentralization;

a. To some local governments, transfer of authority means “freedom” to do whatever it is necessary to do. Unfortunately sometimes they forget their responsibility to serve the public as their main obligation;

b. Given more authority means more creativity or freedom, but creativity doesn’t necessarily mean increasing the ‘price’ of services in order to raise local government revenue;

c. Ineffective and inefficient local government organization influences the amount of local government spending. This automatically inhibits service quality funding;

d. Unclear definition on who does what concerning SPM or MSS;

e. A complaint mechanism does not exist yet. As a consequence, individual complaints will only promote apathy among citizens as customers.

In this case, Rachmadi raises fundamental points. He argues that in a unitary state like Indonesia, decentralization is not meant to be free from central coordination. Local governments are subject to centrally determined and imposed service standards and accountability mechanisms to show that they have exercised their new roles and functions properly. This is an indication that MSS should be implemented in each Indonesian DEO as soon as possible.

Moreover, Susanto (2006) describes the problems related to government public service in many local government offices. He suggests that most people perceive public services as follows;

a. Public service is a source of complaints; most people would try to avoid it if possible. Generally, this gives a bad image of local government;

b. Government officers are supposed to be a ‘servant’ not to be served by the citizen;

c. The main problem in service quality is the human resource itself. These are mainly related to system values and the attitudes or behavioral aspects of humans.

Based on his observations, Susanto suggests that cultural factors such as system values strongly influence public service delivery. For most Indonesians, who are strongly influenced by religious beliefs and still have memories of monarchy and colonialism, serving their leaders is considered to be a good deed. Unfortunately, this
tends to work against democratic governance where leaders or government personnel should serve their citizens. Unlike the passing of legislation and the development of improved organization and management strategies, this is a more difficult problem to resolve, as culture is embedded in people’s attitudes and minds and behaviour.

An Indonesian bureaucrat from BAPPENAS (National Bureau of Planning) Agus Sudrajat (2006) also describes some of the problems related to service delivery improvement after decentralization as follows:

1. Many difficulties still exist in accessing services;
2. Unclear procedures and illegal over-charging for permits or license requirements;
3. It seems that public service is not equally delivered for every citizen, service is usually better and easier for those who are rich;
4. There are some tendencies for the central government to still hold greater authority than it should. As a consequence, public service delivery is not effective, efficient, or economic. There are many possibilities that service unit are not responsive, lack responsibility, and do not represent public needs. In many ways the private sector is better and more satisfactory compared to government services;
5. In many cases, government officials perceive themselves as people who need to be served rather than serving the community;
6. Some weaknesses emerge from local government organizations. The design was not originally set-up to provide service at the local level; sometimes the organization becomes too bureaucratic, and is not well coordinated. These organizations tend to function both as regulating and serving, resulting in inefficient service provision;
7. Some other weaknesses;
   a. Weaknesses or difficulties in service quality, there are problems in measuring local government service quality;
   b. Unclear ‘bottom line’ of local government services. No matter how bad are the services provided, the unit will still exist without fear of sanctions or bankruptcy;
   c. Local government avoidance of ‘bureaucratic influences’, for example in setting priorities;
8. As most government service is characterized by monopoly, they usually lack competitiveness, and there is low attention to quality improvement. Even worse; many officials take opportunities to be bribed; otherwise they will deliver the service in a more difficult ways. This is why in many occasions; government services create a poor image of untrustworthiness.

In addition to the data contained in reports from international organizations, the local specialist, Agus Sudrajat (2006), also outlines his concerns regarding the difficulty of measuring local government service quality above. He argues that there is no such
concept as ‘bottom line’ in local government services. As a result, most citizens or customer are unable to criticize or voice their complaints if service delivery fails. (This is reinforced by Indonesian attitudes - complaining is seen as being impolite.) This is more support for my contention that developing service quality auditing or an accountability mechanism is crucial to the success of decentralization. As mandated by the Government Regulation 65/2005, MSS is considered as a way of measuring local government capacity to implement its new obligations. In the education sector, it would measure the DEOs’ capacity to fulfill its tasks to provide for school needs.

While according to Meuthia (2007), in the last few years, Indonesian decentralization is in fact a political reform from centralization to democratization, the reform is mainly to restructure the political setting among the three governance tiers. Very little was mentioned in legislation about the reform of public service quality. It is therefore not surprising that service delivery at the local level is not the main focus yet. Service, she argues, continues to be neglected. After more than five years of decentralization implementation, now is the time for DEOs to improve their performance in delivering quality service to schools and communities.

From the various sources above, it seems that even though improved service quality is one of the stated important decentralization goals, in reality, its implementation is complex and improved service quality is not guaranteed and has not been delivered. Many international and Indonesian observers noticed that even long before decentralization, service quality problems already existed in Indonesia. For many reasons, mainly related to the abrupt ‘big bang’ reform, varied local capacity, poor design and technical processes, inadequate accountability mechanisms and lack of clearly articulated service standards, it seems it is still too early to expect service quality to be substantially improved.

Public complaints about service quality still exist in various mass media. For example Jaringan Kerja Pemerhati Pelayanan Publik Kabupaten Gowa (Jaker P3G) or Public Service Watch Network in Gowa (South Sulawesi Province) released its survey findings (Tribune Timur Makassar, 2007) that communities are still complaining about public services such as education and health services. Lack of medicines, doctors’ absenteeism, and low quality of facilities are common
complaints or concerns in local health centers. In education, for example, high school fees are considered expensive, and high schools are seen to be difficult to access and without sufficient facilities. Another media in Jakarta illustrates how the roof of an Elementary School near the army airport in East Jakarta almost fell down in 2005 leading to the headmaster complaining to the district office (Republika, 2008). Ironically in 2006, the roof finally fell down before renovation due to the strong vibration of an army aircraft passing over it when an air show was held to celebrate an army anniversary. Fortunately, the pupils were outside the building to see the air show.

In order to bring better service provision to citizens; national, provincial and district governments should seek the best strategies to boost service quality. One of the strategies that might be used is to develop and implement national service standards. The lack of nationally mandated service standards makes it very difficult for governments to define quality services and determine whether DEOs are providing them. But, what does service quality really mean? The following section will provide some definitions of service quality, and outline factors to influence its improvement.

What Is Service Quality?

The definition, characteristics and factors influencing service quality are outlined in the following section. Most theories on service quality are related to business or private institutions, only some of them discuss service quality in public or bureaucratic settings. However those theories can still be used to analyze service quality in government organizations.

According to White, Abels, and Niteck (1994) service quality is a judgment about the ability of a service to fulfill its task, or defined quality as “how good is the service? In a more operational way, Sawchuk (2004) suggests that service quality is the combination of two movements: Service, which means knowing what the customer wants and satisfying that need. Quality, which means doing it right the first time, and continually improving the service. These definitions can be applied in a more general way, either for public or private organizations.
Since this study is mainly researching decentralized government organizations, specifically in DEOs, Jennie Litvack’s (World Bank, 2007) definition on public service below is relevant;

public service as a whole can be seen as one of the main instruments with which the governments fulfill its obligations. In the context of decentralization, this tool must often be reshaped in order to perform a new set of duties efficiently, equitably, and effectively. Reform of the civil service, therefore, is the process of modifying rules and incentives to obtain a more efficient, dedicated and performing government labor-force in newly decentralized environment. (Litvak, 2007)

Based on this definition, for the purpose of this study, service quality in DEOs will be understood as how well this organization fulfils its task or its obligation to satisfy the needs of schools for which it has responsibility. In this case, DEOs function as service providers and schools are their customers. Therefore, improving service quality of DEOs in a decentralized system, should also consider the school voices regarding their needs. In other word, efforts to improve schools (as customers), school community satisfaction should be seen as mandatory for every DEO. Although schools are their main customer, DEOs as a government institution are also obligated to serve broader customers including the community and other government institutions. In other word, DEOs should also be responsive to government institution (especially the MONE institution) and to the broader community.

The above definitions are focusing on the ability of an organization to provide quality public services. Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1988) suggest that service quality from the customer’s perspective is based on how they experience and receive the service. They claim that service quality (SERVQUAL) is an abstract concept, and in operationalizing it, they have identified five generic dimensions or factors below:

1. Tangibles (appearance of physical facilities, personnel and equipments/materials);
2. Reliability (ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately);
3. Responsiveness (willingness to help customers and provide prompt service);
4. Assurance (knowledge of and courtesy towards employees, including competence, credibility, ability to provide security, ability to inspire trust and confidence of employees);
5. Empathy (caring and giving individualized attention, an organization should provide to customers, including access, communication, understanding the customer).

Service quality is therefore, not only about an organization’s ability to fulfill its obligatory functions in satisfying customers, but should also be concerned with customer perception or satisfaction. It is also about how an organization as a service provider sets and meets standard operating procedures across those five dimensions. To measure customers’ satisfaction or perceptions of an organization service quality, Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry administered a survey using a SERVQUAL instrument design based on those five dimensions. This survey could also be used in measuring school and community satisfaction with DEO service quality. Unfortunately it does not specify explicitly what capacity an organization should have, and what process should be delivered to fulfill its task. This research is aimed at identifying these processes and tasks.

After discussing what service quality really is, a question related to service provision emerged. For example, how does service provision differ from the provision of goods? DEOs are not goods-production units, their main functions and authorities are to serve schools within their administrative area, and educational stakeholders in general. White et. al. (1994), suggest that unlike goods, where quality is defined by conformity to its specifications, quality service has some unique characteristics as described by the Canadian Treasury Board (2006) below:

- Clients are a direct part of the process, bringing perceptions and expectations to the transaction that become part of their interaction with you;
- Because clients participate fully in the transaction, they are concerned both with the output or result of the transaction, and the process for delivering that outcome;
- In a production environment, eliminating variance is critical to making high-quality goods. In delivering service, satisfying clients depends not on eliminating variance, but rather on personalizing the service delivery to the unique circumstances of each transaction. Applying certain principles
consistently, rather than providing an identical response to each transaction, is the key to delivering quality service;

- Client satisfaction is subjective. It is made up of two essential ingredients - expectations and perceptions of delivery. Clients have unique expectations based on their individual experience and needs. They have their own perception of what they received. Any difference between what they expected to get and what they perceive they got will affect their satisfaction level.

This Canadian comment raises some very important points for service quality in DEOs, particularly the stress on process and outcomes. The DEO is the service provider and schools are the customers. In order to improve service quality, school needs or school voices should be carefully considered as part of the process. Most importantly, applying consistent principles such as MSS is significant in maintaining and improving DEO service quality. Unfortunately, one of the key problems in Indonesia is that schools do not see themselves as the customer or client. They see themselves as subordinates who do not feel empowered to demand an increase in service. Moreover there may be a fear that if they do demand better services, then the DEO may 'punish' them.

The characteristics of quality services as outlined above could be applied either in a private or public institution. Unfortunately, unlike services in private or business institution, service qualities in government institutions such as DEOs are more difficult to measure and improve. Public and government institution have more complex networks and more stakeholders with many different political interests (Dwijanto, 2003). A reasonable solution for this would probably be by implementing SOP (standard operating procedures) in delivering services, to satisfy all organization stakeholders (Metters, 2006). Instead of using profit oriented motives (a culture that generally does not exist in Indonesian bureaucracy) in improving service quality, assuring SOP and improving the accountability mechanisms are technically more applicable in improving government organization service quality. The procedures should cover standardization, supervision, monitoring, evaluation and service quality assurance.
The questions; why are such standards needed in public service delivery? What are the consequences if a government institution fails to provide service quality? What are the benefits of improved service quality? are answered by Sawchuk (2004) as follows: Poor quality service in public organizations may result in complaints to politicians, complaints to public managers, initiative to privatization, raising pressure groups, tax resistance, restructuring and downsizing organization, and lost competition (p. 24). On the contrary, improved service may result in: reduced costs and the ability to do more with less, more time to do work and less time spent on damage control or dealing with dissatisfied customers, a more pleasant and satisfying working environment, a less stressed situation, and public support for the organization.

DEOs as public institutions encounter the benefits of providing good service quality and consequences of poor service quality. The DEO as a service provider should provide good services to schools in its coverage area, otherwise communities, and their schools may propose individual or collective complaints describing the unsatisfactory service and demand the resignation of the personnel in charge. On the other hand, better service quality may result in better public trust in DEO personnel and in the local government in general. And, of course, improvements in service quality would bring recognition for better teaching and learning processes in schools.

In order to be able to focus more clearly on improving service quality in DEOs, key factors influencing service delivery in decentralized government system should be identified first. Azfar and Kahkonen (1999, p. 24) suggest three key factors influencing local government capacity:

1. Human capital;
2. Physical capital, and
3. Incentive structures within the local government.

Unless careful attention is paid to these factors, the ability of local government to provide public service may become worse. In addition, Fizbein (2005, p. 3) in the World Bank report based on experience in Latin American Countries, claims that public service delivery reform should always consider its three main actors;
1. Citizen;
2. Policy makers;
3. Service providers.

The relationship among the service actors and their accountability relationships are described using the figure below:

**Figure 3-3:**
Accountability Framework among the Main Actors in Public Service Delivery

![Accountability Framework Figure]

(Source: World Bank, 2007)

This report conceptualizes an approach that focuses on accountability mechanisms and power relationships between policy makers, providers, and citizens/users. The approach emphasizes the role of three such relationships:

1. The “political voice” of different citizen groups over policy makers in shaping policy design;
2. The “compact” between policy makers and service providers, whether they be public, private, or nongovernmental; and
3. The “client power” (either through the exercise of a more direct form of voice or through choice) of citizens vis-à-vis the service providers.

The relationship of service providers, citizens and policy makers above shows the complexity of service quality improvements in government organizations. In this case, the DEO is only small part of the whole government organization. In a broader context, the complexity of service provision also suggested by Omar Azfar and Satu
Kahkonen (1999) indicate that there are many factors influencing the performance of decentralized service provision:

1. Political framework;
2. Fiscal dimension;
3. Transparency;
4. Citizen participation;
5. Civil society and social structure;

Considering the various factors influencing public service above, it can be seen that improving public service quality is not a simple, easy or overnight business, but requires a significant and challenging effort. The DEO as the lowest tier in Indonesian governance is a public education service provider that is also influenced by these factors. Researching all factors influencing DEO service quality within a single research project and in a limited amount of time is too demanding and impractical. In the long run, this research basically aims at dealing only with small part of these multifactors, mainly to improve the capacity of DEO as the main target of education decentralization. But before any capacity building is carried out, in the short run, assessment is needed to see how good service is delivered and to design appropriate capacity building programs and activities. This is why MSS as one of assessment tools is important, and building MSS implementation guidelines in this research is becoming more important than mere building capacity at DEO level. In the context of DEOs, MSS can be used to provide guidance and goals for DEOs and can also be used as an assessment tool to measure DEO performance. By government regulation 65/2005, MSS is a mandatory requirement that should be implemented in each district.

However, there is no agreement or decision yet on what definition of service quality to adopt, there is no clear and established methodology to measure the different aspects or components of service quality and there is no culture in DEOs of seeking, collating and reporting on client or customer feedback. In addition, the national legislative framework is still unclear and ambiguous and changing and evolving. Based on the literature in this section concerning service quality definition, and the public perceptions of service quality implementation after decentralization, it can be concluded that improving DEO service quality in this decentralized era is no easy
task. The following section describes one of the Indonesian government’s efforts to anticipate the possibility of decreasing education service quality after decentralization, by implementing MSS.

**SPM or MSS: Assuring DEO Service Quality**

To understand the context of service quality in the Indonesian decentralized education system, some examination of relevant laws and regulations is necessary. Therefore, several laws related to the distribution of authorities among government tiers and their government regulations will be discussed in this section. Firstly, the main law concerning regional governance, law 22/1999 and its government regulations 25/2000 will be discussed. Secondly, the new law 32/2004 (revision of law 22/1999) on decentralization and its government regulation 38/2007. Most importantly, the latest government regulation on MSS 65/2005 will also be discussed, because this is the yardstick to measure how good local government organizations exercise their ‘newly handed down authority’. (This used to be called ‘obligatory functions’.)

The main laws on decentralization were discussed in collaborative paper (exhibit 34). This section will explore Government Regulation 25/2000 on Government Authority and The Provincial Authority as an Autonomous Region. For many observers, the fact that this regulation only specifies the central and provincial government authority without describing clearly the district/municipal (local) government authority is a serious weakness (GOI, 2000b). As a consequence, in order to be able to exercise their new authority legally, all DEOs should interpret and formulate their own obligatory functions based on Government Regulation 25/2000. Another consequence of this regulation is that there are now varied local government regulations, even among districts within the same province. As a result of these different interpretations, DEO organizational structures and functions also vary from place to place, and from district to district. Right after DEOs were restructured following decentralization, most local government named their DEOs in different ways, for example, Local Government Education Office, Office of Education and
Learning, Education and Culture, Education and Youth, Education and Library, etc. There are more than twenty different names with different functions and structures. On one hand, this is a sign of democratization, because for the first time in history, districts feel free to design their own organization after years of rigid centralization. Unfortunately, on the other hand, this is only temporary consolation. The differences in nomenclature and practice tend to cause confusion and hinder effective coordination, organizational communication and local education management.

As mentioned above, in response to Government Regulation No. 25/2000, local governments defined their own authority in the education sector differently. Although, there are central government guidelines on how to formulate organizational structures and functions of DEO, the guidelines are usually not adopted. Local government officials have tended to formulate their own regulations about DEO functions based on their own views and perceptions. According to Government Regulation 8/2003 on Local Government Organizations, DEO organizational structure and its functions are proposed by the district head to the local House of Representatives. After being approved by the local House of Representatives then, the DEO structure and functions are stipulated by a local government decree. Unfortunately, most local governments neglected the central government guidelines in restructuring their organization, and as a result a range of DEO structure and functions exists. This is worrying, because the failure to specify the structure and role/responsibilities of local government creates uncertainty and confusion and is a major weakness that hinders the decentralization process.

Baedhowi (2004) suggests that each district/municipality (Kabupaten/Kota) should hold a comprehensive education function or authority in order for DEOs to be able to formulate and implement their new authority in better ways for schools and community. He proposed, that based on government regulation 25/2000, DEO functions should be stipulated by national, provincial and district regulation. The function should cover and specify district policy and its implementation mainly related to education finance, facilities, and personnel. In addition, the function should also include any relevant function such as DEO planning, organizing, managing, developing, and supervising processes. Baedhowi proposed 32 DEO functions based
mainly on his interpretation of government regulation 25/2000 above (please see appendix 4).

While the list developed by Baedhowi is comprehensive it is, in my opinion, too complicated and demanding. In other word, by trying to achieve all functions, DEOs will more likely achieve little. It is doubtful whether many of the staff or people in a DEO would be able to implement the functions. In fact any attempt to achieve all 32 functions would most probably result in a lower performance. This is not the only problem with this very long list. For example, item 4 requires that DEOs ‘develop student competency standards’ for kindergarten, primary and secondary students based upon minimum competencies stipulated by national government. This assumes that staff in district offices understand the national standards and how they operate. Because it requires DEO staff to develop competencies it is reasonable to expect that DEO staffs are themselves ‘competent’ in curriculum development and assessment. Although the list is useful for understanding DEO functions, in reality not all local governments adopted it in their local government regulations. This is why government regulation 25/2000 was revised by government regulation 38/2007 where district and municipality functions are clearly specified. These DEO functions, as listed by the new Government Regulation 38/2007 are fundamental for defining what appropriate input, process and output a DEO should have, to provide better service quality to schools.

Compared to the DEOs functions in the centralized era, their responsibilities and obligatory function have almost doubled. In the centralized era, DEOs were responsible for elementary education matters only, especially related to personnel, finance, and facility aspects. But in this decentralized era, their responsibility is much more than before; they are now responsible for all education matters at all levels (including preschool, elementary, junior and senior high education, vocational and general) except for tertiary or higher education. However, ensuring that this new authority is clearly understood and implemented is the challenge. In response to this issue, the government introduced a concept called *SPM* or MSS. To ensure that those obligatory functions are really implemented at district and municipal levels, the central government, through each sectoral ministry issued ministerial decrees. The

The MSS details quantitative and qualitative standards/measurements to ensure how well a district is fulfilling its task as mandated by the decentralization law to satisfy its stakeholders. The Educational MSS is a set of indicators on formal, non-formal, Youth, and Sport Education to be achieved by all DEOs as a consequence of their new obligatory functions after decentralization. Without such standards, there would be no evaluation of how those greater authorities handed down to province and district affect regional government service quality provision. Unfortunately, for many observers, the latest MSS are considered too output oriented, because basically they only describe the educational output that should be achieved by district offices. On the contrary, the above literature review and the new Government Regulation 65/2005 suggest that MSS should cover three important factors; input, process and output. For example, the MSS as outlined in Education Ministerial Decree 129a/U/2004 are difficult to quantify and only relate to performance (too output oriented) in junior high schools and says little about the work of DEOs (see table 3-1 below).

![Table 3-1:](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Enrollment of 13-15 age</td>
<td>&gt;= 90</td>
<td>At least 90% in Junior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Drop Out rate</td>
<td>&lt;= 1</td>
<td>Drop Out Rate less than 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 School Facilities</td>
<td>&gt;= 90</td>
<td>Facilities comply with National Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Administrative personnel</td>
<td>&gt;= 80</td>
<td>Schools having enough Non Teaching Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Number of Teachers</td>
<td>&gt;= 90</td>
<td>Adequate Number of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Teacher certification</td>
<td>&gt;= 90</td>
<td>Comply with National Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Student Books</td>
<td>&gt;= 100</td>
<td>Subject matter books fulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Number of Students</td>
<td>&lt;= 30 - 40</td>
<td>Number of student in each class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Student Achievement</td>
<td>&gt;= 90</td>
<td>Satisfactory achievement test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Student Transition Rate</td>
<td>&gt;= 70</td>
<td>Continue to Senior High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: GOI, 2004a, p. 5)
It is clear that the Decree mandates 90% or more of 13-15 year old children in a district should enroll in the Junior High Educational system. Dropout rates should be less than 1% in every single district, and so on. It is obvious that MSS is merely a target or performance standard. In other word, it is only about DEO responsibility for high school output, disregarding a more comprehensive approach covering input, process and output as required by government regulation 65/2005 on MSS. Basically it indicates very little about the whole process of actually implementing service quality in DEOs.

Not only is it too output oriented, the Ministerial Decree 129a/U/2004 also has other weakness. Its position among government laws and regulations is still questioned. Ministerial decrees are not explicitly listed in the hierarchy of the Indonesian legal system, the system usually referred to by local government in formulating policies. Consequently, most local governments overlook the essence of assessing DEO service measurement using MSS. In addition, the hierarchy of laws and regulations within the Indonesian legal system is described by a decree stipulated by the Indonesian General Assembly as follows:

1. 1945 Constitution Law;
2. General Assembly Decrees;
3. Laws;
4. Government Regulation Substituting Laws;
5. Government Regulations;
6. Presidential Decrees;
7. Local Government Regulations. (GOI, 2000a),

It is clear that Ministerial Decrees, for example Ministerial Decree 129a/2004 on MSS is not enlisted in the legal hierarchy above. As a consequence, in reality, Ministerial Decree 129a/2004 on MSS is usually overlooked by most local governments. As a result, until now, there is no effective way to measure the implementation of DEOs authority or the implementation of its very uncertain obligatory functions.
Now that the decentralization reform has been implemented since 1999, many observers realize that its laws and regulations still lack clarity and are subject to many criticisms on their weaknesses. For example, McClure (2002) argues that there is some convergence of meaning, and multiple meanings exist both within and across levels of government regarding MSS, as a result of the poor dissemination process. Considering this situation, in 2004, the central government finally stipulated a new law 32/2004 on central and local governance. Government regulation 25/2000 was also revised, becoming government regulation 38/2007.

In this new regulation 38/2007, authority among the three different tiers of government (central, provincial, and district) has been specified separately. The educational authorities of districts and municipalities in the education sector are now grouped in six categories: Policy, Financing, Curriculum, Facilities, Education Personnel, and Education Quality Assurance (GOI, 2007a). In detail, the authorities to be held by districts and municipalities, as translated by this researcher, are listed in appendix 5.

Compared to the previous government regulation 25/2000, the new government regulation 38/2007 is considered much improved because it explicitly specifies the authorities (used to be called obligatory functions) held by district and municipalities in the education sector. In addition, this regulation is an improvement, because the previous government regulation only specified central and provincial authority, but the authority of district and municipality has never been specified nor stipulated in a formal regulation.

To measure and ensure that those obligatory functions are implemented in districts and municipalities, the central government also stipulated another new regulation - 65/2005 on MSS. This regulation is supposed to be an umbrella for sectoral ministries in formulating their new regulations on MSS to be implemented by all local governments. The forthcoming National Education Ministerial decree on MSS to be formulated (as a revision of National Education Ministerial decree 129a/U/2003 on MSS) should be based on law 32/2004, government regulation 38/2007 and government regulation 65/2005. This Government Regulation 65/2005 states several important points should be considered by all sectoral ministries in formulating the new MSS. These include:
1. Minimum Service Standard (MSS) is a regulation on what and how good basic services should be delivered by local government as their obligatory function to fulfill the minimum rights of citizen;

2. Obligatory functions are government functions related to the rights and basic services enacted by laws or regulations for local government institution to protect the constitutional, national security, community welfare, and public order rights of the citizen to guarantee the national unity and to fulfill the commitment related to national or international convention;

3. Basic services are all public services needed to fulfill all citizen needs in social, economical, and constitutional life;

4. MSS indicators are quantitative and qualitative achievement describing MSS targets covering the input, process, output and impact of the services;

5. Ministries from each sector should propose MSS drafts in consultation with MOHA before it is enacted as a Decree by the respective Ministry. This draft must include clear guidelines;

6. MSS must be referred to by all local governments in preparing sectoral planning including its targets and timelines based on their resources;

7. Each Ministry shall ensure and supervise the MSS implementation in each province; while Provincial governments supervise their respective district and municipal government;

8. Within three years after Government Regulation 65/2005 stipulation (by the end of 2008), MSS for all sectors should have been formulated and stipulated by all respective ministerial sectors including MSS for MONE. (GOI, 2005c)

Based on this summary of Government Regulation 65/2005, each ministry in the Indonesian government has to formulate MSS. The MSS must outline the basic level of acceptable services that should be delivered by every district office to satisfy citizen’s rights as outlined in the Indonesian constitution. This should include clear statements about the provision of acceptable education services by DEOs to satisfy all aspects of school needs. In this case, by the end of 2008, the MONE should have finished formulating and stipulating a ministerial decree concerning DEO MSS to be enacted by all DEOs. MSS, as mandated by the above regulation, should cover input, process, output, and outcome aspects. Indicators for each aspect should be defined flexibly enough in order for differently resourced DEOs to be able to achieve the MSS. Provincial governments are to supervise their respective district and municipal governments in implementing MSS. The PEO, in this case, should supervise DEOs in implementing MSS. This regulation also informs my research and the development of the MSS that are located in the accompanying portfolio.
It is appropriate now to return to the definition of service quality. In the previous section, it is understood that the ability of a DEO to fulfill its obligatory functions is determined by their performance in implementing all functions (Policy, Financing, Curriculum, Facilities, Education Personnel, and Education Quality Assurance) mandated by Government Regulation 38/2007. If a DEO implements this function consistently, it should soon indicate whether or not the DEO’s achieves service quality in satisfying school needs in each DEO service area. In relation to this, MSS is becoming critically important to ensure that each DEO implements all of these new functions as mandated by the government regulation 65/2005. Not only that, in the future, the role of MSS should be enhanced, becoming part of the public service auditing system; an institutionalized mechanism to gain citizen feedback, which in turn stimulates public concern and participation. This is where local governments show their accountability to their citizens.

Unfortunately, the usage of MSS as an accountability mechanism is not explicitly stated yet in government regulations. More effective government regulations and proper disseminations are still needed. Despite its important role in assuring education service quality at the district level, the existing MSS as stipulated by National Education Ministerial Decree 129a/U/2004 as described above, is only a little more than a listing of outputs. There is almost no mention of strategies for increasing capacity, detailing processes to improve performance or for providing appropriate funding. In addition, as noted, too often these new regulations are still unclear, incomplete, irrelevant or even ignored as stated by many DEOs personnel whenever describing Ministerial Decree 129a/U/2004. As a consequence little has changed in DEOs and service quality has not improved significantly. This is ironic because, although the decision-making process has already been handed down closer to citizen or customer, service quality remains unchanged. This is one reason why this research has become very important.

The following central question is then; how to improve the existing MSS regulations? What strategies should be developed and what changes should be implemented to make the forthcoming MSS regulation clearer and more applicable in DEO level? This is what this research is aiming for: to improve the existing MSS stipulated by National Education Ministerial Decree 129a/U/2004. By implementing
the more recently revised MSS each DEO could assess their service quality comprehensively, not only measuring their outputs as described above, but also their inputs and processes as well. They could assess their capacity, their performance and most importantly their weaknesses in processing all the available resources to respond to and fulfill school needs properly.

Now that a detailed context for MSS has been provided the next question to be considered is: what sort of institution are DEOs and how could they possibly implement MSS? The next section will elaborate the profile of DEO as a critical point in Indonesian education and in the decentralization process in relation to MSS implementation.

**DEOs as Foundation of Education Decentralization**

After reviewing various resources related to service quality, this chapter continues to discuss how improved service quality is to be implemented within the Indonesian decentralized education system with a focus on DEOs. As noted, although the whole education system is responsible for administering and improving education services throughout the country, within the Indonesian governance framework the DEO is positioned at the lowest tier of the government system, holding local decision making powers. In other words, the DEO is only one level above the school system as the front line of the education service. In many ways, schools, especially public or government schools, are dependent on DEO functions (for example funding, human resources, facilities, standard, guidelines, and evaluation), while private schools are dependent on DEOs mainly for regulations, guidelines, standardizations, monitoring and evaluation. Although this responsibility is shared among the three tiers, my research suggests (with recent support from AusAID, 2007), that the DEO should be considered as the critical point for intervention in basic education;

Responsibility for delivery of public primary and public secondary education in Indonesia is shared between centre, province, district and sub-district, with a critical role vested in district governments. Policy, strategy and standard setting are concentrated at the centre; the provinces are responsible for
planning and quality assurance; the districts manage the resources and delivery of education. Since the promulgation of decentralization regulations in 2000, provincial and district governments have been given responsibility to deliver education that is more attuned to local needs. (AusAID, 2007)

The organizational structure located in the following page illustrates how DEOs as the target of decentralization are directly linked to schools within their administrative area. However, based on decentralization laws and regulations there is no direct relationship between the centre and provincial education offices to the schools. Any reform, policy, program, or activity to improve education quality should be carried out through the DEO as the local manager.

Take for example the elementary school rehabilitation program. The central offices in the MONE, in this case the Planning Division of Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education (where this researcher works), could only allocate proportional budgets to each province and district. But the decision in prioritizing which school should be renovated first is held at the district level. As a consequence, in some districts, good schools get rehabilitation funding, while deteriorating schools are neglected. Despite the rigid standards, guidelines and central directions in school rehabilitation mechanism, sometimes DEO personnel disobey or neglect the norms. In many cases, the rehabilitation criteria is not determined by the poorness of facilities, but by whose school it is, and even worse, there is some evidence of bribery.

Unless DEOs as the critical points are functioning properly, they could inhibit the education decentralization process. In order to anticipate this, clear service standards such as MSS are a necessity. The failure to implement MSS at the district level has had vital consequences for the Indonesian decentralization process.

Unfortunately, as a consequence of the sudden decentralization reforms, organizational structures at the DEO level were not truly well designed within an appropriate lead-in time. Therefore, it is important to understand the changes of DEO organizational structure first before proposing strategies to improve its service quality. As mentioned in collaborative paper (see portfolio, exhibit 34), during the centralized era, there were only 26 provinces in Indonesia (excluding East Timor).
Figure 3-4: Ministry of National Education Organization Structure
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Now in this decentralized era, there are 33 provinces and about 470 districts and municipalities (MOHA, 2010). Within the next several years, the number of province and districts will most likely grow again, because there are still many new local governments territories that now are being proposed through MORA for House of Representative approval. From one viewpoint, the growing number of local government organizations (and automatically the number of DEOs) is a signal of democracy. Unfortunately, in reality, the growing number usually dilutes capacity and creates ineffective communication and coordination and some confusion among the three tiers.

Since the decentralization law was enacted in 2000, problems associated with DEO organizational structure have started to emerge. As suggested, part of the problem was probably caused by the rapid process of decentralization, leading to a ‘trial and error’ approach DEO organizational redevelopment. In addition, as described above before, the multi-interpretation of regulations on district functions resulted in various DEO organizational structures and functions. In the centralized era, all DEO structures and functions were similar. But in this decentralized era, every DEO could have its own model of organization with different echelons and functions. For example, the planning unit could be placed in a higher position in one DEO, but could also be placed in lower position only as a subdivision in another DEO. It is becoming a problem whenever Provincial Education Office (PEO) or MONE invites the planning personnel, because they are not in the same level and with the same name. As a solution, the invitation would probably say something like; “Whoever holds the planning function or position, please come!” Messy, but probably more effective than the present situation.

The various organizational structures were probably first meant to accommodate the different education problems in each district. The problems of a DEO in Jakarta as the capital city for example, emerged after decentralization process was enacted. To eliminate tensions between the two different groups (a group of personnel from DEO central office and a group of personnel from DEO district office) the Jakarta Special Regency House of Representative finally approved two different DEO organizations in Jakarta. The first was called Dinas Pendidikan Dasar Jakarta (Jakarta Basic Education DEO), and the second called Dinas Pendidikan Menengah dan Tinggi
(Jakarta Middle and High Education DEO). At first, the tension between the two
groups was resolved, but it is becoming apparent that problems associated with
efficiency and effectiveness has begun to emerge.

Lately, MOHA realized that the two DEOs in Jakarta and elsewhere in the country
only contribute to inefficiency in government budget spending. The DEO situation in
Jakarta manifested the emerging problem only after civil servant transfer as a result
of decentralization. One way to assure that the changing of DEO organization
structure does not influence the DEO service quality would be by implementing
standardized national MSS as an operating procedure to be followed by every DEO.
MSS coupled with targeted capacity building should be used to overcome the DEO
capacity problems comprehensively. Appropriate MSS should be able to make a
significant contribution to resolving the input, process, and output problems of DEOs
as public service organizations.

The changing and restructuring of DEO organization is actually not a linear process
as most people would usually perceive. Long before decentralization reform, there
used to be two different education offices in each province and district throughout
the Indonesian territory. The first office was called Dinas Pendidikan (Education
office) under the local government as a sub-ordinate of MOHA. This office dealt
mainly with basic or elementary education only, especially in term of personnel,
funding, and facilities. The educational methodology and pedagogy was overseen by
the Kantor Departemen (Department Office) under the central MONE. This was the
second education office in each district and province. Before decentralization, these
department offices were not only responsible for the pedagogical aspects of
elementary education, but they were also responsible for junior and senior high
education matters. In reality, before decentralization, the quality of elementary
education under the Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten was relatively poor compared to
junior or senior high education under the Kantor Departemen. This was a pertinent
reason why public opinion perceived that education quality had decreased soon after
decentralization.

The Dinas reputation in managing elementary education was considered relatively
poor, yet after decentralization they were given the responsibility for managing
elementary, junior high and senior high education. Despite their bigger responsibilities after decentralization, the new DEOs are seen as not having a solid organization. They have a mixed staff drawn from different organizations, and, in many cases, are not well managed by leaders with education experience. Again, this is another reason why MSS is critically important to improving DEO performance. For example, real efforts need to be made to improve the deteriorating education facilities as shown by an elementary school in West Java below.

Figure 3-5:  
Deteriorating Elementary School in West Java

The deteriorating school facilities as shown by figure above should be anticipated. Otherwise, the good junior and senior high schools recently transferred to local DEOs could also worsen. This deteriorating school facility actually illustrates poor DEO response to serving schools and reflects a lack of interest or information about DEO service quality. Deteriorating school conditions in this case are an outcome of deteriorating DEO service quality. Better DEO service quality would normally lead to better school quality.
As described by Government Regulation 38/2007, each DEO is responsible for supporting and overseeing public and private schools in its area. In a rich area such as city and town where the community is very supportive of their children’s education, education quality is generally fairly good. This was the case in Jogjakarta and other big cities. But for a rural area where most parents and community are poor, the quality of education is usually lower than average. This is where the role of DEO is critically important, because public schools are dependent on the DEO in many ways. The DEO provides all personnel, funding, facilities, guidance, supervision, and evaluation for all public schools. After decentralization, the ability of a DEO to provide those resources is questionable and needs to be measured. One comprehensive way of measuring and improving DEO service quality is by implementing MSS. Government regulation 65/2005 even states that MSS should also be used as a basis in formulating annual and long term education planning. This is due to the possibility of using MSS in detecting gaps between the DEO current service quality and DEO standard service quality. But in reality the DEO is not a single actor, it is strongly influenced by the district heads that are administratively under the Governor and under the MOHA. This is where one of the more serious problems of leadership in education arises.

In the centralized era it was not surprising that, to some observers education in Indonesia was considered to have two different leaderships: MOHA and MONE. These two different organizations in each district were considered to have two different cultural backgrounds. The central education office in a district was considered more up-to-date and evolving under the ministry leadership. On the other hand the local education office was considered more conservative or even traditional under the district head or Bupati. In reality, friction tended to occur between the two. The program of Nine Year Basic Education as a national initiative, for example, experienced hindrances if the local education office or local government were not very responsive. After decentralization, the two organizations with different cultural backgrounds and characteristics were amalgamated. Whenever two groups are merged, such important questions will arise; from which group the leader should be appointed, which group should dominate? These questions do create tensions. In many cases the DEO heads or their deputies were appointed by the district head (Bupati) from outside of the education organization. This was justified by arguing
that the appointees are capable enough for only managerial matters. The potential personnel from the education sector were usually put aside as if they were intruders. This has not been resolved and the tensions continue.

This research suggests that the key positions in DEO after decentralization should be held by personnel who have an adequate education background and experience, but in reality this was not always the case. Ideally, the DEO head should be an education professional having education and schooling experience, but in many cases DEO heads were politically appointed by the district head due to the appointee’s contribution as one of district head local election winning team. Of course, by disregarding the appointee’s educational background and experience it might well be argued that the wrong man was selected. An example of this was seen in North Sulawesi investigation by SMERU (2001) after decentralization. Eight deputy heads appointed in the 21 Districts observed were senior personnel from sub district head without proper sectoral experiences. They were appointed merely due to their high rank or seniority in local government position as the main qualification to hold the position, regardless of their educational background and experience.

The merging of two organizations after decentralization also lead to the massive transfer of civil servants from the Ministerial Education Office in each province and district to the local education office. This merging contributed another problem as illustrated by ADB-JBIC-World Bank East Asia Pacific Infrastructure Flagship Study paper (2004) outlined below:

The table on the following page illustrates how local government indicators in five big municipalities (*Bandung, Palembang, Balikpapan, Kendari, and Blitar*) changed after decentralization. Their land areas, population number and GRDP per capita remain the same, but their civil servant numbers changed dramatically as a consequence of central government personnel transfer to each relevant local government institution. In this case, central government personnel from each district office were transferred to DEOs.
The table indicates that civil servant numbers in districts or provinces doubled after decentralization. For example in Palembang Municipality, there were only 3,400 civil servants in 1999 before decentralization, but after central offices staffs in district or municipality were transferred to local government offices in Palembang there were 16,400 civil servants. As a consequence of this hasty, incomplete planning many DEOs were actually not ready yet to exercise their new authority mandated by decentralization laws as suggested by JBIC;

Many cities were at a loss as to how to adapt to the changes. In delivering efficient and effective decentralized infrastructure services, many local governments are not yet ready to take over central government functions.

Not only facing problems with organizational development, DEOs are also experiencing human capacity problems: The JBIC paper reports that;

Prior to decentralization, central government organizations were set in parallel to administrative organizations across various levels of government. Even in the case of rural infrastructures, infrastructure provision was mostly done not by local governments but by regional offices of line ministries. Planning, budgeting and several other functions, which require a high degree of expertise, were done centrally and, consequently, knowledge of and knowhow for such functions were hardly accumulated at the local governments. (ADB-JBIC-World Bank East Asia Pacific Infrastructure Flagship Study December 2004.)
It is clear from this paper and my research, that human resource capacity was and still is a problem after seven years of decentralization implementation. The amalgamation of two different institutions has increased the number of DEO personnel, but not the quality of its human resources.

The following figure 3-6 makes it clear that the DEO is not a single actor in delivering services to schools. The DEO is strongly influenced by its local government (either Bupati or Walikota as the district head), local House of Representative members, PEO personnel, and community education organization members (Boards of Education).

![Figure 3-6: Complicated Administration in DEOs](source)

Source: prepared by researcher

And most importantly, although administratively DEOs are under the MOHA through its local government, but in many ways, technically, especially related to educational matters, they have to report to the MONE. Unfortunately, MONE does not have the authority to oversee DEO performance in education. Consequently, MONE does not have the right to take a direct action, for example to sanction a DEO if DEO personnel do not follow MONE rules or guidelines. On the other hand,
Islamic or Religious Schools (*Madrasah*) are managed neither under MOHA nor MONE. They are under the MORA. For the time being *madrasahs* are considered to be religious institutions, not education institutions. That is why *madrasahs* are still managed centrally under the MORA. (Under decentralization law, religious affairs are still centralized under MORA). However, in terms of educational aspects, for example, curriculum and examination *madrasahs* have to report to MONE. On the other hand there are many religion teachers in public schools. Although these teachers are teaching in public schools (which are under DEO and MONE), they are managed under the MORA through its district offices. This adds additional layers of complexity in managing the provision of quality education services at the district level.

These organizational and personnel problems exacerbate the various service quality problems already discussed in the previous section. Roy Bahl and Jorge Martinez-Vazquez (2005) suggest that Indonesian decentralization is more of a political than a service quality reform.

Indonesia’s was very much a political decentralization, but it had elements that were meant to diffuse secession tendencies. Decentralization was the natural follow-on to the democracy initiative that followed the fall of Suharto. (Bahl and Vazquez, 2005)

In the last few years, many observers suggest that the decentralization reform has only laid down the foundation for service quality improvement. It is mainly because service quality problems were already there long before decentralization was initiated. At this stage, probably it is too early to expect totally improved service quality.

Now that decentralization has taken place, educational service provision is managed under the DEO as part of local government. As a consequence, there are no more National Education Ministerial offices under the MONE in each province and district. All personnel and facilities (including all junior and senior high schools) were handed down to the same level of governance, to province or district local government, while elementary schools originally belonged to local government long before decentralization. This transfer and amalgamation of all central government offices in each province and district contributes to the wrong perception of many
local government personnel (Legowo, 2006) as though there were no more hierarchical relation between central and local government, and they can do whatever they want regardless of central government policies.

The biggest education administration and operation is now under the Bupati (District Head) or Mayor and managed by the DEO. This simplified diagram below shows how the DEO is part of local government administration among other district offices such as the District Civil Work Office, District Transportation Office.

The diagram below illustrates a typical DEO organization structure. (As noted earlier in this chapter, not all DEO organization structures are exactly the same.) Each DEO could have different names for its units, but the number of units is limited. Based on the newest government regulation 41/2007 on local government organization, the size of district office is formulated and limits are based on the population size, land coverage area and district’s total budget (GOI, 2007b).

**Figure 3-7:**
Typical District Government Organization Structure
Simply based on this regulation, the number of district offices are formulated and grouped into three categories; twelve, fifteen, or eighteen offices. This should include a DEO in each district. In each DEO at most, there should be only one supporting unit (secretariat/internal division) with its two subordinates, and four technical divisions with its two or three subordinates for each as shown in this next diagram. Because of this new regulation the structure of DEOs throughout the country are now more alike.

**Figure 3-8:**
**Typical DEO Organization Structure**

The function of district offices is stipulated in Government Regulation 38/2007. In this case DEO functions comprise the six categories as mentioned before: Policy, Financing, Curriculum, Facilities, Education Personnel, and Education Quality Assurance (GOI, 2007a). Since these two new regulations were only stipulated one year ago, many DEOs are still in the process of restructuring their organization. This DEO organization example above (simplified from one of DEOs in West Java) has adopted the latest two regulations.
The government regulation 38/2007 mandates six main functions (Policy, Financing, Curriculum, Facilities, Education Personnel, and Education Quality Assurance), but yet this organization above only has 5 functions (internal division, pre and elementary education, junior and senior high education, non formal education, and youth sport and culture division). Only two functions are adopted from government regulation (finance and personnel under internal division), it seems that each division should also hold policy, curriculum, facility, and quality assurance. This situation might be different from district to district within a province or across provinces. Although the government regulation does not specify the name and position of units in each DEO, the effectiveness and efficiency of DEO organization should be seriously considered by every local government.

In order for a DEO to be able to carry out all of its functions properly, adequate capacity should be determined by a capacity audit followed by continuous capacity building. According to the ADB (2005), capacity building is defined as individual (personnel aspects), institutional (organization, leadership and management) and system (laws, regulation and policies). Improving all these capacities in a short time is difficult, but first of all, any effort taken should be based on accurate information about the existing problems. The immediate question would then be; how good or how bad is a DEO’s capacity and its service quality? How do we get this information? And what do we do about it? This is where the problem of service quality measurement emerges.

Based on this research, DEO capacity building could be grouped under input (all resources needed to implement DEO mandates), process (all activities and managerial skills to process the mandates), output (services and goods delivered to schools as required by mandates), outcome (impact of services at school levels), and monitoring evaluation (an integrated information system to collect and analyze relevant data concerning MSS indicators). Later on, using a regular assessment mechanism, each DEO should be overseen using the above MSS indicators (input, process, output, outcome, and evaluation) to examine how well a DEO performs. If a DEO failed to reach its minimum targets, a special investigation and/or intervention might be needed, including sanctions if necessary.
According to Ovretveit (1993), the purpose of measuring the quality of service is to see if the quality is better or worse than it was, or is better or worse compared to other services. In the Indonesian decentralization context, MSS is used to measure DEO service quality. MSS indicators should not only be used by auditors from within the internal MONE or MOHA organization, but should also be used by external customers, mainly schools, principals, teachers, and communities or parents.

To summarize the discussion, a framework on the next page could be used to understand necessary efforts in improving DEO service quality. Basically, all organization factors should be taken into account in every capacity building effort. The ADB suggests the individual, institutional, and system factors should be considered. While Omar Azfar and Kahkonen suggest three key factors influencing local government capacity, including human capital, physical capital, and structures within the local government. In addition, Ariel Fizbein claims that there are three main actors in public service delivery: citizen, policy makers, and service providers. Considering all those influencing factor in one study is outside the scope of this research. Even though this research could contribute to the DEO service quality improvement in general, it is focused mainly on how to improve the existing MSS and how to implement it in DEOs as described in the diagram below. The MSS position is considered very strategic because it will also be used as a basis for an improved planning and accountability mechanism.

From the discussion above and using the diagram on the following page, it is clear that decentralization has brought fundamental changes to local governance in Indonesia, especially at the district level. Compared to the centralized era when all DEOs had exactly the same structure and functions, the new DEOs are now varied in terms of their capacities, structures and functions because the authority to decide are now hold by the district itself. This is why, in many ways, especially in their managerial capacities and skills, the new DEOs need to be improved. Before planning any capacity building activity to improve DEO managerial capacity and skill, it is important to carry out a comprehensive assessment mechanism first. The literatures and data from this research indicate that there are many factors influencing DEO performance.
In order to simplify portfolio development (the product of this research), I adopted a systemic approach in grouping the factors that influenced DEO service quality. These factors were: input, process, output/outcome and evaluation. Before any capacity building activity is implemented, a systematic or comprehensive assessment is needed to evaluate all these factors. Based on the result of this systematic or comprehensive assessment, DEO weaknesses are identified, focused capacity building is planned, and finally identified weaknesses are evaluated and careful targeted capacity building provided. This process should be administered periodically in a cyclical and iterative way for all DEOs throughout Indonesia. This regular DEOs assessment and continuous capacity building would both assure and improve DEO service quality improvement.
In relation to this, MSS should be used both as an assessment and assurance tool in DEO service quality improvement. This is why MSS are considered to have a strategic position in detecting and anticipating problems related to DEO service quality improvements. In many cases, the problems emerged as a result of rapid decentralization which resulted in changes in DEO mandates, the merging of two different organizations, and the amalgamation of two different groups of personnel. These have all lead to deterioration in DEO service quality. MSS provide a very useful tool for diagnosing, assessing and assuring DEO performance. Regular and competent DEO review and assessment will accordingly improve DEO service quality.

This research indicates that the improvement of DEO service quality is the most important and difficult process after enacting laws and restructuring organizations. Unfortunately, it is sometimes believed that decentralization processes are completed already and service quality is rarely part of local government agendas. Improving DEO service quality, in fact, depends on continuous efforts at capacity building, be it individual, institutional or systemic capacity building. Of course, before any effort in improving DEO service quality is undertaken, several questions should be answered: what is the current service quality, what factors influence it, and what efforts should be taken? And most importantly, how could MSS is best implemented to assess or benchmark and assure DEO service quality?

Chapter 4 (The story of this project) will describe in more detail the steps and findings related to these questions. Based on Government Regulation 65/2005, by the end of 2008 all ministries should have formulated and stipulated the new MSS for their district offices and the attached portfolio of this research is an important contribution to answering the above questions and at the same time contributes to the MONE formulation and implementation of MSS for its DEOs to more effectively contribute to education decentralization and the provision of improved quality of and access to education across Indonesia.
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Chapter 4
A CHALLENGING JOURNEY FOR IMPROVING DEO SERVICE QUALITY

In chapters 3 and collaborative paper (portfolio, exhibit 34), as the starting point of this journey of knowing, the context of the DEO service quality was discussed, providing a framework for the first step of this project. These chapters described how decentralization reform was initiated and implemented, and most importantly for this research, how DEO service quality was thought to be the foundation for the decentralization process. In this chapter, the overall process of this Research by Project will be discussed by using the journey metaphor or allegory as signaled in chapter 2 (Research Design).

This journey of knowing started in the qualitative research area when for the first time I tried to clarify my three research questions: What is the status of DEO service quality? What factors influence DEO service quality? And finally, what actions are needed to improve it? Keeping these three questions in mind, I searched for necessary evidence to provide appropriate answers to those questions and of course to improve my understanding about decentralization and DEO service quality. Gaining an understanding before proposing any improvement strategies was important for me both as a researcher and administrator. And in order not to get lost, I tried to follow the action research track. Although I have followed what I intended to be the right track, in the end I don’t think I have really gained a total understanding about the essence of decentralization and DEO service quality. As described in chapter 2, knowledge is socially constructed, and so is my knowledge of decentralization and service quality. This is to say, that even after my research is completed, the process of generating meanings and knowledge about decentralization and service quality in the Indonesian context will continue as a social process. I am still concerned that I have only caught a small part of their essence, since the real knowledge of decentralization and service quality is generated over generations in
this country as it is in many different parts of the world where researchers and administrators like me struggle to improve their systems.

Somewhere along this journey, I realized that the research process is not meant to describe the whole process for improving DEO service quality, but only a small part, mainly relating to the development of the MSS model. Although data from this research indicates that capacity building to improve service quality is needed, to discuss all the factors one by one is beyond this researcher. This is why finally MSS was selected as one strategic method to be examined.

Unfortunately, policy formulation in the public service is complex and takes a long time, especially when it involves policy dissemination from the centre to district and school levels. That is why, even at the end of this research, the MSS model building was still running, mainly to assess its costing implications and to identify, and implement its legal aspects. No doubt therefore, that this exhaustive process of Research by Project as a journey of knowing only contributed a small, but significant part of the formulation of the improved MSS model; a small but important part of the MONE’s DEO service quality improvement efforts.

The whole process for developing MSS in this research consisted of three main phases as follows:

1. Phase One; Understanding the Issues (2004 – 2006);
2. Phase Two; Formulating a Solution (2006 – 2008), and

In the first phase, activities were focused on understanding the real situation of DEO service quality after decentralization. This was done by undertaking literature reviews and document analysis, attending several relevant meetings, asking stakeholders for their perceptions and finally visiting some DEOs to observe the reality of the issue in the field.
The activities in this second phase included: analyzing people’s opinions or perceptions based on the first phase to find ways of improving DEO service quality, building the basic design of MSS as a service standard and introducing it to DEO stakeholders to get their first responses.

Finally, in the third phase, the implementation process was initiated. This final phase covered three different activities: discussing the revised MSS model with some central level key decision makers in MONE, MOHA and MORA, then introducing the concepts back to DEO stakeholders, and finally disseminating the new version of the MSS to garner support from stakeholders.

In each phase, three main things will be described: its intentions, the actions previously described and some reflections. In addition, the data gathered and its relevant findings will be discussed within each action in each phase. In the following section, the first phase of this Research by Project will be described in more detail.
Phase One,
Understanding the Issues

If I were a newcomer in the decentralization and service quality area, understanding the situation should be the first priority before taking any steps forward. In this phase, I have sought information from three different sources. First, from secondary data or documents mainly related to decentralization and DEO service quality in Indonesia and other relevant countries. For example I consulted with some senior personnel in the Bureau of Law and Organization within MONE to check some regulations related to decentralization and DEO service quality. This meant that I explored the context using articles, GOI regulations, reports, or even newspapers as sources for this preliminary study. Secondly, to broaden my understanding about the issues, I gathered stakeholders’ opinions or views by distributing open-ended questionnaires to three DEO main stakeholders: DEO staff, District Board members and principals or teachers as DEO’s main customers. And finally, I observed some district offices to see the reality in the field and discussed it with people in selected district offices.

Without a comprehensive understanding as a result of the context exploration above, any traveler holding a map in his or her hand, would not feel comfortable to start their journey. In other words, without proper information there is no guarantee that the journey of knowing could be continued confidently and safely. Any new comer in a new place would feel anxious about which way to go, what vehicle to take, which accommodation is best, even what food to eat. Not only that, normally he or she would also seek information related to the journey: asking questions about language, climate, culture, and so on. With all this information in hand, the traveler/researcher can go forward on the journey with a smile and without wrinkling his or her forehead. Similarly, in the first part of my journey of knowing, I have gone through several activities to gain a comprehensive understanding about the current status of decentralization and its impact on DEO service quality in Indonesia.
Exploring Context

As detailed in collaborative paper (portfolio, exhibit 34), in 1999, Law 22/1999 was enacted, the first step on the path to decentralization in Indonesia. Then, only two years later all government institutions were obliged to implement its mandates regardless of their readiness. Ever since, many changes in government practices have taken place, including the division of authority in the education sector. Most education authority was handed down to district or city level with the assumption that our education service quality would soon improve. Unfortunately, after more than ten years, this assumption is still being questioned. This situation raised many questions that needed to be clarified before any attempt to propose alternative solutions could be taken.

In order to gain a better understanding as mentioned above, basically I did two important things; collecting and reading relevant documents and attending relevant meetings to identify issues related to decentralization and DEO service quality. These actions were done mainly in the beginning of my research, but even after that I still kept the habit of keeping up with the latest issues. As a practitioner working in the MONE, unfortunately literature was not easily available. I realized that I was not part of university or academic life with plentiful reading resources. However, there were some opportunities for me to visit nearby university libraries and use the RMIT libraries whenever I visited Melbourne, but I sometimes felt as if I were in a different world. Most people in academic areas find reading and discussion very much their main work, while in my day to day activities on the other hand, people are supposed to work to solve current real problems.

In my workplace, fortunately there were plenty of reports made by different donors from various institutions like World Bank, ADB, JICA, etc. Their reports for me became relevant resources because they were based on real work done by those institutions in helping to solve our educational problems. The websites of those institutions also provided useful reports on different activities throughout the globe which were very useful to support my understanding. In my experience, text books or formal literature usually provide a good theoretical basis, but in many cases, they lack real examples from the real world. This is why in my case, an institutional report
based on real situation is sometimes more useful because it reflects many practical principles that could be implemented in real actions. One difficulty for me was that institutional reports from international organizations are usually in English. Although basically I understand English, there were times when I could not really understand some specific word or terminology. Only after I checked a dictionary or asked my supervisors did I finally understand its meaning. The word “socialization” for example was understood differently, although it is understood both in English or Bahasa. Unfortunately in Bahasa it is understood as dissemination, while on the other hand in English it generally means to get familiar with people or instilling attitudes or understandings.

After reading for some time, I realized that even though decentralization and service delivery were a very widely used terms at that time, unfortunately only a small number of MONE personnel, either at central or regional level were really concerned and wanted to know more about these principles. Many of them were trapped in the difficulties of implementing and restructuring their organization as mandated by the new laws without a chance of questioning why and how. If decentralization and improved service delivery are to be implemented successfully in the near future, I believe that it is imperative for at least key personnel to really understand the essence of decentralization and how it should be implemented. Imagine what would happen if most people were not really familiar with its basic principles. It would be quite strange to implement decentralization without capacity, participation, transparency, democracy or accountability. That was why at that time I tried to listen to what people were saying if decentralization or service quality issues arose in any relevant meeting or discussion.

**Important Findings on Decentralization**

Rondinelli and Cheema (1983) for example, define decentralization quite broadly to mean the transfer of planning, decision making or administrative authority from central government to its field organizations, local administrative units, semi-autonomous organizations, local government or non-governmental organizations (p.13). While according to McGinn and Welsh (1999), decentralization is about a
shift in location of those who govern, about the transfer of authority from those in one location or level in an educational organization, to those in another level. The location of authority refers to the location of the position or the governing bodies; national, municipal, county or district governments and schools (p. 17).

Centralization-decentralization therefore, could be viewed as a spectrum ranging from a unitary governmental system where the central government has most power or decision making authority, to a system where local governments and community organizations exercise large amounts of power. Centralization-decentralization is a continuum along which the positioning of the decision making process is held - somewhere between the central and peripheral units of organization.

Based on relevant documents found (the current decentralization laws and regulations), Indonesia is not fully centralized nor fully decentralized, because after decentralization, most decision making processes were handed down to local government, but some (for example, foreign affairs, economic matters, religious affairs, defense, national security and judicial) were retained by the central government. Indonesia therefore, falls somewhere between centralized and decentralized poles of governance.

Decentralization is generally defined as a way of transferring authority from organization’s centre to its peripheral units, although the degree of authority handed down might vary. According to some writers like Hanson (1998) and Rondinelli (1990), there are three major forms of decentralization; deconcentration, delegation and devolution. Deconcentration typically involves the transfer of tasks and work, but not authority, to other units in the organization. Delegation involves the transfer of decision-making authority from higher to lower hierarchical units, but that authority can be withdrawn at the discretion of the delegating unit. Finally, devolution refers to the transfer of authority to an autonomous unit that can act independently, or a unit that can act without first asking permission. In addition, according to Rondinelli (1990), privatization is also a form of devolution as responsibility and resources are transferred from public to private sector institutions.
as happened in Indonesian’s telecommunication, transportation and water treatment state owned companies.

From the sources listed above, reasons for decentralization reform can also be found. According to McGinn and Welsh (1999) there are three reasons that account for the upsurge of interest in decentralization in the world beginning around 1970. First, the economic/political reasons: the development of globalization and the market economy led to more local based decision making. The role of central government is declining while the role of the market and local groups are increasing. Second, the role of NGO or privatization: the advancement of civil society also results in the increased role of non government organizations (NGOs) and the private sector in handling local public services, and at the same time a decreased central government grip. Third, the innovation of information technologies: the implementation of this technology has opened the possibility for central organizations to control their complex peripheral systems and at the same time empower local decision making capacity. However, Indonesian decentralization is more a response to the over-centralized system during the Suharto era, which inhibited local authority.

Alm and Bahl (1999) state that countries with a large population and large land areas tend to be more decentralized. They suggest that it is too difficult and too costly to govern effectively from the center when the population and land area are very large. Large countries are likely to have variation among regions in climate, geography, and in their economic base, so that centrally mandated uniformity in the provision of government services is likely to be quite inefficient. Moreover, according to Alm and Bahl (1999) if the population of a country is diverse or if the regional economies are diverse enough that there are distinct regional preferences for government services, then there is a strong case for decentralized governance. Diversity might mean different things; examples of the kinds of diversity that typically lead to cries for decentralization are variations in ethnic, religious, and cultural backgrounds, isolation from the governing centers, and distinctive economic bases. This view is relevant to Indonesia, which consists of thousands of islands, each with its own ethnic make-up. Consequently every local government has own preferences in the provision of public services to their people.
According to Winkler (1999), the rationale for educational decentralization can be grouped into three broad categories: educational finance, efficiency and effectiveness, and redistribution of political power. Hanson (1998) suggests that many different, but interrelated goals drive education decentralization initiatives and consequently shape their strategies. These include increased economic development through institutional modernization; increased management efficiency; redistribution of financial responsibility; democratization; the neutralization of competing powers; and improved quality of education.

Bjorg (2003) also stated that recently international funding organizations (including the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank) have thrown their weight behind the decentralization of education systems around the globe, often making decentralization a precondition for financial assistance. These international funding organizations claim that decentralization will lead to one or more of the following outcomes: a distribution of power, increased efficiency, or greater sensitivity to local culture.

Unfortunately, in Indonesia, decentralization was forced more by external factors rather than reasons inspired by an internal assessment and motivation. When the economic crisis struck Indonesia in 1997-1998, help was sought from international institutions. Suharto as the president was given little choice but to sign the IMF’s MUO on one condition: decentralized government. Decentralization was implemented to fulfill international donors’ financial assistance conditions when responding to a monetary crisis, to answer demands from regional government to gain power in managing their own resources, and to overcome a political crisis as a result of over centralized governance. The central government was given very little choice but to decentralize, regardless of the lack of proper preparation and planning for implementation. Indonesian decentralization was the product of a crisis rather than a smooth, well-planned reform.

The Indonesian government did not have the luxury of time in preparing decentralization instruments. Ignited by the 1997-1998 crises, the law 22/1999 on decentralization was enacted in 2000 and implemented in 2001 regardless of any preparation at the central or local level. There was a strong assumption that
decentralization would solve most of the problems caused by the economic and political crisis. Unfortunately, this was not the case and many problems remain after decentralization. Not surprisingly, later weaknesses were found, for example, the division of authority among the three tiers was still unclear. Finally in 2004 the new law 32/2004 on decentralization was enacted as a revision.

Encouraged by the many apparently sound motives behind decentralization reform mentioned above and convinced by the assumption that the quality of schooling would automatically improve after the educational decision making process is shifted closer to the school level (Behrman et. al., 2002), many developing countries like Indonesia are now attempting to implement or practice decentralized education systems. In reality, many of them are now still experiencing implementation problems.

I was fortunate because when reading some relevant international financial donor reports I could explore their decentralization experiences. The detail of these experiences is discussed in chapter (see portfolio, exhibit 34) and in order to avoid repetition only the essence is elaborated here. I found reports of three international experiences in implementing education decentralization: from Africa by Gershberg and Winkler (2003); from the World Bank by Paqueo and Lammert (2000) and from Latin America by Hanson (1998).

From the African experiences it can be concluded that for successful decentralization several important strategies are needed. First of all, division of authority or function between government levels needs to be clear. Secondly, in order for each level of government to be able to carry out its functions, adequate resources such as buildings, facilities, equipment and funding need to be provided. Thirdly, a sufficient number of personnel with appropriate leadership and management skills are needed to manage available resources. Fourthly, empowering local communities to build participation and to strengthen accountability mechanisms is essential. Lastly, a focus on school quality improvement is the most significant determinant of the effectiveness of education decentralization. (Gershberg and Winkler 2003, p. 5-7)
From the World Bank experience in implementing decentralization, several best practices need to be considered. Ultimately it is at the school level where the effectiveness of education decentralization can be determined. As a consequence, all governance levels beyond the school level should contribute to the building of system wide strategies for supporting and empowering schools. Class rooms as the front line of educational services where the teaching and learning process take place should be the focus and empowered accordingly. Secondly, in the Indonesian case, most public schools are dependent on DEO services. Therefore, it is almost impossible to empower schools and improve school quality without building stronger capacity within DEOs. Needless to say, building local government capacity, especially its DEO, developing effective system linkages among government tiers, and installing effective communication across the system are among the most basic requirements for DEOs to be able to empower each individual school. Consequently, measuring and assuring DEO performance is important, and MSS are an appropriate strategy for this. Finally, as one of the measures of the effectiveness of decentralized service delivery, community participation through school boards or school committees also needs to be improved. (Paqueo and Lammert in Decentralization in Education, World Bank Governance Reform Question and Answer, 2000)

Another decentralization expert, Hanson (1998), provides some important points that the Indonesian government and the MONE need to consider if the implementation of education decentralization is to succeed. First of all, strengthening DEO capacity is critical to success. Secondly, since the capacity of DEOs varies from place to place, it is better to transfer authority to individual regions only when they meet a specific test of readiness rather than to all DEOs at once. Third, considering that not many Indonesian bureaucrats are familiar and have enough experience in decentralization implementation - only some scholars in universities and a limited number of key personnel at central level do - building decentralized vision and organizational culture is vital, because, according to Hanson, the people who have managed a centralized system are not very effective in managing a decentralized system. Finally, Hanson suggests, once decentralization has taken place, the central ministry must have some tools to ensure that the regions follow national educational policy, and one of the tools for doing this is the implementation of relevant MSS. Hanson (1998, p. 12-13)
So far, from the literature review I have managed to identify some important concepts of decentralization and its implementation. Unfortunately the above information is mostly based on international experiences. Therefore it is necessary for me to explore some literature or documents specifically describing the implementation of decentralization in Indonesia. Most information was found from government documents such as laws, decrees or government regulations ranging from central, provincial and district level. In addition, some relevant reports from international institutions and national or local media also contributed much important information.

The decentralization process in Indonesia can be traced back to the colonial era before 1945, when the Dutch divided the country into regions to facilitate control and governance. After independence, in the Soekarno and Soeharto era, the pattern of centre and regions relationship remained the same as that inherited from the colonial era. Year after year, the dynamics of the political situation stimulated many government regulations, trying to introduce and implement the decentralization concept, but the pattern remained constant, that is to manage the control from the centre. Finally in 1998, after a multi-dimensional crisis struck, and forced by political and regional pressures, Habibie, as the president, had no other way to save the country from disintegration except by implementing a policy of decentralization (Karim, 2003, p. 50).

In 1998, finally, decentralization was mandated through a collective decision by the highest national authority, the Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat (People’s Consultative Assembly or MPR for short), 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: Law No. 22 Year 1999 on Local Government and Law No. 25 Year 1999 on Financial Balance between Local Government and Central Government in May 1999. By law, Indonesia has been a decentralized country since the enactment of those two laws. According to these laws, local government has most authority in public functions except in the fields of foreign affairs, national security, finance, fiscal matters, religion, and other specified areas.
According to the Law 22/1999 and the Government Regulation No. 25/2000, it is clear that the function of the central government will be to establish norms, standards, monitoring and evaluation, and control (GOI, 1999). The Governor continues to have a double function as head of an autonomous region and as a representative of the central government in the region under the command of the President (via the MOHA). The main roles of the provinces are cross-regional functions, functions in regional macro-planning, human resource development and research, the management of regional ports, environmental protection, trade and tourism promotion, pest control/quarantine and spatial planning. While the district and municipal (kabupaten and kota) level is now removed from the line of command that under the Orde Baru run from the President down to the village level. The election of District Head (Bupati) and Mayor (Walikota) no longer requires the clearance from higher levels of government. They are accountable only to their respective local parliaments (DPRD).

Later in October 2004, Under President Megawati, revisions of Law No. 22/1999 and Law No. 25/1999 were enacted, becoming Law No. 32/2004 and Law No. 33/2004 consecutively. Several years after President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono was appointed president, an additional government regulation concerning decentralization was also enacted, Government Regulation 38/2007 on Central and Regional government authority (revising Government Regulation 25/2000), and Government Regulation 65/2005 on MSS.

Although the Indonesian decentralization processes began more than eight years ago, there are still many questions concerning implementation. On the one hand it is strongly believed that it depends on the commitment of key actors across government levels. It should also be remembered that Winkler (2003, p. 7) states that decentralization is a long, evolutionary process. While legislative and constitutional changes may radically change responsibilities over night, real changes in governance, accountability, and impact at district and school levels take much longer. My research suggests this is the case. It is clear now that even though some basic principles of decentralization were adopted in Indonesia the implementation process is very different from a number of other countries. For example by comparing international best practices to the decentralization process in Indonesia
(see a matrix in collaborative paper-portfolio, exhibit 34) it can be found that most of these best practices are still in the process of being implemented. For example, most accountability processes are only reported to the upper level or superiors within an organization, but not yet to the public in general. As a consequence, collective public complaint is usually not seriously considered in public service quality development, except if it occurs via a massive (usually destructive) demonstration.

The following observations on the implementation of Indonesian decentralization were also drawn from international or national sources such as reports, articles or formal documents and from this research (see collaborative paper):

1. Decentralization in Indonesia is not a fait accompli. It is neither fully centralized nor fully decentralized, but located towards the centre on a continuous spectrum, since not all authorities are handed down to district level. (Defense, national security, monetary and fiscal, religion, justice, foreign affairs are all still managed nationally or centrally);

2. The World Bank notes that Indonesia began experimenting with a new form of decentralization at the end of the twentieth century, with the passage of new legislation that shifted political and fiscal authority from the national government in Jakarta to sub-provincial level governments throughout the country. This transfer of authority transformed one of the most centralized governments in the world into one of the most decentralized (World Bank, 2003, p. 1). This is regarded as one of the most radical and massive approaches ever seen in the devolution of decision-making power to sub-national authorities (the so-called "Big-Bang Approach"). Consequently, decentralization then was seen as offering a wide range of opportunities and potential benefits, but also one which encompassed large risks (World Bank, 2000a, p. 13);

3. Indonesian education decentralization is complex compared to other countries where education is only under one institution or ministry. In Indonesia at least three major ministries are involved: the MOHA, MONE and MORA. After decentralization, two major actors; Home Affairs and Education were merged
into one institution at province and district levels. The two offices were amalgamated, including all their assets. This created more complexity and confusion at the grass root level. Their ‘spirit’ of good decentralization (if there was such thing), was dissolved into a traditional or “business as usual” situation. Unless the new emerging organization (Dinas) is enlightened and energized by the true spirit of decentralization, the administration would remain inefficient and ineffectual;

4. Ideally, transfer of authority should only be done to mature or ready regions; regions that are independent and were ready to stand on their own feet in facing problems. Unfortunately decentralization of Indonesian education was implemented without a readiness test; authority was handed down at once, regardless of readiness;

5. Despite the impression that the MONE has real power in managing education decentralization, its reach is limited and constrained by political and bureaucratic structures and the capacity of those working in the system at all levels;

6. Managing decentralized education in Indonesia requires knowledge of diverse local cultures and traditions, employing strategies for improving community participation, empowering and improving the local districts’ managerial capacity. This cultural complexity creates significant problems for schools, school communities, teachers, and education managers;

7. Central governments should have policy tools, such as special grants to low-performing schools, to prevent inequity from increasing. In relation to that, local government should also be given relevant training and resources and be equipped with service quality measurement tools to avoid disparities in service provision among regions.

To sum up, Indonesian education decentralization is unique compared to decentralization in other countries. First for example, education is not only under one ministry (MONE), but also under two different institutions MOHA and MORA. In addition, it was triggered by a quick response to external pressure resulting from
political and economical turbulence rather than being an internal, smooth, well
planned process. Moreover, as a result of an abrupt, drastic and massive transfer of
authority many of the districts were unprepared to exercise their new mandates in
providing quality service. No wonder therefore, that many observers claim that up to
this point perhaps the Indonesian decentralization is merely a process for laying the
foundation for educational democratization at the local level. Probably it is still too
eyearly to expect decentralization to bring better education service quality at this stage.

**Important Findings on Service Quality**

The findings on the relationship between decentralization and service quality are
already detailed in chapter 3 and this section will elaborate some of the more
important findings only.

It is sometimes stated that educational service quality is more likely to improve if
locally based decision making processes can immediately affect the teaching-
learning process in schools (Ahmad, 2005). It is envisaged that customer or citizen
satisfaction will be improved accordingly, because service providers are closer and
more responsive to the customer’s needs. In the Indonesian case, DEOs are closer
than provincial or central level to school level. This is why, regardless of their
preparedness in managing their new authorities, DEOs were defined as a proper
place to delegate authority on the assumption that they could serve schools - their
main customers - better.

Unfortunately, improved service quality is generally not guaranteed and has not been
delivered. One possible reason according to Ganie (2007) is that Indonesian
decentralization is in fact a political reform mainly to restructure the political setting
among the three governance tiers. Very little was mentioned in legislation about the
reform of public service quality. It is therefore not surprising that service delivery at
the local level is not the main focus yet, almost ten years later. For most bureaucrats
decentralization was only for economic and political reasons following the fall of
Suharto, and nothing to do with service quality reform.
In addition, many international and Indonesian observers noticed that even long before decentralization, service quality problems already existed in Indonesia. For many reasons, outlined above, it is still too early to expect service quality to be substantially improved.

**Important Findings from Meetings**

In addition to gathering data or information from documents or printed words, I tried to capture relevant information from meetings I attended. The following paragraphs explore some of the important findings from the meetings; the complete table is attached in the portfolio (page 20; as exhibit 4).

These meeting notes from the first year of my research provide illustrations of education stakeholders’ concerns about the decentralization of education and its impact on service quality.

First of all, people were asking about performance indicators after the implementation of decentralization. Based on Government Regulation 19/2005 on National Education Standard there are eight main standards or categories: standard of content, standard of process, standard of competency, standard of personnel, standard of facilities, standards of funding and standard of evaluation (GOI, 2005b). Each standard is elaborated using indicators from the National Accreditation System. Unfortunately these indicators are applied only to measure the schooling system not to measure DEO performance. This is why the Indonesian government enacted government regulation 65/2005 on MSS, applied for measuring DEO service quality. Based on the new National Education Standards, the new accreditation instruments were revised accordingly and composed based on the eight components above.

Under this accreditation system, schools are classified as having A, B, C or D accreditation. But in relation to MSS people were questioning how DEOs should be categorized using the MSS system. Since the MSS system is still in progress, no certain answer can be found yet. If MSS are also meant to measure DEO
performance, there should be a possibility later on to classify DEOs based on their MSS assessment results. Meanwhile, as mentioned earlier, the latest Ministerial Decree 129a/U/2004 on MSS is no longer relevant since the enactment of the new decentralization laws. And based on several years implementation of this MSS decree, it would be preferable if the next MSS decree or regulation is enacted by using higher or stronger degrees of regulation such as government regulation or presidential decree, otherwise it would not be very effective.

People then also asked on whose authority quality improvement is being implemented. Up to the time when I wrote this report, it was still unclear who or what institutions are responsible for assessing DEO MSS, but there was some rumor that PEO and LPMP or Lembaga Penjamin Mutu Pendidikan (Educational Quality Assurance Body) at the provincial level were competing to wield this authority.

From the above findings, it was also interesting to note how people perceived decentralization implementation. Comments included:

1. Poor preparation in the districts prior to decentralization;
2. Low resources of human capital, financial and facilities to support effective decentralization;
3. Funding for regular activities is thought too slow to reach the target (districts, boards, or schools);
4. Previously the junior and senior high schools were under the district education ministerial office (Kandep) but now they are under the district education office (Dinas). As a result, problems started to emerge from this new relationship;
5. Islamic schools or madrasah are in a problematic position. If considered as religious institutions then they are not decentralized (religious affairs is retained to central government) but as educational institutions they should be decentralized.

Finally, regarding the lack of service quality vision, some people in one meeting were debating some probable causes why public (government) services cannot perform as well as private sector service providers. The comments were as follows:
1. Government offices are nonprofit oriented organizations;
2. Low civil servant salaries compared to private institutions;
3. A “Serve the boss culture,” not “Serve customers” culture still exists among officers;
4. Many government officials do not know their stakeholders/customers;
5. Complaining is taboo; citizens tend to be silent/passive customers;
6. There is a lack of entrepreneurship: because there is no fear of bankruptcy;
7. There is low accountability, transparency, responsibility and efficiency.

It is now time to explore stakeholder’s views regarding DEO service quality.

**Understanding DEO’s Stakeholder Views**

Having an understanding of the context of decentralization and service quality in Indonesia did not mean that I felt ready to propose any solutions concerning education service quality in Indonesia. So far, most the information I had gained was from documents or the printed word only. I realized that there are many people working out there struggling to improve education service quality. I started to realize that these people could become resources for my research on decentralization and service quality. I identified three groups of people, usually stakeholders from DEO offices. These included Boards of Education members, DEO staff and, most importantly, principals and teachers, the DEOs’ main customers. To these three different groups of stakeholders I distributed open ended questionnaires on 3 different occasions (see next page).

The questionnaires were distributed mainly to explore three issues: the current status of DEO service quality in fulfilling school needs; group perceptions on factors influencing service quality and what efforts are needed to improve service quality. This was important because at this point I had only gained information from the printed word. Knowing stake holder’s perception of DEO service quality would complement my initial understanding. In particular I was interested mostly to see factors influencing DEO service performance in the decentralized system.
The questionnaires were distributed between 2005 and 2007 in separate workshops attended by those three different groups of people. The number of respondents and their returned responses are as follows:

a. National Board of Education Workshops, Bogor National Workshop; July 14, 2005; 110 questionnaires distributed and 71 returned,

b. National Teachers and School Principals Workshops, Purnama Hotel Cipayung; July 25, 2005, 160 questionnaires distributed and 140 returned and
   Yogya Teachers and School Principals Workshops (Teacher/Principals Association Workshop), MGMP Office Yogya; August 24, 2007; 20 questionnaires distributed and 20 returned,

c. National District Staff Workshop, Surabaya; October 10, 2005. 109 questionnaires distributed and 73 returned.

Those respondents represented districts and cities from 33 different provinces throughout Indonesia. In this case I took advantage of being a senior administrator to meet many respondents from districts and ask them to fill out my open ended questionnaires (See exhibit 5 in the portfolio).

One might ask, “Why was it very important to collect these stakeholders’ views?” In social sciences (as discussed in chapter 2), meaning, knowledge or truth are in fact socially or subjectively constructed. Therefore, people’s or stakeholders’ views were needed to contribute to building a comprehensive understanding about the issue of decentralization and service quality in this case. Without support from the grassroots level, any formulated policy would have the possibility of failing, and a policy for improving DEO service quality is no exception. This is why bottom up, customer or citizen oriented policy would have a better chance of success. Moreover, in line with decentralization principles, participative decision making processes ought to be adopted at every opportunity.

There were about 300 questionnaires returned. Analyzing those 300 questionnaires was very challenging. One by one, each questionnaire was read, and responses typed in using a word processor (Words 2007). Then, themes were identified and their occurrences were counted as in quantitative survey. As a consequence of the open ended questions, respondents responded in many different ways, and many themes emerged. By using spreadsheet software (Excels 2007), all responses were sorted,
grouped and counted to establish frequency. To simplify this process, I only took the most frequently emerging themes. To see the detailed results of the analysis, please check exhibit 6 (page 29 in my portfolio).

Reading or understanding people’s minds through questionnaires was not as easy as I thought. I was always challenged to justify whether respondents really understood what they were saying. I often asked myself, “How do I know that what they say is true?” For example; to illustrate the current status of DEO service quality, some respondents replied; “Supportive enough”, “Very appreciated” or “It is not optimal yet”. As a result, I was questioning myself; did I ask the right question to the right person in a right way?

Secondly; euphemism in language or culture was challenging. Many Indonesians, especially Javanese, find it difficult to speak frankly especially if he or she is to assess something related to somebody’s status or reputation like DEO performance. When asked about the status of service quality since decentralization many would answer equivocally or vaguely. For example a respondent responded; “Well, in general it is good but there are many things that need to be improved.” It was not easy to categorize this response to indicate whether it falls in “good”, “average” or “bad” category. In many cases, they just want to please me as a MONE official, they would tell what they think I want to hear. This is an evidence that the Indonesian acronym called ‘ABS’ (Asal Bapak Senang - as long as the Boss is pleased) still existed and became an important issue in determining issues.

Another difficulty was how to separate or group those responses into similar categories. For example, to assess the current status of DEO service quality three categories were adequate: good, medium or bad. But when it came to categorizing factors influencing service quality, problems emerged. This was as a consequence of my open ended questionnaires. There are so many responses when respondents were asked about the factors, and to group them was not easy.

I grouped the responses thus: For questions 1 (What is the current situation of service quality?) there are 71 responses from BOE members, 73 responses from DEO staff
and 160 responses from school personnel (Principals and Teachers). Although I found that it was not easy to categorize them as described above, but finally I managed to group them into three categories; good, acceptable or medium and not good. Mainly because at first I asked whether people perceived service quality as better/good or worse/not good after decentralization, but many of them perceived it equivocally (neither better nor worse) and I interpreted it as in between or medium. For example a respondent said that generally the service was good, but there are many things that need to be improved.

For question 2 (What factors influence its service delivery?) there are 223 responses from BOE members, 302 responses from DEO staffs and 438 responses from school personnel. For the second and third questions, there are more responses than the number of respondents because many of them mentioned more than one factor. After processing, five major factors emerged: human, management, finance, facilities and external factors such as community or geography.

Finally for the third question (What efforts need to be taken to improve DEO service quality?) there were 172 responses from BOE members, 280 from DEO staff and 447 from school personnel. Since most respondents answered the second and third questions similarly, the emerging categories would automatically be similar: human, management, finance, facilities and external factors such as community or geography. The complete matrix showing three questions and responses from these three groups of respondents is seen as exhibit 8.

To discuss the findings of this research, a matrix was set up according to the three different questions. Findings from the first questions can be seen in the following table:
Table 4-1: Respondents’ Perceptions on the Current Status of DEO Service Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS</th>
<th>DEO STAFFS</th>
<th>PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: What is the status of current service quality?</td>
<td>Good 54.9</td>
<td>Good 42.5</td>
<td>Good 6.4</td>
<td>34.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium 16.9</td>
<td>Medium 42.5</td>
<td>Medium 63.7</td>
<td>41.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Good 28.2</td>
<td>Not Good 15.1</td>
<td>Not Good 29.9</td>
<td>24.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: prepared by researcher

It is important to note that principals and teachers as the main customer of DEO responded differently compared to BOE member and DEO staff. Only 6.4 percent stated that the service was good. This is a strong or significant signal to education managers that DEO service quality needs to be improved to satisfy school needs.

These analyses do not always accurately reflect the large number of equivocal responses made by the respondents. Typical of the responses was comment such as ‘Generally good but there are things that need to be improved.” The respondent then listed a number concerns that seemed to indicate that they thought that the quality was not really good.

It should also be noted that often respondents from the same district had vastly different views of the current status of quality. One possible reason for this is that many public servants in Indonesia are reluctant to criticize or to speak frankly.

Others, depending on their situations, may have different perceptions. For example, a principal of a good public school in a district might respond differently from a principal of poor-private school from the same district.

The figure above shows that problems with DEO service quality do exist. However the three different groups of respondents have different perceptions about the degree of the problems. 28.2 percent of Board members, 15.1 of district staff and 29.9 percent of school personnel perceive that the service is not good. Interestingly, more
school personnel perceive that the service is not good compared to board and district personnel. This is important as schools are the DEOs’ most important customers; they are in the strongest position to judge district service performance. The findings of the second question will be explored.

Table 4-2:
Respondents’ Perceptions on the Influencing Factors of DEO Service Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS</th>
<th>DEO STAFFS</th>
<th>PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: What factors influence its delivery?</td>
<td>Human Capital 32.7</td>
<td>Human Capital 27.8</td>
<td>Human Capital 27.9</td>
<td>29.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management/Organization 35.4</td>
<td>Management/Organization 24.8</td>
<td>Management/Organization 35.4</td>
<td>31.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography/Community 13.5</td>
<td>Geography/Community 18.5</td>
<td>Geography/Community 8.2</td>
<td>13.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Facility 8.1</td>
<td>Facility 17.5</td>
<td>Facility 15.3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Funding 10.3</td>
<td>Funding 11.3</td>
<td>Funding 13.2</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: prepared by researcher

It is important to note that many respondents perceive that the factors are not limited to the internal factors (from within the district itself) but also from its external factors such as number of schools within DEO areas, the characteristics of people living in the district area as a community or even geographical characteristics of the districts (dense, sparse, dry, hilly, flat, mountainous, etc.). Therefore, whenever a respondent mentioned human, management, funding or facilities he or she might refer to these factors either at district office or school level. Trying to compose the above figure or table was another challenging task in this research. To detect the emerging categories or factors, at least I went through two cycles. Firstly identifying the clear and obvious factors from respondents’ responses (There are 963 responses; 223 responses from BOE members, 302 responses from DEO staff and 438 responses from school personnel.) This is not easy because many times respondents did not really state that perceptions clearly. For example when they mention words such as commitment, transparency or communication, I have to judge whether they belong to human or management categories. Communication between personnel would obviously belong to human development, but communication between DEO and its schools is something related to management or organization factors. Another example, for instance a respondent mentioned that teachers need more incentive to
improve their prosperity and, in turn, improve teaching-learning processes while, on the other hand, another respondent asked for more funding for school rehabilitation. Although teaching-learning processes and school facilities were mentioned, but in this case, the focus is actually funding for both of them. In addition, since this research is focused more on the district rather on the school level, many times I had to identify whether a factor really belonged to district office or to an external factor. When words or phrases such as ‘school conditions’, ‘transportation facilities’, ‘mountainous area’ etc. were mentioned, I had to judge that those factors were external to the DEO. This actually gave me a hint that service quality affects many different points in the education sector. In this case, there are two points; in DEOs and in schools. Any concepts related to education service quality improvement should really consider both of these.

From the table above it can be seen that concerns about factors related to management, governance or organizations were the most common. Probably this is due to the introduction of new concepts such as decentralization, autonomy, democratization and school based management that for many respondents are still not clear enough and are causing some confusion at the grass roots level. On the other hand, Indonesia as a developing country, is still struggling with its basic needs in developing the education sectors. Factors such as competent human resources, acceptable facilities or funding are the very basic needs for any unit of organization system to run its mission properly. It is not surprising therefore, that education could not perform better in a poor district or school. In many cases probably, it is even too much to expect or too early to force them to perform efficiently and effectively.

What are really needed in the near future are more understandable concepts of DEO service quality, including an explanation of relevant factors. In addition, an instrument to measure the degree of its fulfillment of either quantity or quality is necessary to judge whether a district is delivering a better or worse service. Again, application of MSS is one of the most effective mechanisms to achieve this. Based on the findings of this second question, it is clear that the MSS components should include the factors above. Finally, the response of the third questions is illustrated in the following figure.
When defining the third question, I did not realize that respondents would respond in a similar way to the second question. Although they did not use exactly the same words or sentences, substantially they mentioned similar things or words as they used in their responses for the second question. This is sensible because whenever a cause is identified, the needed effort becomes obvious. As a consequence of this, the categories in the third figure or table above are similar to the one used in the previous figure; consisting of five main categories such as human, management, funding, facilities and external factors.

Nevertheless, I found similar challenges and difficulties in analyzing the respondents’ views for this third question. From this third question (What needs to be done to improve DEO service quality?), I found 899 responses covering 172 responses from BOE members, 280 from DEO staffs and 447 from school personnel. It was a tedious task reading every single response, identifying its category and grouping them into categories. After dealing with those data for months, fortunately, finally I had several days full time to finalize this process during my visit to Melbourne while consulting with supervisors in the middle of 2009. It was too difficult to be done during my regular work time.

As the above figure show, many respondents perceived that aspects related to management and organizations are dominant factors influencing service quality. More than 26 percent of the responses could be categorized as management, organization or governance, and this is the highest percentage of all categories. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that from both questions number 2 and 3, human
and management categories consistently ranked in the higher percentage as shown below.

Table 4-4:
Most Important Factors in Improving DEO Service Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Main Factors</th>
<th>Percentage Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Human Resources</td>
<td>29.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Management/Organization</td>
<td>31.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Geography/Community</td>
<td>13.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Facility</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Finance/Funding</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percentage</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: prepared by researcher

This is an indication that most respondents place these two categories in a higher priority to be dealt with, if a DEO is to improve its service quality. Moreover, if averaged, the respondent’s responses from the second and third questions have a similar pattern in prioritizing the categories, where human resources, management/organization and facility are the three highest priority categories as shown in the above figure. This is an indication that respondents have consistent perceptions when asked about the factors influencing service quality and efforts needed to improve it.

Now it is time to conclude the discussion about the findings from the open ended questionnaires. Several important things need to be considered. First, it needs to be acknowledged that the aim of the survey was to gauge participant’s perception. A different form of measurement may produce a different result. Second, although the three groups of respondents responded differently when asked about the current status of DEO service quality, it is obvious that they view problems in service delivery as a reality. The majority of respondents perceived that the service is in medium state (41.02%), many would perceive it as good (34.59%) and the rest would say not good (24.39%). This suggests that almost approximately 65% percent are less than really satisfied with DEO performance. Based on the responses from the questionnaires, there are five main factors influencing poor DEO service quality; managerial or organizational, human resources, and facilities, external and financial.
factors. Consequently, any effort to improve DEO service quality after decentralization in Indonesia, should consider the quantity and quality of these main factors.

Identifying influencing factors is an important step for improving DEO service quality, but what to do next is a more important question. Based on information from the context analysis and respondent responses it is clear that in order for decentralization to be fruitful and promote better public service quality, some conditions should be met, one of them is local government capacity. Literature and respondents also suggest the importance of defining certain standards for measuring service quality as part of the decentralization process. David Osborn and Ted Gartner (1993) in their book Reinventing Government explicitly state why measuring performance is critically important;

If you don’t measure results, you can’t tell success from failure;
If you can’t see success, you can’t reward it;
If you can’t reward success, you’re probably rewarding failure;
If you can’t see success, you can’t learn from it;
If you can’t recognize failure, you can’t correct it;
If you can demonstrate results, you can win public support.

( Osborn and Gartner ,1993)

This is the reason why MSS are becoming important in the Indonesian decentralized education system. How MSS are formulated will be discussed later in phase two. But before that, first it is important to see the real world of educational services in some Indonesian DEOs.

**Visiting the Fields**

After the context analysis and questionnaire process I was curious to observe the reality in the field, to find whether the information gathered so far could be supported by information from the real world and as a result of my observations. Fortunately, as an administrator working in the MONE, I have the opportunity to visit many DEOs. During 2005 and 2006 I visited some the following districts:
a. Yogyakarta City in Yogyakarta Special Territory Province, 22, 23 August 2005;
b. Lombok Tengah District in West Nusa Tenggara Province, 25, 26 August 2005;
c. Tangerang District in West Java Province, 24 February 2006;
d. Bekasi District in West Java Province, 23 February 2006.
(Please check attached Indonesian map for the location of these districts).

Yogyakarta is not very advanced economically but its education services are relatively good. Lombok Tengah District was actually under the DBEP (Decentralized Basic Education Project) sponsored by the ADB and receiving considerable assistance to improve its education quality. The last two districts, Tangerang and Bekasi represent typical districts on the border of the capital city of Jakarta; however, Tangerang is considered to have the better economic conditions of the two.

Visiting Yogyakarta Province

In August 22nd to 23rd 2005, I began to collect data from a series of field visits to Yogyakarta Municipality in the Yogyakarta Special Region or Province. It was our first visit to Yogyakarta as a team with my two RMIT supervisors Dr. Bill Vistarini and Dr. David Hodges. I was also accompanied by my local supervisor Prof Slamet PH, and my two colleagues Mr. Didik Suhardi and Mr. Moch Abduh. Fortunately, later on, I had other opportunities to visit Yogyakarta either as a researcher or as an administrator from the MONE.

Propinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta or Yogyakarta Special Territory Province is considered a special territory because of its historic role in Indonesian independence. During the Dutch occupation, the kingdom was a sultanate and one of the few kingdoms which refused to acknowledge Dutch authority. During the nineteen forties, the capital of Indonesia was located in this city, and at that time Sukarno as the first president moved around, avoiding the Dutch.
In this province, there are four districts (Sleman, Kulanprogo, Gunungkidul and Bantul) and also one city or municipality (Yogyakarta City). This Special Territory of Yogyakarta province has a total area of 3,185.80 km² with a population of approximately 3,200,517 in 2004 (Yogyakarta PEO, 2004). It is located on the island of Java (south-central part of Java) and is surrounded by the district of Central Java Province on its west, north and east side, and the Indian Ocean on the south side. It is the only province in Indonesia that is still formally governed by a pre-colonial Sultanate, the Sultanate of Ngayogyakarta Hadiningrat.

In September 2005 when I proposed to undertake some observations in the Yogya City DEO, one of its staffs questioned me about my intentions as though I were an intruder in their community. This included asking for a formal letter from the MONE. Fortunately, later on, I was lucky because the head of this DEO is someone I know very well as we had worked in the same room in 1994-1996 as staff of the Yogyakarta Education Provincial Office at that time. Since meeting him, I have had no more difficulty doing my observation in Yogya City and I was welcomed to visit and observe its education anytime. From these visits I collected additional information related to the context analysis and the open ended questionnaires previously discussed. The following paragraphs elaborate information gathered from Yogya as a province and its two local territories; Yogya City and Bantul District.
Visiting Yogyakarta City

Educational development in Yogyakarta province is relatively good compared to other provinces in the country. Its highest ranking in *Wajib Belajar 9 Tahun* (Nine Year Basic Education) compared to other provinces is an indicator. According to the 2006/2007 Nine Year Basic Education Report, Yogyakarta Province, Jakarta and Bali are the three highest achieving provinces in basic education GER with more than 90 percent of its 7-12 and 13-15 year population age enrolled in elementary and junior high schools. This is a significant achievement because economically Yogyakarta is poorer than the other two provinces. Unfortunately, this achievement varies among districts/city within Yogyakarta Province itself. Yogya City is considered as the best developed district.

Obviously, visiting all the districts as well as the city was impractical for me at that time; this is why at first I focused on Yogya City while Bantul District (described later) was visited because of a school rehabilitation program after an earthquake hit the area. Yogyakarta Municipality or Yogyakarta City is actually only a small territory compared to its neighboring districts (*Sleman, Gunungkidul, Kulonprogo* and *Bantul*). *Yogyakarta* city is the capital of the province. It is well-known as a center of classical Javanese fine art and culture such as batik printing, ballet, drama, music, poetry and puppet shows. These advantages of Yogyakarta bring a better economic life to its people. Yogyakarta is the second most important tourist destination in Indonesia after Bali. Yogyakarta is also known as one of education centers in Indonesia. In the old days many students from various parts of Indonesia would choose Yogyakarta as their destination to finish their studies. But nowadays after every part of the country is improving their own education system and facilities, there is a tendency for the number of students studying in Yogyakarta to decrease. This is becoming a crucial issue.

This phenomenon is interesting, because in one hand the local government is forced to improve its education quality to attract students from different districts and at the same time to increase its local revenue. Probably this is why Yogyakarta DEO’s service quality is relatively better than other DEOs. But the quality of education in Yogyakarta is not only as a result of DEO service quality, but also as a result of its people valuing education.
I still remember when one of the DEO staff who lives in Bantul District (the southern part of Yogy Province) told me a story about his neighbor. There was a poor family in his neighborhood, but the parents and their children were very concerned about education. One of his neighbor’s children went to a forestry high school (Sekolah Menengah Perkebunan/SPBMA) in the northern part of Yogyakarta, although they lived in south part of Yogyakarta. This boy had to get up very early in the morning and ride a bicycle for about 2-3 hours every day to get to his school (Yogyakarta Notes). This story showed me how motivated they are to finish education. If most parents and students are as motivated as they are, it would be much easier for the DEO to direct and improve education quality. Community participation is also built up by strong commitment toward education by all community members, not only by active participation in school committee.

Although most people in Yogyakarta do not have a high income, their high appreciation of education is a great advantage in improving education service quality. The DEO staff continued to explain about his neighbor; “In the old days it was ok for children not to go to school because there were only small number of people in the village, with wide area of land to plant crops and vegetables. But all these lands are now gone, and we cannot cultivate streets or a parking area. Schooling is the only way to earn a life in a city” This must be another reason why people are more motivated to finish education in cities like Yogy rather than in villages or rural areas with plentiful natural resources.

This conversation with one of Yogya City DEO staff triggered greater knowledge and understanding of these city education aspects. This was the first time I felt the difference between being a researcher rather than an administrator or manager as I used to be. Although I lived in this city many years ago and I visited it many times, but I had not seriously questioned its education system. Being a doctoral student, I now felt as if I had to question anything I saw or heard about Yogya education and needed to answer it scientifically. Unfortunately, time is always limited and the focus needed to be set: DEO service quality.
If DEO service quality is demonstrated by its ability to serve schools; school conditions could then be used as an indicator to show the quality of DEO service. Observing schools around Yogya City I could not find a school with poor conditions. But as we travelled to northern part of this province, to Sleman District I could see some schools that were not fully rehabilitated. When we visited one of Junior High Schools (SMP), I could see there were problems with its classrooms and laboratories. It seemed that the further the schools were from city center, the more problems we found. In rural areas where community support is poor, schools (mainly public) are strongly dependent on DEO services. A poor school tends to indicate poor DEO services. Unfortunately to check each school condition was impossible, and accurate, broad-based data became significant.

Since decentralization obtaining good data has become challenging, mainly because systems, people and facilities were mixed up among different units in the DEOs. The DEO personnel were unable to show the educational data or information at the time when I asked, but promised to send it on later. After I waited for several weeks, finally they emailed me the data. I suspected that they had worked very hard to prepare it, yet the data appeared incomplete and inaccurate. I had to be very critical and check it with other sources of data and information before quoting it. The following information was gathered and compiled from the Yogya City DEO education profile and other sources.

The following table shows that in terms of primary and secondary education enrollment, the City of Yogya is relatively good with GER percentage of more than hundred percent. I was curious and asked for some clarification from one of the DEO staff. It was explained that the GER is more than one hundred percent for some reasons. First of all, there are students who are under or over school age but still enrolled within the elementary and secondary education. Secondly, Yogya City has better education facilities compared to the other districts; this would automatically attract people from neighboring districts to send their children to go to the city’s schools rather than to schools within their own districts.
Table 4-5:
Education Profile in Yogyakarta City 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Population in School Aged</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</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>225</td>
<td>43,433</td>
<td>26,968</td>
<td></td>
<td>161.77</td>
<td>142.70</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Secondary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22,667</td>
<td>16,130</td>
<td></td>
<td>154.94</td>
<td>109.23</td>
<td>118.14</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Secondary</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21,050</td>
<td>27,576</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.33</td>
<td>100.04</td>
<td>86.99</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Yogya City Education Profile, 2005

On the other hand, the enrollment rate in senior secondary education is lower. This might indicate that not all junior secondary school graduates automatically enrolled in senior high schools. When I confirmed this with a DEO staff member, problems of data management emerged. He said that the GER should be somewhere around a hundred percent as described in DEO’s statistics. I questioned further, if the GER is a comparison between number of students and school aged population, and the number of students is lower, then the GER should be less than hundred percent. Since the statistics were already published formally, the staff assured me that it is difficult or even impossible for DEO to revise it. There was a common saying among Indonesian bureaucrats, “Only God knows data.” Statistics are only a basis for planning, the DEO staff explained. Later on I found out informally that the DEO is only responsible for data related to education such as school, teacher or students. Population in general (non students) is under the Regional Bureau of Statistics (BPS = Biro Pusat Statistik), this is why DEOs never know for sure about the data of population, they just take it for granted from BPS, and whenever a problem occurs further confirmation is too difficult. At the end, I was allowed to quote the above table, but only for the purpose of this study because the senior secondary education GER is different from its original. What data! The more we explored the more problems emerged. This is why I limited the discussion only to some important data for illustrating aspects of the DEOs.
Using factors influencing service quality identified in the open ended questionnaires, the above table shows that facilities (classrooms) and education personnel (teachers) still have problems. About 13 percent of elementary classrooms (145 classrooms) are in poor condition, indicating that even in a relatively big city like Yogya poor classrooms could still be found. One DEO staff explained that many of the elementary schools were built in the 1970s when Indonesia was experiencing an oil boom, and have never been significantly rehabilitated ever since. In addition, unqualified teachers also still exist both in public and Islamic elementary schools (almost 5 percent). To improve both factors (classrooms and teachers) in a short time would be a challenging task for Yogya City DEO, especially because of the amount of finances needed.

Unlike elementary schools, the following simple Junior High School statistics give an impression that Junior High Schools are, in general, better than elementary schools especially shown by better classroom conditions. Only about 0.5 percent (4 out of 678) classrooms are in poor condition, this is far better than the elementary school classrooms. On the other hand, problems with teacher qualification still exist in junior high schools. This is another challenging task for the DEO.
Table 4-7:
Quality of Teachers and Facilities in
Yogyakarta City Junior High Schools 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>SMP (Junior High)</th>
<th>MTs (Islamic JHS)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baik (Good)</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Ringan (Medium)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Berat (Poor)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guru (Teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Layak mengajar (qualified)</td>
<td>75,79</td>
<td>86,85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• semi layak (semi qualified)</td>
<td>11,32</td>
<td>11,74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tidak layak (not qualified)</td>
<td>12,89</td>
<td>1,41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Profile of Yogya City Education, DEO of Yogya, 2005

It is interesting to note that there are only 2 elementary Islamic schools in the city, while on the other hand there are 7 junior and 7 senior Islamic secondary schools. It seems that some junior or senior Islamic school student intakes are coming from public elementary and junior secondary schools. This is an indication that there is a flexibility regarding cross registration where students from public elementary schools could enroll to junior Islamic schools in the city.

Regarding public, vocational or Islamic senior high schools, the following table provides short descriptions. Again, compared with elementary school classrooms, the senior high school classrooms are generally better. Only six out of 1081 classrooms are categorized as in poor condition. In terms of teacher qualification, it seems that public, Islamic and vocational high schools experience similar problems. Among the three, the Islamic high schools have the highest percentage almost fourteen percent of its teachers are not qualified. This is another problem for the DEO to resolve. The lower the number of poor classrooms and unqualified teachers, the better the DEO is serving school needs.
So it can be seen that there are still problems at all levels of education. Even though only limited aspects of educational data were explored, nevertheless it gave an indication that problems related to personnel and facilities (as mentioned by many respondents in their open ended responses) did exist in Yogyakarta City. Unfortunately within the very limited time of my visit, I could not explore all the other factors influencing service quality (management, funding and geography/external factors). From some discussions with some DEO staff however, it can be initially concluded that the problems with school facilities and personnel indicate these other three factors. It sounds reasonable because school facilities and personnel are in many ways a result of DEO management supported by its funding and external or community participation. It shows that my observation in this visit support, in many ways, the respondents’ views about factors influencing DEO service quality.

Besides collecting data from some observations as discussed above, I also conducted some interviews or consultations with important respondents in Yogyakarta City such as the DEO head (Kepala Dinas), the BOE Chairman (Ketua Dewan), School personnel (Principal and or teachers), and the School Committee Chairman (Ketua Komite Sekolah). Only significant issue as the result of this interview and discussion is described in the following paragraphs. The interviews or consultations were
guided by questions related to my research questions such as; what is the current situation of service quality and what is actually meant by service quality? What efforts are needed to improve service quality? And what strategy is needed to implement service quality?

As a start-up at first, I interviewed the head of the Yogyakarta District DEO by asking the question; what is meant by service quality that you provide to your schools? The answer was: I would say service quality is a service that I give to my schools in the dimensions of management and leadership. I asked further question: What kinds of service do you give to your schools? He answered I give funds, I train them, and I give them school facilities.

When I asked him: What new practices do you want to apply in order to improve the service quality given to your schools? He confidently answered my question: I will develop a holistic system of service quality, I will develop my DEO’s capacity to do the job, and I will develop resources required to provide good services to my schools i.e. human, financial, and material resources for both soft and hardware.

His ideas of good practices for service quality were clear and comprehensive.

And then I tried to ask a more detailed question: Can you tell me what is meant by system, institution, and resources in order for your DEO to be able to offer better service quality to your schools? Again, he replied confidently: By system I mean policy and regulation development so my DEO is able to provide better service quality to my schools. By institution I mean my DEO has to have a clear and good direction and guidance, management, organization, leadership, entrepreneurship, and monitoring and evaluation. By resources I mean my DEO has to have the necessary and sufficient resources (human, financial, and material) to run my DEO in order to be able to offer better service quality to my schools. In addition, I propose to improve the current MSS i.e. the Ministry Decree 129a/U/2004 covering all dimensions above. The new Government Regulations 38/2007 and 41/2007 must be used as a references to formulate the new MSS.

When he was asked: How do you go about changing from the current to new practices of DEO service quality? His brief and succinct answer was: It requires preconditions for successful new practical implementation such as resources.
institutions with capacity, and clearly established legal aspects. However, the most important point is that, new practices will be successfully implemented if they are generated from the bottom up (from the perspective of consumers of new practices of DEO service quality, the schools). I asked a further question: How complex is it to implement the new practices of DEO service quality? He answered: It is very complex, it involves many different key players, and it includes a wide variety of actions. The answers, although very general were logical and very relevant to the required conditions for successful implementation of new practices.

At the district of Yogyakarta, I interviewed the chairman of district board of education, using the same question as I used earlier. I asked him: As a chairman of district board of education, what new practices of DEO service quality do you expect? He replied: I expect that the DEO will develop a sound MSS, provide the DEO with capacity to do its jobs, and necessary and sufficient resources to run the DEO in order to be able to provide high service quality to its schools. For me, the schools are the most valuable customer of the DEO. If I were the head of DEO, I would like to do my best to facilitate, to serve, to assist, and to empower the schools under whatever conditions.

I then asked the following question: Do you have any ideas of how to implement new practices of DEO service quality? He answered: First, when we implement new practices of DEO service quality, we must be fully cognizant of their complexity and diversity. Another seemingly trivial but practical consideration when it comes to implementation of new practices is the fact that the existing systems and organizational structures are very complex. We must be able to identify key priorities in implementing new practices. I must say that it is a lot easier to develop new practices than it is to make them happen. I also predict that introducing new practices is likely to take 3 years to plan, implement, evaluate and disseminate. Therefore, we have to recognize that Rome was not built in one day. This answer was challenging because it showed me the complexity of implementing new practices.

In Yogyakarta I visited several schools. At Junior Secondary School 5 (SMPN 5 Yogyakarta), I interviewed the school principal. As a school principal, what changes do you expect from the current DEO service quality given to your school? He
answered bravely and logically: The DEO must serve the schools not vice versa. The DEO should know the real problems and the real needs of the schools, and then the DEO should know the real solutions. This is my general comments. But, I have specific suggestion to the DEO. If the DEO would like to serve my school with high quality, I want DEO people to help me in procuring schools facilities because I need them very much. I want the DEO to give more funds to my school because I need more money to run my school. I want the DEO to give me clear direction, guidance and regulation as to how I should run my school. I need clear information from the DEO about the status of my school as compared to other schools (I interpreted this statement as school monitoring and evaluation). In addition, give me more authority and more responsibility for my school, because it is now over-regulated, over-administered, but under-managed. For example, I need a teacher of subject matter ‘A’, but the DEO gave a teacher of subject matter ‘B’. This is inappropriate.

In the same school, I then talked to two teachers; Mathematics and a Science teacher. I asked them: What new practices of service quality do you want from the DEO in order to be able to better teach your students? One of them proposed: I want the DEO to support training for me to improve my competency in teaching. I want the DEO to provide modern learning materials, teacher made learning materials and the latest modern published text books. I want the DEO to support modern learning media (written, electronic, models, etc.), an updated laboratory, and materials for experimentation. I also want the DEO to have competent personnel, sufficient funds, and materials to run the DEO in order to serve my teaching better. Another teacher said: I agree with him but I need more, that is, I want more opportunities given by the DEO for me to develop my career. Their answers were relevant to their tasks as teachers and provided useful, insight into customer perception of a DEO.

After visiting SMPN 5, I visited another school in Yogyakarta, SMPN 8, to meet the school principal and teachers. My intention to come to SMPN 8 Yogyakarta was to get ideas from the real customers of DEO (the schools) as I did in SMPN 5. I then asked the principal a question: If new practices of DEO service quality are going to be implemented, do you have any ideas of how to implement it? He replied: I suggest that the DEOs have to have high quality of design and high quality of conformance to design. The last one, it deals with whether or not the processes and procedures
outlined in the design phase are being used and are effective. That is my only suggestion.

I continued to collect ideas from teachers of the same school. I also asked teachers exactly the same question as I asked the school principal, and one of the teachers replied: *The DEO should involve us because we are the ones who are impacted by the new practices of DEO service quality. The DEO should apply a bottom-up approach prescribing how agreed-upon targets can be achieved effectively.*

Interviewing the chairman of the school committee, I asked this question: *What new practices of service quality should be given by the DEO to schools in order to improve the current practices of schools?* He honestly replied: *I am not well informed with the tasks of the DEO in providing services to schools because I do not have a direct linkage with the DEO. What I know is that, as a community representative, I want the DEO to run campaigns on the importance of education for community at large and advise on how to involve the community in order that they support education intellectually, morally, financially, and materially. This is all what I want from the DEO.*

In the final session, I questioned the chairman of school committee of SMPN 8 Yogyakarta. He replied: *I think the DEO has to develop its capacity in terms of staff and organization, and be able to steer resources into priority program implementation of the new practices.* The answer was short and concise.

It seems that people perceive the concept and factors influencing service quality in different ways. But still, I presume that the responses from interview or discussion above can also be analyzed and grouped by using the same way as used in analyzing open ended questionnaires before with similar results. Some new suggestions emerged, for example, it was suggested to view the implementation side rather than formulation side which was considered to be an easier step. *How to make it happen in the real world is more difficult,* one respondent explained.

Although Yogyakarta City has a good reputation in the education sector, this doesn’t necessarily mean that its DEO is free from problems. From my short observation,
data analysis and interview or discussion, it is clearer now that there are still problems related to school facilities (class rooms) and school personnel (teachers). Indirectly, this is an indication that the DEO is also still facing financial, managerial and external or community participation problems as mentioned by many respondents in their open ended questionnaires discussed earlier.

Visiting Bantul District

As one of Yogyakarta’s Special Territory districts, Bantul is located in the southern part of Yogya and adjoins the south sea (Indonesian Sea). To the west, Bantul borders Kulon Progo District with Gunung Kidul on its east side. While to the north side Bantul adjoins Yogya City and Sleman District. With an area of about 506.85 km\(^2\) Bantul was populated by around 796,863 people in 2004. Unlike Yogya City, most of its population lives in villages and some of them are still considered under developed (Bantul DEO Profile, 2005). The following information was compiled from several sources during the Bantul visit and briefly describes some aspects related to its education profile before this area was struck by a severe earthquake.

Table 4-9: Education Profile in Bantul District 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>
<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>442</td>
<td>71.005</td>
<td>69,697</td>
<td>105.08</td>
<td>91.40</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Secondary School</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>29.676</td>
<td>36.594</td>
<td>93.09</td>
<td>70.75</td>
<td>117.68</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Secondary School</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.519</td>
<td>33.450</td>
<td>72.06</td>
<td>51.52</td>
<td>74.85</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bantul District Education Profile, 2005
From the above table it can be seen that the older the population, the less their participation in the schooling system. The higher the schooling level, the lower the number of students and schools. There are 442 elementary schools with 71,005 students, 85 junior high schools with 36,594 students and 36 senior high schools with only 13,519 students. With GER below hundred percent, it is clear that Bantul still faces problems with educational access especially in junior and senior high education. For the Bantul DEO to serve the total school age population, additional school facilities would be needed and this would be a challenging task because even its existing educational facilities still experience difficulties as indicated in the following tables:

### Table 4-10:
**Quality of Teachers and Facilities**
**In Bantul Elementary Schools 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>SD (Elementary)</th>
<th>MI (Islamic Elementary)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Sekolah</em> (Schools)</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kelas</em> Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Baik</em> (Good)</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rusak Ringan</em> (Medium)</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rusak Berat</em> (Poor)</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Guru</em> (Teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Layak mengajar</em> (qualified)</td>
<td>3,774</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>semi layak</em> (semi qualified)</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tidak layak</em> (not qualified)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Profile of Bantul District Education, DEO of Bantul, 2005

Using only two important factors in the above table; personnel and facilities, we can still see how Bantul elementary schools still face serious problems. First of all, from its 3,010 classrooms, 337 (11 %) were still in poor condition. While 60 teachers out of 4,709 (1.3 %) are still not qualified. These are challenges to be faced by the Bantul DEO in developing the education sector. On the other hand, the DEO should also work hand in hand with the MORA district office to improve Islamic schools in Bantul district because from the table above it can be seen that some Islamic schools are also still facing similar problems to public elementary schools with their personnel and facilities.
Table 4-11:
Quality of Teachers and Facilities
In Bantul Junior High Schools 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>SMP (Junior High)</th>
<th>MTs (Islamic JHS)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baik (Good)</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Ringan (Medium)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Berat (Poor)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guru (Teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Layak mengajar (qualified)</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>2,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• semi layak (semi qualified)</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tidak layak (not qualified)</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Profile of Bantul District Education, DEO of Bantul, 2005

Not only Bantul elementary education, but its junior high schools and junior Islamic high schools are also facing similar personnel and facility problems. 23 of Bantul junior high school classrooms were already in poor condition, while only 5 of its Islamic junior high school classrooms were in the same poor condition. For its school personnel, 307 teachers in public junior high school are not qualified, while 55 of Islamic junior high school are not qualified. Although the number is not as high as in elementary education, it will be challenging for the Bantul DEO to improve the situation.

Table 4-12:
Quality of Teachers and Facilities
In Bantul Senior High and Vocational Schools 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>SMA (Senior HS)</th>
<th>MA (Islamic SH)</th>
<th>SMK (Vocational HS)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baik (Good)</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Ringan (Medium)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Berat (Poor)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guru (Teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Layak mengajar (qualified)</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• semi layak (semi qualified)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tidak layak (not qualified)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Profile of Bantul District Education, DEO of Bantul, 2005
Finally, for the Bantul district senior high education, problems related to personnel and classroom facilities still exist. From the table above, it can be seen that only 2 senior high school classrooms and 2 senior vocational high schools are in poor condition. This far better compared to its elementary and junior high schools. Meanwhile 105 senior high school, 34 senior Islamic school and 87 senior vocational high school teachers are still not qualified. In short, it can be seen that the Bantul District is also still facing some inadequacies in two most important of its educational service quality factors: personnel and facilities.

The visit to Bantul District was initially not related to this Research by Project because I was sent there with some other MONE staff to help classroom rehabilitation after the earth quake struck the district on May 26, 2007. As an aside, as government officials we are expected to respond to emergencies and it seems there have recently been too many. Obviously our work interrupts our research. Research by project does have its challenges. However, I was able to collect important information regarding some educational aspects of Bantul district as discussed above.

The 5.9 Richter scale earth quake erupted only for 57 seconds, but the impact was unimaginable. The earthquake center was about 35 kilometers south of Java and within 10 kilometers deep (BMG/Badan Meteorologi dan Geofisika = Indonesian Bureau of Meteorology and Geophysics, 2006). According to the official report from SATKORLAK (Coordinating unit for disaster relief) there were more than five thousands dead in Bantul district and its neighboring districts including Yogya City and some adjacent districts of central Java (http://www.detik.com; Sunday, May 28, 2006, 20.35). The photograph below shows one example of how serious the destruction was.
Figure 4-1:
Destruction caused by the earthquake in one village in Bantul, May 2006

http://www.littlecare.org/eng/childrenscreative_room_pleret.html

As the photograph shows, most of the simple houses in the village were destroyed. Most of them were constructed simply of clay walls and bamboo roofs. Since the earthquake occurred early in the morning at about 5.45 am, most of the inhabitant were still in their houses, and unable to escape the devastation. Most government offices including schools were also damaged by the quake. The following photograph shows a damaged elementary school in Bantul district, with only one side of a class room wall left. Luckily the quake occurred on a Sunday morning when students were on holiday.
Most schools, especially elementary and secondary schools in Bantul District were destroyed and unable to support the normal teaching-learning process. Without central government assistance, the local government would face serious difficulties and take a long time to rebuild the schools. This is why some central government funds were re-allocated to support school rehabilitation. Assistance was provided according to the degree of damage suffered, regardless of the school level.

One of the Earthquake Relief Centers in Yogya PPPG Kesenian (Center for Arts Teacher Training) reported that on June 14th 2007 most of the schools are either totally destroyed or in poor condition. The following table shows the seriousness of the impact of earthquake on the Bantul education facilities:
Table 4-13:
Bantul Schools Condition one month after the Earthquake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Sub Districts</th>
<th>School Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totally Destroyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Srandakan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sanden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kretek</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pundong</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bambangliporo</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pandak</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bantul</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jatis</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Imogiri</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dlingo</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pleret</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Piyungan</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Banguntapan</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sewon</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kasihan</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pajangan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sedayu</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total : 197 421 344 154 1.116

Monday, July 26th 2009, 12.15

One of the programs diverted to support the rehabilitation was the Management of System Information program which was under my unit in the Secretariat Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education Planning Division. This budget reallocation shows how large the central government commitment was, to help local government to bring the education facilities back to normal after the disaster. The photograph below shows how very simple, temporary class rooms were built, to allow the learning process to continue. Rehabilitation became the first priority.
Together with some other program coordinators, we were sent to rehabilitate school buildings ranging from kindergartens, elementary schools, junior and senior high schools and also senior vocational schools in the district. When necessary, we were also allowed to rehabilitate *madrasah* or Islamic school under the *MORA*. The total budget administered under my unit was Rp.5.200.000.000, - ($US 520.000) spent to rehabilitate 18 kindergartens and elementary schools in Bantul district and Yogya City.

When we visited Yogyakarta on October 30, 2006 about six months after the quake, things were a lot better, but many class rooms and school facilities in Yogya City and Bantul District had not yet been reconstructed. As a team of about 8 MONE staff we arrived at Bantul DEO office for our first coordination meeting before beginning the
rehabilitation program. The building was still in a precarious condition, many walls were cracked and only parts of the building were available for daily activities. After waiting in line as guests, we were finally invited to enter the guest room and were interviewed by the receptionist. Unfortunately, the DEO head was not available and none of his staff were willing to welcome us and discuss the classroom rehabilitation. This was an indication of how unresponsive the DEO staffs were, reluctant even to meet us who were about to help them. One staff member finally suggested that we come back again later, after the DEO head was available. Just before we left, I informally asked one security guard why the situation was unlike before. He explained that people were tired of being asked too many times about the earthquake and yet most of those questioners never came back to help. However, we were able to contact Yogya City DEO head, and worked with one of his senior staff to coordinate the school rehabilitation.

At first we hoped that within a short space of time we would be able to identify certain schools to be beneficiaries of our rehabilitation program. However, in reality most of school data given by the DEO was inaccurate. It meant that we needed to check the schools individually, to find the appropriate schools ourselves. As we worked in the field, when we checked a school from the list, usually a problem with data accuracy emerged. For example; a school needed a two classrooms block grant on the list, but when we verified it, it only needed minor rehabilitation. When we asked the DEO staff and school principals, they simply explained that if the amount of budget to rehabilitate the whole school would be equivalent to two classrooms block grant, while our program required that only schools with totally destroyed classrooms would be rehabilitated. On another day we found a school with ruined classrooms, but when we checked with the school principal he said that the school had signed an MOU with an international agency through the local government. It was strange that the DEO staff was not informed about the case. Even though the international agency’s proposed assistance was still not clear at that time, the school refused our block grant because, sadly, they were afraid of the local government authority. There was an incident when a school which is located in a strategic area also refused our block grant. No matter how we tried to persuade them, the principal and DEO staff would not allow us to rehabilitate the school. Why? Because many important individuals or institutions wanted their name to be written and read at a
strategic position as the one who helped rehabilitate school, just like an advertisement. Finally, after five long days, we were able to identify some schools as the beneficiaries of our classroom rehabilitation program. Before we left for Jakarta, we asked both DEO staff from Bantul District and Yogya City to prepare all the requirements of each school as a condition for receiving the block grant within one working week. Just before we left, one school principal came in a hurry saying that his school urgently needed rehabilitation. We did not say yes but indicated that we would consider it as an input and decide later. Surprisingly, when later on one of our teams checked the school out, in fact the school was already being built by another donor institution. What a trial! It was difficult to believe who were the people and schools in genuine need. It was also difficult to believe in the value and effectiveness of DEOs.

Two weeks later on November 13th, 2006, we came back to Yogya City and Bantul District for technical coordination with the DEO staff and all School principals and their School Committee Heads of the schools which who were nominated as the block grant beneficiaries. Many school principals from Yogya City or Bantul District were surprised and seemed to be doubtful that we were really going to rebuild their school immediately. This was because, according to the DEO head, there had been many promises which had not been fulfilled. Only after a long explanations and discussion did they finally agree to sign an MOU between each individual school with one of us as a MONE program coordinator. The MOU required all schools and their committees to fulfill all the administrative and technical requirements and agree to finish the classroom rehabilitation works within 90 working days once the funds were transferred. By the end of January 2007, when we monitored them, most of the classroom buildings were ready to be used by their teachers and students (see the names of schools rehabilitated in portfolio as exhibit 41).

Using findings from the open ended questionnaires discussed earlier, it is interesting to note some points from this quake visit to Bantul district and Yogya City. If DEO service quality is determined by the five influencing factors (Man, Money, Management, Material (Facilities) and Milieu (External/community) then some preliminary conclusion can be reached. In an emergency or disaster situation, it is difficult for DEO staff to work normally because many of them are victims of the
disaster as well. Consequently DEO responsiveness was also suffering. This is why risk or crisis management is becoming an important issue in such situations and strong coordination between central and local government is essential. In a normal situation, it is not surprising that many DEOs were unable to fund all of their programs to support or fulfill school needs. In an emergency situation it got worse. This is why local and central government funding or resources, supported by external institution (donors from national or international institutions) are critically important to bring school conditions back to normal. DEOs should assume a central role in coordinating the work of all external organization. Sadly, it can be easily understood therefore that the DEO service quality was not as good as expected at that time. Problems related to service quality do exist in Yogyakarta.

**Visiting Central Lombok (Praya) District**

In August 2005, I was one of the team members from MONE who visited Praya in Central Lombok 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. I was keen to gather information related to my research project. This field visit provided a good opportunity to explore facts about the current status of service quality in the district. 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 to the meeting.

Central Lombok (like the other three districts) was chosen for two reasons. First, 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. 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 the State University of Yogyakarta.

Praya is the capital city of Central Lombok District within West Nusa Tenggara Province in the central part of Indonesia (see the map in appendix 6). 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, West Nusa Tenggara is a relatively poor province. The Central Lombok District is poorer than its neighboring districts, especially Mataram Municipality. As shown in the Profile of Central Lombok District, 2006, Pendapatan Asli Daerah, the Local District Income is only Rp.13,654,922,917 (about US$ 1,437,360) and Pendapatan Per Kapita (Annual Per Capita Income) is only Rp.1,661,205 (about US$ 175). In comparison, as outlined by Badan Pusat Statistik (2005), at the national level, Per Capita National Income was Rp.11,193,855 (about US$ 1,178). The Central Lombok District’s economic disadvantages can also be demonstrated by the total number of television and telephones, which are 6,000 in a total population of 821,989 (The Profile of Central Lombok District, 2006).

In terms of education, the Central Lombok district faces some daunting challenges. This table below provides an educational snapshot of Central Lombok District.
Table 4-14:
Education Profile in Central Lombok

<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>
<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>99.795</td>
<td>109.245</td>
<td>90.96</td>
<td>79.13</td>
<td>97.83</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Secondary School</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.559</td>
<td>52.246</td>
<td>48.02</td>
<td>38.06</td>
<td>71.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Secondary School</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.261</td>
<td>49.895</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>17.51</td>
<td>46.10</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Central Lombok District Education Statistics, 2006

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 still high at 4.07%. Nationally the repetition rate is 2.21%. Meanwhile, the national dropout rate in elementary school is 3.61% (Center for Education Statistics, Ministry of National Education, Jakarta 2006). The table also reveals that the dropout rate for Elementary Schools in Central Lombok is 0.38%. These percentages convinced me that Central Lombok is economically and socially disadvantaged, especially at the elementary school level. Second, the national GER target for Junior Secondary School is 95%. The table reveals that the GER for Central Lombok is a little more than two thirds of the target. The low enrolment rates in Junior Secondary School have 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 ensure that the family survives – it is reasonable to conclude that their learning is interrupted. Many students have long distances to travel to junior
secondary and particularly to senior secondary schools, also has an impact on the low transition rates to the higher school levels.

This profile clearly indicates that there is still more work needed 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/collective efforts from all education stakeholders in West Lombok district. And most importantly it requires better service quality by the DEO.

In terms of quality of teachers and facilities, Lombok Tengah is not too bad. Based on the tables below, most class rooms are in good conditions either in elementary, junior or senior high schools. Amazingly, there is no teacher who is not qualified at any level of schooling.

**Table 4-15: Quality of Teachers and Facilities In Lombok Tengah Elementary Schools 2006/7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>SD (Elementary)</th>
<th>MI (Islamic Elementary)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sekolah (Schools)</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelas Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baik (Good)</td>
<td>2135</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>2602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Ringan (Medium)</td>
<td>673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Berat (Poor)</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guru (Teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Layak mengajar (qualified)</td>
<td>3231</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• semi layak (semi qualified)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tidak layak (not qualified)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Profile of Central Lombok District, DEO of Central Lombok, 2006

But if we take a closer look at the elementary school table above, it shows that 407 public school classes and 183 Islamic elementary school classes are in poor condition. This is not surprising, because as I mentioned before in chapter 3, long before decentralization reform, elementary schools had been relatively neglected in many districts around the country. This condition illustrates the local government’s DEO reputation prior to decentralization in managing basic education.
Table 4-16:
Quality of Teachers and Facilities
In Lombok Tengah Junior High Schools 2006/7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>SMP (Junior High)</th>
<th>MTs (Islamic JHS)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baik (Good)</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Ringan (Medium)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Berat (Poor)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guru (Teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>SMP (Junior High)</th>
<th>MTs (Islamic JHS)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Layak mengajar (qualified)</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• semi layak (semi qualified)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tidak layak (not qualified)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Profile of Central Lombok District, DEO of Central Lombok, 2006

On the other hand only 5 junior high school classes and 52 Islamic junior high school classes are in poor condition. To some extent, it shows that junior high schools which were previously under central government DEO are generally in a better condition compared to elementary schools. This is why many central government personnel worry that someday after Junior High schools are handed down to local government soon they will also deteriorate.

Table 4-17:
Quality of Teachers and Facilities
In Lombok Tengah Senior High and Vocational Schools 2006/7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>SMA (Senior HS)</th>
<th>MA (Islamic SH)</th>
<th>SMK (Vocational HS)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baik (Good)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Ringan (Medium)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Berat (Poor)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guru (Teachers)</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Layak mengajar (qualified)</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• semi layak (semi qualified)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tidak layak (not qualified)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Profile of Central Lombok District, DEO of Central Lombok, 2006
From the tables above, it can be seen that school facilities are a simple and useful way to measure how good or poor is DEO service quality in satisfying school needs. As long as there is a poor classroom in any school of the district it shows that DEO has not provided good service quality yet to all its schools. It is clearly stated in the government regulations that one of the DEO authorities’ obligatory functions is to provide adequate facilities to each school within the DEO’s administrative area.

In a discussion or interview held on the 20th of August 2007 in MONE office, Prof Slamet reported that there had been some improvement in educational quality in the Praya District. He stated that the DEO was more responsive to the needs of the local people, in terms of the basic education. However, compared to some years ago, teacher quality has not been upgraded through the provision of various training activities.

In addition, however, in Praya this improvement in educational service may be explained by a number of external factors including the activities of a group of the wives of senior civil servants (Dharma Wanita); the local religious groups such mosques or churches, and staff from Mataram University who acted as mentors in the remote villages. These local interventions were actively supported by MONE as part of a national strategy to improve basic education across Indonesia.

Prof Slamet also indicated that the DEO seems to have become more aware of the importance of improving the data collection process and then using this data as the basis for the planning and delivery of local educational services. This may be an indicator that the objectives of educational decentralization and more critically the change in mindset required are emerging in Praya. Despite these positive observations Prof Slamet expressed his concern about the sustainability of the improvement. He indicated his continuing concerns about individuals, institutions and systems.

**What happened when we visited Praya?**

Upon arrival at the Central Lombok 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 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. It is apparent that seating arrangements and the food are simple indicators of the importance of hospitality and respect in Indonesia. They are 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 as community members may feel intimidated and reluctant to contribute or question.

The people at the meeting were mostly connected with the DBEP and included staff from the Central Lombok DEO, Board of Education members, school principals, local schools and community representatives. The meeting commenced with a welcome by the Head of the Central Lombok DEO, then Mr. Didik Suhardi addressed the meeting and was followed by Prof. Slamet PH and then by general discussion.

From the visits and observation above, it seems to me that *Praya* is improving its service quality, but the quality of school facilities mentioned earlier also proved that more works need to be done. If the definition of DEO service quality is its ability to fulfill obligatory functions in satisfying school needs (in this case to provide adequate school facilities), than the elementary schools with their 407 poor classrooms above would obviously not satisfy school needs. In the following
paragraph the information from discussion or interviews with respondents from education personnel in Praya will be described.

The first question I asked of the head of DEO in the Lombok Tengah was about his opinion concerning service quality definitions. He replied that Service quality is the quality of my service to my schools in the forms of direction and guidance as to where I would bring my schools and how to do it. The service that I give to schools depends on the needs of the schools.

He explained further how new MSS could be implemented: To make implementing the new practices effective the DEO has to provide clear direction as to where the new practices go (goals), provide clear guidelines to achieve the goals (guidance), have a clearly established legal framework to support the achievement of the goals, and undertake tight monitoring and evaluation to provide early warning in case of incompliance with the process and procedures to achieve the defined goals.

On different occasion I asked The Head of Board the same question: “What new practices do you want to apply in order to improve your current practices of service quality given to your schools?” He quickly and intelligently answered: “I will improve the system, institution (DEO), and resources required to run the DEO in order to better serve the schools. For me, the schools are my main customers. I will serve them with high quality and I will mobilize the community, business, and commerce to support education in my district. In fact I am already mobilizing community leaders, business and commerce to support my schools. I further asked him about the document describing cooperation between the DEO, district board of education, and business and commerce, and he showed me the authentic document of cooperation. I was very satisfied with the high performing DEO Head and BOE Head in this district.

When I mentioned about the answers from different district boards (his colleagues from Tangerang and Yogyakarta), he totally agreed but with slightly additional answer: Cooperation with the Offices of District Religious Affairs is needed to implement the new practices of service quality because they are our partners. It
sounds logical because the new practices, particularly MSS, will also be applied to the schools under the Offices of District Religious Affair.

The answer from school perspectives (the school principal), had no significant difference compared to his colleagues in the districts of Tangerang, but he proposed another factor: “Galvanizing organization-wide commitment to the accomplishment of new practices of DEO service quality is a very important task for the DEO to do.

The same response was received from the teachers in Lombok Tengah district; they agreed with their colleagues’ answers and one of the teachers proposed: *Empowerment, a sense of ownership, rewards and punishment should be used creatively to support the success of implementing new practices of DEO service quality. Teachers should get benefits from the new practices. I agreed with her suggestions because it is relevant to the challenges faced in implementing the new practices.*

The chairman of the school committee in Lombok Tengah district also agreed with the answers which were generated by his colleagues in the districts of Tangerang and Yogyakarta with an additional note: *Make sure that school committee is creatively involved in implementing new practices because we are also one of the DEO’s customers.*

Unlike respondents in Yogyakarta who suggest tangible things to support DEO service quality, people in Praya reminded me of the importance of non physical sources needed by schools such as guidance, instruction and reward or punishment as an integrated part of service quality development.

The information on service quality and its probable implementation from the discussion above is actually very useful for me, especially for me to propose the new MSS at DEO level. These following several terms need to be carefully considered in formulating and implementing MSS; direction, guidance, goals, legal aspect, monitoring and evaluation, adequate resources, partnership, cooperation and coordination, commitment, ownership, reward and punishment, school benefit, and involvement.
Visiting Bekasi District

I was a member of education decentralization team to visit the DEO in Bekasi, West Java on February 23, 2006. The team members were me, the other two Indonesian students Didik Suhardi and Moch Abduh, Dr. David Hodges, Dr. Bill Vistarini as my supervisors from RMIT, and Prof. Slamet, PH as my local supervisor. Cikarang is the capital city of Bekasi District within West Java Province (see map appendix 6). It is approximately 100 kilometers or an hour and a half driving time from Bandung, the West Java provincial capital city.

The Bekasi District is adjacent to Jakarta, the capital city of Indonesia, being only about a one hour drive from Jakarta. This district area is about 1,484.37 sq. km. It lies from the border of Jakarta and Bekasi City in the west to the border of Karawang District in the east; while on the north side it is bordered by the Java Sea, and adjacent to Bogor District on its south side. The population of Bekasi District was about 1,917,248 people in 2005 (Bekasi District Education Profile, 2005). In the following sections, the Bekasi education profile will be described in more detail.

Dealing with data in a DEO is not always easy after decentralization. This time I could not find data on students by their age from the DEO statistics. As a consequence, figuring the NER or Net Enrollment Ratio was impossible. Although part of the DEO statistical report mentioned this figure, but when checked by using the number of population on each schooling level, the figure became nonsensical. This was why I finally only used the GER indicator to determine the access to education in this district. In the following table 4-18, the gross enrollment rate (GER) of primary, junior and senior high education can be seen.

It is similar to most districts in Indonesia that the older the population age, the lower its enrollment rate in schooling system. While elementary GER is over 100%, junior high above 61% and senior high only approximately 23%. It means that more than 30% of its 13-15 years population and more than 70% of its 15-18 years population is still somewhere outside the schooling system. It would be a challenging task to enroll them all in the schooling system.
### Table 4-18: Education Profile in Bekasi District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Population in Aged School</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>254.334</td>
<td>239.616</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drop Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Secondary</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>71.316</td>
<td>116.318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Secondary</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>24.441</td>
<td>109.132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bekasi District Education Profile, 2005

In addition its internal efficiency is still relatively low with significant number of drop outs and repetition: 239 (almost one percent) and 1.578 (more than 6 percent) in elementary schools; this is another evidence that service quality is still a problem.

In addition, the DEO was not able to show the teachers’ qualification data as I was able to obtain in Lombok Tengah or Yogyakarta. Fortunately, it was possible to see the teacher’s education attainment. Because of this I slightly modified the forms as follows, where teachers indicator was described. This was important to illustrate that to some extend that Bekasi is still facing problems in fulfilling the basic needs of school teachers. The following table shows two important aspects of service quality in Bekasi District: facilities and personnel.

### Table 4-19: Quality of Teachers and Facilities In Bekasi Elementary Schools 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>SD (Elementary)</th>
<th>MI (Islamic Elementary)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sekolah (Schools)</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelas (Classrooms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Baik (Good)</td>
<td>4.515</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>5.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rusak Ringan (Medium)</td>
<td>2.939</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>3.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rusak Berat (Poor)</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guru (Teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- S1 or Higher (qualified)</td>
<td>1.837</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>2.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- D3 or Bachelors (semi qualified)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- D2 or Lower (not qualified)</td>
<td>5.124</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>6.323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Profile of Bekasi District Education, DEO of Bekasi, 2005
More than one thousand (825 public plus 370 Islamic) out of almost six thousand elementary education class rooms were in poor condition. This means the buildings need to be totally rehabilitated or renovated. Should the DEO plan to rehabilitate these class rooms immediately in one fiscal year, the amount of finance needed would be extremely high. This is why the central government up till now still provides block grants to public schools to rehabilitate class rooms. The above table shows that most teachers are still below the qualification set by the new regulation under which elementary school teachers are required to finish at least S1 (Strata one) education or higher. Unfortunately, more than six thousand out of about eight thousand teachers have only D2 (diploma two). This is another challenging task for this DEO.

The table of Junior High education below also illustrates a similar pattern of facilities and personnel conditions in Bekasi district. Fortunately the number of poor class rooms in junior high education is lower compared to the elementary education. Among more than two thousand class rooms in junior high schools (including both public and Islamic junior high schools) only 150 (57 public plus 93 Islamic) class rooms are in poor condition. This is far better, compared to its elementary schools.

Table 4-20:
Quality of Teachers and Facilities
In Bekasi Junior High Schools 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>SMP (Junior High)</th>
<th>MTs (Islamic JHS)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baik (Good)</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>1.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Ringan (Medium)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Berat (Poor)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guru (Teachers)</td>
<td>3.591</td>
<td>2.612</td>
<td>6.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• S1 or Higher (qualified)</td>
<td>2.886</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td>4.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• D3 or Bachelors (semi qualified)</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• D2 or Lower (not qualified)</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Profile of Bekasi District Education, DEO of Bekasi, 2005
Unlike elementary education teachers, where most of them are under qualified, most junior high school teachers (either public or Islamic) in Bekasi are graduated from S1 education. But still, more than one thousand teachers need to be upgraded to fulfill the regulation; a significant number. This teacher indicator is only seen from their certification, but if their certificates are grouped as majoring in education or non education, another problem might emerge. This is challenging enough, and the responsibility to upgrade these teachers is shared between DEO and MORA district office in Bekasi, since the responsibility of Islamic junior high schools administration is under the MORA. However, it proves that Bekasi DEO service quality is still facing problems; again, just like the other; in this case personnel and facility problems are significant.

In terms of senior high education, the table below illustrates some information about Bekasi DEO service quality aspects; class room facilities and education personnel (teachers). Unfortunately, later on I realized that the statistics provided by the DEO staff during the visit to Bekasi were not as complete as I thought. This time I could not find their public senior high school teacher’s information, but the Islamic senior high and vocational senior high school teacher information is there and is described in the table below.

### Table 4-21:
**Quality of Teachers and Facilities**
**In Bekasi Senior High and Vocational Schools 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>SMA (Public SH)</th>
<th>MA (Islamic SH)</th>
<th>SMK (Vocational HS)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baik (Good)</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>1.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>457</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Ringan (Medium)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rusak Berat (Poor)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guru (Teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• S1 or Higher (qualified)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>1.189</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Source: The Profile of Bekasi District Education, DEO of Bekasi, 2005
It seems that the lower the level of education in Bekasi District, most problems exist in schools. As discussed previously there are more problems relating to teacher qualifications and facilities in elementary schools than in junior high schools. Now from the table above can be seen that only 5.17 percent (73 of 1.143) of senior high school class rooms (including public, Islamic and vocational) are in poor condition, while for elementary and junior high schools are 20.91 and 7.05 percent respectively. In addition, teacher qualifications problems exist in Bekasi, especially in Islamic senior high schools, where almost one third of them (202 of 671) are still under qualified (only D2 or lower); while in vocational senior high schools there are only 30 out of 1.189 with D2 or lower. The table above provides additional evidence proving that service quality problems do exist in Bekasi DEO, at least from the personnel and facilities aspects. These facts strengthen the assumption that DEO service quality is not as good as it should be and gives an indication about some important influencing factors which might hinder its improvement.

When first we visited Bekasi DEO, we had three objectives. First, it was a good opportunity to explore the progress of decentralization of education. Second, it was a good way to explore education service quality as part of the decentralization goals. Third, we aimed to follow up the findings from our previous visit.

Arriving in the office, we quickly noticed that the complex where the DEO is located looked brand new. I was told that this is a new site for all government offices at Bekasi District. Unlike the previous one, now all government offices are located in the same site. This is considered as a breakthrough, because traditionally local government always had separate and scattered offices which hindered good communication and coordination.

We were welcomed by the Head of Administration Affairs and Head of Non Formal Education Section. I was a little disappointed, because we were told that the DEO head could not attended the meeting, he was attending a provincial coordination meeting in Bandung, the capital of West Java Province. At the beginning of the discussion, they commented, This DEO building was relatively new. We moved into this new building in the middle of 2003. It was understandable that some policies were not implemented as well as when we were in the previous building. For me,
implementation of the policies should not depend on the dimension of time and place. Moreover, their function for delivering service in education at the district level must continue as well as if there had been no moving of offices.

At first we discussed the Board of Education. To my surprise, they complained about the difficulty of coordination between District office and Board of Education. With regard to the District Board of Education, we asked them, what is the background of the District Board of Education members? They answered, Currently, Chairman of District Board of Education is the Head of a Faction at the District Parliament. The Vice Chairman is a member of a Non Government Organization (NGO) Further they continued; Most of the members of District Board of Education are already busy with their own schedules. Mostly, they could not attend the invitation for coordination meetings together with DEO which were sponsored by DEO or even the DBE itself. We are really disappointed about this lack of coordination. Moreover, we have already provided an operational car to support these activities. In addition, we are sure that they do not have regular internal meetings. This was surprising. I could not imagine why the District Office and District Boards of Education do not have regular meetings. How can they improve the education service quality at the district level if they do not allocate much time to coordinate? Education service quality is a result of collective efforts from different actors or stakeholders in the district.

From the short observation above, it was clear to me that Bekasi DEO still faced serious problems in term of improving service quality. The clearest indicator, the poor school facilities are still there in some areas. Many children are still outside the schooling system, and worse, there was a problem with local coordination, mainly with the board of education. All of these are important factors in service quality improvement efforts.

The following information was compiled from meeting, discussion, consultation or interviews during my field visit to Bekasi in August 2005. In one interview, the DEO head defined of service quality: Service quality is defined as clear legal aspects required by the DEO to run its office and its schools. I was unclear what was meant by service quality as defined by this informant. It was apparent that he was also unclear about the meaning of service quality. Then he described further; Good
service quality is the quality of administration. When I asked further question what is meant by quality of administration, he answered Quality of administration is the quality of administration in personnel, curriculum, facilities, finance, student, and secretariat. I questioned further: What kinds of services do you give to your schools? He answered I visit schools to see the reality and so that I can decide what kinds of service I should give to them. From the interviews with the head of DEO at Bekasi District, it was clear that he did not really understand what is meant by service quality because actually he gave me two different definitions of service quality.

To obtain more ideas on new practices of DEO service quality, further information was sought from District Board of Education with the following question: What new practices do you want to apply in order to improve your service quality to schools? He replied: I will conduct meetings with school principals and I will ask them what they want and then I will improve my current service quality on the basis of their inputs and recommendations. When I asked a further question: Is it possible for you to fulfill all their wants? He further replied: I do not think so and I think I will only partially fulfill all their wants due to the limited resources I have.

I tried to clarify further; as a chairman of the district board of education, what new practices of DEO service quality do you expect? His face and words indicated his doubts: I expect that the DEO will offer better services that fulfill the needs of the schools. In addition, I expect that the DEO will increase its funding for schools. By doing this, the schools will be able to conduct their daily operations efficiently.

On the next day, I also managed to collected data from a Public Junior Secondary School in Bekasi district (SMPN 1 Bekasi) by asking the same questions as I used in SMPN 5 Yogyakarta to school principal, teachers and chairman of school committee. To the school principal, I asked the question: As a school principal, what changes do you expect from the current DEO service quality given to your school? He emotionally answered my question: I am not very concerned with new changes, but what I need from the DEO is a better service quality as a base for my school problems and needs. Until now, the DEO does not know exactly what to do because some of its personnel are not education people. Furthermore, frequent changes of peak leaders in the DEO create problems of inconsistency, discontinuity and un-
sustainability for school operations due to different policies, management, leadership, and other related matters in education. I also want the DEO to provide more resources to my school in terms of the number of competent and relevant teachers, adequate finance to run my school both to cover capital and operational costs, and material resources in terms of soft and hardware resources such as computers, laboratory facilities, learning materials, learning resources, education media, and this does not mention all. In short, this was a strong and relevant answer to my question.

At the same school I interviewed two teachers, English and Civics teachers. First I asked the English teacher: As an English teacher, what new practices of service quality do you want from the DEO in order that you are able to better teach your students? With a little bit of shyness, she proposed: I want the DEO to support my English class in the forms of teaching materials, modern textbooks, complete laboratory facilities, and short training in English speaking countries such as Australia, United State of America, and United Kingdom. I then interviewed an Indonesian Language teacher: What about you? She replied: I agree with what she said, but as an Indonesian Language teacher, I want the DEO to also support Indonesian Language teacher cluster activities in the forms of funds, experts, transportation, and modern books to discuss with my colleagues.

Later on that day, I interviewed the chairman of the school committee, asking the question: What new practices of service quality need to be given by the DEO to schools in order to improve the current practices of schools? He replied: We need training on the roles and functions of school committee, we need new criteria for recruitment and selection of school committees, we want the DEO to give more authority and responsibility to schools (school based management), we want support from the DEO to empower/strengthen the commitment of school committee members, we want to strengthen coordination, we want MSS, we want more funds to run school committees, and we want the DEO to support the publication of district education regulations.
One important aspect was raised by another respondent, who claimed that good coordination among institutions such as the DEO, the Board of Education and the Local House of Representatives is a necessity in order for local government to provide better public services. Several things emerged from the discussion, but mainly, understanding service quality turned out to be a difficult concept for many education personnel to understand. I think this is a problem with guidelines and dissemination. On the other hand, it is not enough for a DEO to just provide resources to schools. The DEO should know exactly what is needed by certain schools. In this case problems with data and information system emerged. A DEO should have a complete profile of all schools in its administrative area. Whether asked or not the DEO should exactly understand how to satisfy each school needs. It is apparent that implementing standards such as MSS alone would not guarantee service quality without strong commitment from all personnel in the DEO to improve schools quality.

**Visiting Tangerang District**

It was in the morning, about 7.30 a.m. Western Indonesian Time on February 24, 2006, when I, my friends and colleagues Moch. Abduh, Didik Suhardi, Pak Slamet and our two supervisors headed to Tangerang District which is located about one hour’s drive to the western part of Jakarta. Arriving around 9.00 am, we were greeted by one of the head of divisions in DEO who led us to the meeting room containing about 20 people. The group consisted of representatives of the district office personnel, member of education board, REDIP project officers, and some school principals.

Compared to Praya, I felt the set up of the meeting was better. It was not like a classroom, but we were seated in a more democratic way in a circular arrangement. Probably this situation illustrates that living closer to central office means having a closer relationship. We occasionally meet each other, as a consequence, they don’t see central officers as having higher position, but are a partner in our education system. We are familiar and more relaxed with each other. The atmosphere is less
formal and friendlier. After a welcoming speech, we explained that our visit had two different purposes;

Official purpose as MONE manager
1. to conduct regular monitoring and evaluation in education development in general;
2. to evaluate and monitor the Regional Education Development Improvement Project (REDIP) funded by Japanese agency JICA;
3. to maintain close relationships between the MONE and the district office.

Unofficial purposes as a researcher:
1. Gathering information related to my research project;
2. Asking questions related to my research questions;

In my view, the meeting was like a one day seminar, not only because it was attended by key actors in education management, but also the topic concerned the current condition of education in the Tangerang district. From this meeting, after some presentations and discussion, I have noted several important things about education problems in Tangerang:

1. The number of preschool age children not included in education system is still relatively high;
2. Most of the existing schools are not in good condition; There were broken facilities, under qualified teachers and weak leadership from principals;
3. There is a shortage of classrooms and school building in certain sub district, either in junior high or religious schools;
4. Difficulty in obtaining appropriate land area for new school building;
5. There is an insufficient number and quality of elementary and junior high school teachers compared with the national standard;
6. More teaching and learning guidelines including materials and resources at school level are needed;
7. The quantity, quality and utilization of teaching learning media need to be improved;
8. There is a lack of supporting personnel to manage libraries and laboratories;
9. The ratio of textbooks and students needs to be improved;
10. The parents’ economic background is low, especially in poor areas;
11. Poor teacher welfare, especially in rural areas;
12. Issues of free education and child workers still need to be addressed;
13. Role and function of school committees need to be optimized;
14. The lack of support from businesses or enterprises for government education efforts;
15. The managerial and administrative capacity at district and school level needs to be improved.

On the other hand the DEO has made several efforts to solve the problems, and many activities have been undertaken to improve the service quality of education;

1. Developing an Education Information System to support decision making in education services;
2. Rehabilitating and or building primary and secondary schools;
3. Building and improving the ability to manage libraries and laboratories to improve the education process;
4. Teacher training and certification;
5. Developing contextual learning;
6. Fostering schools to be self supporting institution.

The information gathered during the meeting above only gave a glimpse about Tangerang as a district but could not describe it in detail. That was why after that day I visited the Tangerang District again to gather more information, especially related to their education sector. In the following section information regarding Tangerang Education profile is discussed as a result of later visits. At first I was hoping to be able to provide the education statistics of all districts I visited in a similar way (Yogyakarta, Praya, Bekasi and Tangerang). But only after visited Tangerang, I realized that even though all districts were supposed to report their education statistics according to the central government guidelines, in reality this is not always the case. Compared to the other districts visited, Tangerang DEO statistical formats were a bit different. When I confirmed this with a DEO staff member, he explained that Tangerang is still focusing on basic education rather than secondary education,
and though the format is different, people can still find information needed. That was why I found it rather difficult to present the Tangerang education figures whereas I did not find it difficult for the other districts.

In my view, the different statistical report by a district can indicate a degree of non-compliance by a DEO to the central government guidelines. Many DOE personnel believe that after decentralization there is no more tight relationship between districts and central government, as if they could do anything in their own way. Of course this is a wrong perception, but is actually happening, and is not easy to fix. This is another challenge in decentralization for the central government.

Although it was difficult, finally I was able to describe some important aspects of their elementary and junior high education statistics. And within these figures, I could still see similar problems related to factors influencing service quality; especially personnel and facilities as in the other districts I visited. In a more detail the Tangerang District education profile is described below.

Tangerang district is adjacent to the west part of Jakarta. Although it is relatively close to Indonesia’s capital city, but from the problems revealed in the first meeting to Tangerang, it is clear that its education development still faces serious problems. The situation is also illustrated by its education statistics. For example most of its population has no schooling at all or has only graduated from elementary. The following figure illustrates the education background of its population.

<p>| Table 4-22: Tangerang Population’s Education Attainment |
|---------------------------------|------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Age and Schooling level</th>
<th>Number of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 year</td>
<td>3,195,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15 year</td>
<td>407,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18 year</td>
<td>198,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before and or No Schooling</td>
<td>196,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and below</td>
<td>664,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from elementary</td>
<td>530,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>702,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tangerang DEO Statistics 2005
From the table above, it can be seen that more than half of its population (1,896,655 out of 3,195,737) has only finished elementary education, has not finished elementary education, or even is without any schooling at all. This is not good at all. Despite its close location to Jakarta, the capital city, it is obvious that the Tangerang DEO is still facing serious problems with its delivery of education services.

On the other hand, being on the outskirts of Jakarta, Tangerang has some advantages as it is the supporting area of the capital city. Many people who work in Jakarta are living in this district because it is much cheaper than living in the capital city. In addition, many basic needs for Jakarta, for example meat, vegetables and other goods are produced in Tangerang. It is assumed therefore, that this situation brings income to the Tangerang population. Unfortunately, because its education attainment is relatively low, only a small number of people can be absorbed into factories or industries, and the rest still work in poor farming or fishing. This is a big challenge for Tangerang local government, especially DEO.

The above information describes in general the education attainment of the Tangerang population. The following tables illustrate some important aspects of formal education, mainly in elementary and junior high schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Elementary Schools (%)</th>
<th>Islamic Elementary Schools (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>98,21</td>
<td>12,54</td>
<td>110,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NER</td>
<td>82,00</td>
<td>11,60</td>
<td>93,60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition Rate</td>
<td>2,26</td>
<td>0,68</td>
<td>2,94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Out Rate</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td>0,29</td>
<td>0,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Rate</td>
<td>98,86</td>
<td>99,19</td>
<td>99,04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Tangerang DOE Statistics 2005*
Based on the above table, it seems that most of the Tangerang population within school age from 7 to 12 is participating in elementary education (including Islamic Elementary Schools) because its GER is higher than 100%. This is probably caused by the fact that there are children who are above or below 7-12 year school age who are still within the schooling system. On the other hand, there is a possibility that students from neighboring districts are also participating in Tangerang elementary schools. The table also illustrates the schooling system internal efficiency. For example; its repetition, drop out and transition rates are still high, with 2.93 % repetition rates, 0.50 % dropout rates and 98.86 % transition rates. The following table illustrates some indicators of Tangerang Junior High education.

Table 4-24:
Some Tangerang Junior Secondary Education Indicators 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Junior High Schools (%)</th>
<th>Islamic Junior High Schools (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>49.33</td>
<td>23.14</td>
<td>72.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NER</td>
<td>36.69</td>
<td>21.22</td>
<td>57.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition Rate</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Out Rate</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Rate</td>
<td>99.45</td>
<td>99.17</td>
<td>99.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tangerang DOE Statistics 2005

The above table shows that, unlike elementary education, the GER of junior high education is low at only 72.47%. This is indicating that many of Tangerang’s 13 to 15 year population age (almost 30%) are still not enrolled in the junior high schooling system; a challenging situation for the 9 year basic compulsory education program. In addition Tangerang junior secondary education is also facing problems with significant 1.44 repetition and 0.92 dropout rates.

In terms of education facilities, like many relatively poor districts around the country, school facilities are always a big problem. In most cases, elementary school facilities are the poorest compared to the other two levels, junior and senior high
school. And Tangerang is not an exception; most of its elementary school classrooms, as illustrated by the table below, are in poor condition.

### Table 4-25:
**Tangerang Elementary Education Classrooms Condition 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Number of Institution</th>
<th>Number of Classrooms</th>
<th>Classrooms Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partly Broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>6.521</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Elementary</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>2.018</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.426</td>
<td>8.539</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Tangerang DOE Statistics 2005*

Almost a quarter of its classrooms (1.563 out of 6.521) are in poor condition. Most of these classrooms are located in remote areas where local community participation is usually very low due to the low family income. This mostly happened in farming or fishing areas. As it can be seen in the map (see appendix 6), the north part of Tangerang is adjacent to the Java sea where poor fishermen live.

The following table illustrates that junior high school classrooms are also experiencing deterioration. Less than 3% of its classrooms were in poor condition. This figures, again, proves the public assumption that elementary schools, which were under local government long before decentralization, were generally in poorer condition compared to junior or senior high schools, which were under the central government. More than 5% of Islamic junior high school classrooms are also in poor condition, but this is not a DOE responsibility, but that of Tangerang MORA District office.
Teacher allocation is also a challenging problem. The following table shows that in total there too many elementary school teachers for the district.

### Table 4-27:
Teachers Needed in Tangerang Elementary Education 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Classrooms</th>
<th>Class groups</th>
<th>Teachers Needed</th>
<th>Existing Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers Shortage/ overrun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islamic</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>2.033</td>
<td>2.703</td>
<td>2.907</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than two thousand teachers need to be redeployed to neighboring districts. Islamic elementary schools also experience a teacher shortage. More than two hundred teachers are still needed. Unfortunately there is no policy to date, as to how to transfer elementary school teachers under the local government to Islamic elementary schools which is under the MORA. This is another challenging situation not only for Tangerang but for Indonesian education decentralization as well. The table below similarly illustrates junior high school teacher supply.
### Table 4-28:
Teachers Needed in Tangerang Junior High Education 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers Needed</th>
<th>Existing Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers Shortage/overrun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Islamic</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Education</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahasa/Indonesian Language</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport/Physical Education</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Curriculum</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer/Information Technology</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jumlah</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,940</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,128</strong></td>
<td><strong>812</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Tangerang DOE Statistics 2005*

In total, the junior high schools need more than eight hundred teachers. But the detail shows even more serious problems. Mathematics, English, Computer and Science are considered to be fundamental subjects. Unfortunately, to supply teachers for those important subjects is also difficult. This is not only challenging for the Tangerang DOE, but also for institutions providing or producing teachers, in higher education. For many high school graduates, being a student of those subject areas in higher education is considered difficult and, of course, completing higher education in those areas is seen to be even more difficult. Probably this is why in general there is a teacher shortage in those subject areas throughout the country.
The Tangerang DOE is also experiencing challenging problems to improve its formal education service quality. At least three important aspects emerge: access, facilities, and scarcity of appropriately qualified personnel. This is further evidence that there is conformity between what respondents of open ended questionnaires perceived with the reality in the field.

Tangerang also faces problems with low literacy rates. Most of the population has only finished elementary school or has never attended school. The following table illustrates the illiteracy rate in Tangerang district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Age</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Total Illiterate</th>
<th>Illiteracy Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 – 19</td>
<td>105.750</td>
<td>3.538</td>
<td>03,35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24</td>
<td>111.700</td>
<td>3.944</td>
<td>03,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 29</td>
<td>125.800</td>
<td>12.782</td>
<td>10,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 34</td>
<td>129.500</td>
<td>13.598</td>
<td>10,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 39</td>
<td>135.750</td>
<td>14.322</td>
<td>10,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 44</td>
<td>206.001</td>
<td>22.336</td>
<td>10,84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - Over</td>
<td>399.359</td>
<td>120.483</td>
<td>30,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.213.860</strong></td>
<td><strong>191.003</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DEO Tangerang Statistics 2005

From the above table it can be seen that about 15.74 percent of its population are still illiterate. Most of them are elderly people, but a significant number also still exist in 15-19 population age, where 9 years compulsory education is a national priority.

From the discussion above, it is clear that even though Tangerang is only an hour from Jakarta, the capital city, its education problems are enormous and challenging. The basic need of schooling, for example accessibility, is still a problem. This is even more difficult for DEO management, because significant portions of its population
are poor, illiterate, and have a low educational background. Many students, who are within the school system, also experience poor facilities. Directly and indirectly this situation illustrates the DEO low service quality. These problems can only be resolved if in this decentralized education era, the Tangerang DEO has strong managerial capacity and is supported by highly motivated personnel and strong community participation to improve the education for the betterment of its population.

In addition to the information gathered from the first meeting and some observations above, the following paragraphs give more information about DEO service quality in Tangerang. The information was gathered through interviews, discussion or consultation with various educators from the district or school level.

The first question I asked, as I did in other districts, was about the understanding and condition of DEO service quality. I asked exactly the same questions to the head of DEO in Tangerang District and the answer was: For me, service quality is good management. As long as you have good planning, organizing, actuating, coordination, and controlling, then you have good service quality. When I asked further question; what kinds of services do you give to your schools? He answered I invite them to the meeting and I give them important information in relation to school development under my supervision.

I continued the interview by asking: What new practices do you want to apply in order to improve your current practices of service quality given to your schools? He replied: I will develop education regulations in my district, I will improve the competency of my staff, I will increase education funds, I will provide clear direction and guidance to my schools in developing strategic and annual plans, I will improve the career development system, and I will optimize teacher clusters of elementary and secondary schools as a quality control. In addition, I will also improve the participation of stakeholders and the community to improve education in my district.

At the end of interview I asked the head of DEO of Tangerang district: How do you change from the current to new practices of DEO service quality? He succinctly
answered my question as follows: *If we want to implement new practices of service quality, we have to have a plan. The plan should include a description of the need to improve service quality, programs to meet the needs, an implementation strategy, costs required, monitoring and evaluation strategies, milestones, and a schedule.* I asked a further question: *How complex is it to implement the new practices of DEO service quality?* He answered: *Implementing new practices of DEO service quality is rarely self-executing, it is very complex, it involves many factors that directly or indirectly influence implementation (communication, resources, attitudes, and bureaucratic structure), and it is a dynamic process involving the interaction of many factors.*

More different definitions of service quality were given by the chairman of district board of education (DBE) and his members. The head of DBE said; *Service quality is clear direction and guidance given by the DEO to schools.* I then asked the chairman: *Do you have any ideas of how to implement new practices of DEO service quality?* He answered: *This is about change so we need to change people minds, hearts and their behavior and habits. We also need to change institutional roles and functions, as well as the system covering regulations and policies.* For me, their ideas to implement new practices of DEO service quality were excellent. But later on I needed to interview the real customers of the DEO; they were school principals and teachers at Tangerang district, namely *SMPN 1 Tangerang*

I needed more comprehensive information from the district board of education (DBE) members to check or triangulated their perception by asking: *What new practices of DEO service quality do you expect?* He proposed: *If I were the head of the DEO, I would like to introduce new practices of DEO service quality by producing MSS. In addition, I would like to improve school facilities, give more funds, and improve the competencies of school personnel on the basis of school needs.*

On different occasions I also conducted in depth interviews with school personnel, including school principals, teachers, and the chairmen of school committees. In general, they claimed that if the DEO would like to improve its service quality to schools, the DEO has to improve its human, financial, and material resources. From
the data, it was clear that the schools still lack basic needs such as competent teachers, facilities, and fundings. If the DEO wants to better serve the schools, the DEO should contribute to meeting or meet all these basic school needs.

The results of these in-depth interviews with them on the definition of service quality were very diverse. First, I interviewed the school principals. One school principal in Tangerang District defined service quality provided by DEO as follows: *I define service quality as facilities, funds, human resources, training, and welfare of my staff provided by DEO.* I asked further question to the school principal regarding the services provided by the DEO by asking “What services are provided by the DEO to your schools? He answered, *mostly the services given to my school are in the forms of information but actually I need facilities, funds, teacher training, and financial welfare for my teachers. If there will be school examination, usually the DEO calls us to have meeting. Or, if there are other new information and other things, the DEO usually collects us to have meeting.* But when I asked school principal: *Does the DEO provide clear direction, guidance, clear legal aspect, and conduct monitoring and evaluation to see the progress of your school?* The answers were mostly pessimistic. *We need these things, but they are very seldom provided by the DEO.*

Later on I also interviewed the teachers to get a greater understanding about the service provided to them by the DEO. *What kinds of services do you get from the DEO?* They reluctantly answered my question, but they often said that *we do not get direct service from the DEO. But the school principal does because we are not directly under the DEO. We are under the school principal.* I asked a further question, *what do you expect in relation to service provided by the DEO?* One of the teachers answered *Teacher certification must be done as quickly as possible so that we can get improved salaries as fast as possible.*

To fulfill my curiosity about these schools, I also collected official documents coming from the DEO to examine the contents of those documents, particularly documents describing services provided by the DEO. Surprisingly, most of the documents contained little about services provided by the DEO. Most of documents coming from the DEO contained requests for data and several documents contained general information given by the DEO, but few contained information on services
provided by the DEO in the dimensions of inputs (human, financial, materials including software and hardware), process (management, leadership, and other service quality such as reliability, responsiveness, credibility, just to mention a few), and outputs relating to the ability of the DEOs to fulfill/deliver their obligatory functions to satisfy school needs. It was becoming apparent that DEOs will be failing to communicate effectively with schools and teachers.

Then I moved to the next question about new practices of service quality. As it is known, schools are the real customers of the DEO and I told them that the DEO was going to implement new practices of service quality and I explained briefly the meaning of new practices. I then asked the school principal a question: *If new practices of DEO service quality are going to be implemented, do you have any ideas of how to implement them?* He answered my question brilliantly: *If these new practices are to be successful, it is important to involve those who are going to be affected by those new practices, the schools. In addition, this change requires concerted efforts and cooperative endeavor, therefore involvement of customers (the schools) is not only important but it is a necessity.*

This answer implies that a bottom-up approach should be used if new practices were viewed from the perspective of schools, and therefore, value judgments about the new practices themselves would be inevitable. I also asked teachers exactly the same question as I asked the school principal, and one of the teachers replied; *the effective way of implementing new ideas is to have necessary resources required by the DEO to implement the new service quality. Thus, capacity building is required for those who are going to implement the new ideas. Because the heart of the educational infrastructure is the teaching and learning process, do not forget to involve teachers in selecting effective ways of implementing new practices of service quality.*

At the same schools, I also interviewed school committee members in relation to services provided to them. *Is the service quality provided by DEO to schools better in this decentralized era than in centralized era?* The answers were mixed. Some school committee members said better, but others said worse. I asked a further question: *What kinds of services are provided to schools by the DEOs?* The answer was not clear *I was not very familiar with this because I was not directly involved in*
this matter. But we have an expectation that the DEO must pay attention to poor students. This sounds very logical from the perspective of teacher.

The chairman of the school committee of SMPN 1 Tangerang proposed an effective way of implementing new practices as follow: Develop a clear way of implementing the new practices, and attach the school improvement and professional development plans to it. In fact, I could have generated more diverse responses on alternative ways of implementing new ideas, but I had to stop due to limited time.

In a meeting with teachers, school principals, and school committee members I also distributed handouts on the meaning and components of service quality in education, particularly in the context of services provided to schools. The handout that I distributed to them was as a result of my reviews of literature which are reported in Chapter 3. From these reviews of literature, it was concluded that a fair or an appropriate definition of service quality might be the ability of DEO to fulfill its obligatory functions in satisfying school needs. In simple terms, the DEO service quality is determined by and consist of inputs, process, and outputs (check exhibit 13).

The inputs mainly consist of personnel, money, and material. The process includes management and leadership. The resulting outputs are the obligatory functions of the DEO to produce service quality, comprising tangibles (e.g. office facilities; buildings, facilities), and intangibles: reliability, empathy, responsiveness, and assurance. I offered them the handouts and they read them seriously for a while. After reading the handouts, they said that, this is what we want and why didn’t you give them to us earlier? This was encouraging. Although I was concerned that similar information had not been provided earlier, I was also a little worried that my handouts might be a substitute for hard thinking at the local level.

Most of the respondent’s responses above are similar to responses from previous districts. But one important aspect emerged, they mentioned not only technical inputs but also behavioral elements; this is about to change, so we need to change people’s minds, and hearts and their behavior and habits. I do believe that this is much more difficult than formulating strategy and takes a longer time in reality to implement.
How to change the DEO people’s minds from being served, to providing service, is very challenging.

In general, from the document analysis, questionnaires/surveys and field visits to some districts above, it can be tentatively concluded that the Indonesian Government should soon assess the decentralization process at the district level prior to the implementation of new MSS. The inability of DEOs to implement the decentralization process properly has in many cases become a major obstacle to improving DEO service quality. At the same time, the National Government through its relevant ministries should formulate the revised MSS based on the current situation and regulations.

The field visits illustrate that each district has its own education characteristics and in turn illustrates differing improvements of its DEO service quality. But in general it can be concluded that DEO service quality in different districts still faces obstacles and greater efforts need to be taken to anticipate and prevent deteriorating service quality. Important information acquired from the four districts needs to be carefully considered in formulating and implementing MSS. These include: population characteristics, school facilities, cooperation and coordination among different actors at the national and local levels, formal and informal education, illiteracy rates, MSS definition, educational resources, monitoring and evaluation, holistic or systems approach, ownership and participation, school or customer orientation, commitment and attitudes of stakeholders.

In relation to commitment, attitudes or cultural background, I remember that one of our reviews in Jakarta which was attended not only by my supervisors, but also people from different international agencies such as the World Bank, USAID, and AusAID. One of those people reminded me that no matter how good the design, the possibility of failing is great if the motivation of its implementers is not taken into proper account. I totally agree with his comment, because culturally, Indonesian bureaucrats are used to being served rather than serving. Transforming this habit or culture is not an easy task, and needs to be considered carefully by DEOs in implementing MSS. MSS should contribute to changing cultural attitudes and, as a
consequence, provide a solution or a way of serving schools better in this decentralized era.

**Tentative Conclusions**

From the series of data collecting methods above; document analysis, questionnaires, field visits with observation, interviews or consultations, and discussion, the following important findings can be tentatively suggested.

With regards to the meaning of service quality provided by the DEO to schools, I found that there were many different definitions of service quality. Heads of the DEO, heads of the district boards of education, teachers, school principals, and chairmen of school committees all defined service quality differently. However, the definitions they offered were not totally wrong; they were partially true. In fact, if I combined those different definitions together, I get a more comprehensive and more appropriate definition of DEO service quality.

Having realized this, I analyzed the data collected and I tried to synthesize and combine them, together with my review of literature on the meaning of service quality as described in Chapter 3. In essence, based on this range of data, service quality of the DEO may be defined as the ability of the DEO to fulfill its obligatory functions in satisfying school needs. Service quality of a DEO may be categorized into three dimensions: inputs, processes and outputs. The input dimension includes human, financial, and material resources. The process dimension includes management, leadership, and other service quality dimensions covering among other things tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, courtesy, credibility, communication, and understanding the school as the main customer. The output dimension covers, among other things, the delivery of obligatory functions in fulfilling the needs of the main DEO customers, the schools. The obligatory functions, as defined by Government Regulation 38/2007, include policy, finance, curriculum, facilities, teachers and other education personnel, and quality improvement consisting of assessment of learning achievement, evaluation, accreditation, and quality assurance.
In the long run, DEO outputs will contribute to improving the quality of the schooling system.

In a simple diagram, the three dimensions of DEO service quality may be seen from Figure 4-4 below. In a more detail, as part of the portfolio accompanying this research, a new MSS are also proposed revising the latest MSS in education. (See accompanying portfolio).

**Figure 4-4:**
Comprehensive Dimensions of MSS

![Diagram of the Three Dimensions of DEO Minimum Service Standard (MSS)]
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Basically, the ability of a DEO to fulfill its task depends on these three factors (input, process, and output). For example, the appropriate number and qualifications of human resources is a prerequisite for good management and leadership. Without good human capital and good management, it is difficult for a DEO to fulfill its task as mandated in policy and planning. And as a consequence, it is difficult for a DEO to provide good services in improving teaching and learning in schools.

As noted, the current service quality provided by the DEO was perceived differently by heads of DEOs, heads of district board of education, teachers, school principals, and chairmen of school committees. In general, however, service quality provided by
the DEO was still seen as unsatisfactory. For example, the school principals wanted to have service quality provided by the DEO to satisfy their needs, but in reality, the services provided by the DEO were still minimal. Basically, to be effective, every school needs proper resources including human, facilities, and funding. In addition they also need guidelines, supervision and consultation. All of those are services that should be delivered by the DEO, especially to poor schools. Unfortunately the service is not always as good as expected (See description on percentages given by respondents with regards to current service quality provided by DEO on table 4-1.) The types of service quality required by respondents varied but mostly they needed higher quality education personnel at DEO to provide better services, more funds, more facilities, better management, and better leadership.

Analysis of the questionnaires indicated that, in general, the service quality provided by the DEO was still not satisfying respondents, however when I separated the answers of respondents from those who come from poor and rich provinces, I found that the respondents coming from richer provinces tended to perceive the current service quality given by the DEO to be better. Why is this? The answer was, perhaps, money and service. Those who come from richer provinces, now receive extra salary from local government after decentralization, while those who come from poor provinces receive little or none. In addition, decentralization has improved democracy in the eyes of respondents, and this is perceived as better service quality. Democracy is strongly associated with decentralization because local people theoretically have more power to decide and express their needs. Schools can easily report their problems, which can be easily responded to by the DEO. This is why a bottom up process as part of democracy brings a perception of better service quality by respondents.

The factors influencing service quality provided by the DEO were other perceived differently by the respondents, but in general, they agreed that if the DEO would like to be able to serve schools with higher quality services, the DEOs have to have competent and committed personnel, adequate funds to support the DEO and to serve schools, adequate facilities for DEO staff to do their jobs, good management and leadership. In particular, it was argued that the qualifications of DEO personnel were very crucial. From the list of education and work experience backgrounds of DEO
personnel, it is apparent that their qualifications and experience vary. This is particularly true for the heads, deputy heads, and heads of section in the DEOs. Some of them do not have an educational background or experience in education. Consequently, they do not know what to do to provide higher service quality to their schools. Last but not least, the respondents proposed that if DEOs would like to improve their service quality, efforts must be made to improve their capacities; human resources (quantity, quality, relevancy), work facilities, funding, management, and leadership capabilities to do their jobs at the DEO.

With regards to the new practices in improving service quality at the DEO level, three important findings may be made: first, the research indicates that DEOs have a very limited understanding of the basic concept of service quality and its components. As a consequence, when asked about its strategy to improve it, they will only propose a partial or unfocused effort. Secondly, the MONE urgently needs to produce and publish new MSS on the basis of real school needs, with references to Government Regulation 65/2005 on Guidelines to Develop MSS, Government Regulations 38/2007 on Divisions of Obligatory Functions between Central, Provinces, and District Governments; and Government Regulation 41/2007 on Local Government Organization. The DEO then has to adopt and produce local government regulations on MSS, and disseminate and implement guidelines on how to implement MSS in its district. Finally, the DEOs should determine and understand the real and basic needs of its schools, such as competent school personnel, facilities, money, and then fulfill them quickly and accurately. To do this, the DEO may ask its schools to produce school development plans based on their real needs and submit them to the DEO for discussion and endorsement. Another way would be to do school mapping or school profiling which covers, among other things, profiles of teachers, teaching materials, learning media, books, laboratories, funding needs, etc. By having school maps/profiles, the DEO can then help its schools based on the needs of each school.

Importantly improved DEO service quality is rarely self-executing; instituting change is very complex. It involves many different key players; it includes a wide variety of actions; it involves many factors that directly or indirectly influence implementation (communication, resources, attitudes, and bureaucratic structure); it
is a dynamic process involving the interaction of many factors, and there are a plethora preconditions for successful implementation. Most importantly, however, new practices will be more successfully implemented if generated from the bottom up - from the perspective of consumers of new practices of DEO service quality.

An implementation strategy for executing improved practices should consist of strategic plans and operational plans that must be inclusive and participative, a clear implementation strategy covering: Where we are; Where we are going; How to get there; and How do we know that we get there?. All of these can be done only with capable people and institutions with capacity, based on relevant and accurate data, which this research has provided.

Indonesia with 33 provinces and more than 470 districts or cities is the fifth biggest country in the world. To improve its education service quality through MSS implementation is a gigantic program and will take years to complete. In addition, the condition and capacities of its districts vary from place to place. Generally districts in wealthy provinces are wealthier and more developed than the others. The cities or district neighbors to the capital city are also usually better developed and have better educational funding, facilities and personnel. Any policy implemented in the education sector should consider this diversity of districts or cities condition and capability. In order to be able to provide better services, each level of government should have a comprehensive understanding of their respective educational situation. A comprehensive information system that can generate data about individual school MSS conditions in each district or city is a necessity.

**Reflection**

Up to the end of this phase 1, three actions had been undertaken; context analysis, gathering participants or practitioners views and field visits (including observation and consulting/interviewing DEO’s key stakeholders). Although the whole picture of decentralization and service quality is not fully uncovered yet, but at least I have got some real understanding about the issues that can be used as the background or
context for this Research by Project. The following discussions illustrate some of the key findings that emerged from my first phase during this journey of knowing.

As described earlier in chapters 3 and collaborative paper (exhibit 34), a decentralized or centralized system is actually on a continuum where change is like a pendulum swinging back and forth. In reality, there is no system which is absolutely centralized or decentralized. In its early history, Indonesia tended to be rather decentralized, but since European and Japanese influence up to independence, Indonesia became a more centralized system. However, since the reformation era in 1998, it has swung back to greater decentralization as a response to political turbulence.

The Indonesian education decentralization process and the consequent problems associated with service delivery might be considered unique. Unlike many countries which prepared their educational decentralization reform well in advance and provided adequate resources, it can be said that Indonesian decentralization is more as a result of political turbulence in 1998 than a well planned reform. Unlike some other countries, it was not initiated from within the education system. This is why some times it is called as a “big bang” policy by international donor institutions. As a result of this abrupt change, to many, it is considered as too early to identify any fruitful results, including its impact on service delivery. Capacity was relatively stagnant; resources, its human capacity, skill and knowledge were similar to the previous centralized era. It was as if it were the same person wearing different clothing; its ability and characteristics were still much the same. Considering this situation, comprehensive capacity building especially in district level is necessary to improve service quality.

Concerning service delivery in the decentralized era, some literature states that service quality depends on many influencing factors. Parasuraman, et al. (1988) suggests that service quality from the customer’s perspective is based on how they experience and receive the service. (This is discussed in some detail in chapter 3.) They claim that service quality (SERVQUAL) is an abstract concept, and in operationalizing it, they have identified five generic dimensions or factors including; tangibles; reliability; responsiveness; assurance and empathy.
Data from questionnaires discussed indicate a similarity to this concept of service quality. As most respondents are only practitioners, they could only name one or two of those influencing factors such as human resources, funding, management or civil servant attitude. This is to say that different respondents articulate their perception in different ways, but if we analyze their views, similar themes or indicators emerge. This is why different experts might identify different factors influencing service quality. And of course they will tend to come up with different alternative solutions on how to improve it.

My observations in the field also supported the contention that depending on the condition of each district improving educational service quality would involve many different factors. I observed that problems with human capacity, facilities, and funding are the most dominant factors, to very different degrees in the four districts. Take for example, school facilities: each district still has problems, but these differ from place to place and district to district. Especially in Bantul, one of the districts in Jogyakarta Special Territory, when most school facilities had deteriorated - some of them had even collapsed as a result of the 2005 earthquakes.

It is obvious that Indonesian decentralization still has far to go. Based on the analyzed data, mainly from the questionnaires, there are many factors hindering its successful implementation. In educational services provision for example, human resources, funding, facilities, laws/regulations, and management (process/activities) are dominant factors. Consequently, to improve DEO service quality in this Indonesian decentralized era these factors need to be considered carefully. But before any action to improve those factors is taken, as suggested by many respondents, it is necessary to formulate an instrument or standard to evaluate and assure the level of DEO service quality. MSS in this case, is the most appropriate solution. How MSS are formulated and implemented will be explored in the following Phase.
**Phase Two, Formulating a Solution**

Having a better understanding of the basics of DEO service quality in the decentralization context and feeling better informed by the information gained from the field visits, I feel as if I am now able to propose solutions for promoting better DEO service quality. Hopefully, these proposals will contribute to the improvement of DEO performance which, in turn, will support the decentralization process. Most importantly, there will also be real improvements in the quality of schooling. A better understanding of the factors influencing DEO service quality is a first crucial step. Based on this (and most importantly data gained from many educational practitioners) the establishment of MSS is the next important step. It was seen as the most strategic method of improving DEO service quality.

In this second phase, the journey will be focus on how to build relevant service standards. Three main actions or activities were taken to bring these MSS standards into reality: developing a framework, designing the standards and finally testing the design with stakeholders.

**Developing the MSS Framework**

Data from Indonesian and international agencies as discussed earlier in chapter 3 recommend the importance of developing MSS. For example the Asia Foundation and USAID in their project called IRDA (Indonesia Rapid Decentralization Appraisal, 2002) raises important points related to service delivery:

- a. The lack of public service standards makes it very difficult for local governments to define quality services and determine whether they are providing them. This is further aggravated by the bad work ethic of some employees and the fact that there is little funding in the local government budget for public services;

- b. In the absence of public service standards from the central government, local governments need to establish their own regulations on these standards as soon as possible. At the same time, central government needs to start developing national minimum public service standards that local
governments can use as a benchmark. With inputs from donor groups and
civil society, these standards for local government performance could be
used to develop criteria for identifying best practices.

This report also recommends the importance of using service standards to define
DEO quality services and determine whether DEOs are providing them. Even
further, the report urges the central government to start developing national
minimum public service standards that local governments can use as a benchmark. In
turn, the standards could be used as a public service auditing system to measure and
assure DEO service quality in providing for school needs.

In relation to this, Rachmadi (2003) argues that in a unitary state like Indonesia,
service standards are important because decentralization is not meant to be free from
central quality assurance. Local governments are subject to centrally determined and
imposed service standards and accountability mechanisms to show that they have
exercised their new roles and functions properly. Unfortunately, years after
decentralization was begun, service quality weaknesses emerged. Agus Sudrajat
(2005) in addition, identifies significant weaknesses related to public service quality
as follows;

a. Weaknesses or difficulties in service quality, there are problems in
   measuring local government service quality;
b. Unclear ‘bottom line’ of local government services. No matter how
   bad is the service provided, the unit will still exist without fear of
   bankruptcy;
c. As most government service is characterized by monopoly, they
   usually lack competitiveness, and there is low attention to quality
   improvement;
d. Even worse; many officials take opportunities to be bribed;
   otherwise they will deliver the service in a more difficult ways. This
   is why in many occasions; government services create an image of
   untrustworthiness.

Without MSS it is impossible to determine how well a DEO responds to school
needs; no evaluation could be set to establish whether a DEO serves better or worse
after decentralization. Without MSS it can’t be known whether decentralization is
achieving its goals.
Public or government schools are dependent on DEOs to provide for school needs (for example funding, human resources, facilities, standard, guidelines, and evaluation). Private schools are only dependent on DEOs for regulations, guidelines, standardizations, monitoring and evaluation. These facts suggest that DEOs are the critical point in decentralization service quality improvement efforts. Unless DEOs are functioning properly, they can inhibit the education decentralization process. In order to anticipate this, clear service standards are a necessity.

Unlike in a centralized system where accountability is only a one way (upward/vertical) mechanism, in a decentralized system, local government accountability should also go to citizens as their main customers (downward and horizontal accountability). This is why the IRDA report recommends the use of MSS as an accountability mechanism as below.

a. Priority should be given to institutionalizing mechanisms for citizen feedback about local government performance and services, and for disseminating information about good practices that can be replicated;

b. A public service auditing system, for both central and local government, will facilitate service improvement. This is because the quality of public services is necessarily linked to the accountability of local governments in delivering such services. An accountability mechanism will open possibilities for feedback, both positive and negative, on public services. This in turn will stimulate public participation in decentralization.

In this case MSS can be used as a ‘stick and carrot’ mechanism to gear public service quality. Consequences will be experienced, good or bad, depending on a DEOs service quality performance; and MSS are the instrument to measure the performance.

In addition, as suggested by one of respondents during the MSS consultations, legal aspects are critically important factors in developing MSS frameworks. Its implementation should consider the legal aspects carefully, otherwise resistance would emerge

No matter how good is an idea for improving service delivery, but if it is not in line with the current regulations, it would be useless
(Consultation with one of the important respondents in National Planning Bureau, 2009)
The reality is that suggestions for the improvement of MSS they should be proposed for the next regulation revision which will occur in 2010. This, leads to a discussions of the legal aspects related to MSS development. Following are critical parts of some of the laws, regulations or decrees related to the MSS framework particularly as they refer to decentralization, education and service quality issues. These have been as translated by the researcher, see below.

**Figure 4-5:**
**Some Points from of Law 32/2004 on Regional Government**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 11</th>
<th>(4) the administration of government obligatory functions should be based on Minimum Service Standards, implemented in steps and stipulated by the government.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article 14</td>
<td>(1) obligatory functions as the local governments authorities become the district’s and municipality’s own responsibility in their respective areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Education administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 16</td>
<td>(1) The relationship between central and local government concerning public service as mentioned by the article 2 point (4) and (5) covers;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  a. authority and responsibility in defining Minimum Service Standard;

| Article 167 |  (3) Local government spending as mentioned in above point (1) shall consider spending analysis, price standards, performance analysis and Minimum Service Standards as stipulated by government regulation |

**Points in the ELUCIDATION of Law 32/2004 on Regional Government**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 167</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Point (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minimum Service Standard is standards in service provision fulfilling its minimal service adequacy requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Included within the regulation are spending standard analysis guideline, price list, performance measurement and Minimum Service Standards stipulated by the Ministry of MOHA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GOI, 2004b
Law 32/2004 is the most recent main law relating to decentralization in Indonesia. It explicitly stipulates *Standar Pelayanan Minimal* or Minimum Service Standard (SPM/MSS). It also states that the most of authorities handed down to local government should be implemented in line with MSS principles. In the education sector for example, planning and budgetting should be formulated based on MSS criteria involving central, provincial and local governments. It is envisaged that authorities should therefore be transformed to services and should fulfill their minimal adequacy requirements. The following Government Regulation 38/2007, states this in a more explicit way.

**Figure 4-6:**
**Some Points of Government Regulation 38/2007 on Central and Local Government Authorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Obligatory functions as stated in article 6 point (2) is government authorities that should be administered by provincial and district/municipal local government concerning public basic services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Obligatory function as stated in above point (1) covers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. education;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. health;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Environment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Public works;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. statistics;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. archives, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z. library.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) the administration of government obligatory functions as stated in above article 7 point (2) should be based on Minimum Service Standards, stipulated by government and implemented in steps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points in the ELUCIDATION of Government Regulation 38/2007 on Central and Local Government Authorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Point (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the feasibility of local government budgets are limited, therefore the enactment and implementation of Minimum Service Standards concerning the local government obligatory functions should be carried out in steps by prioritizing the most important sub sector of related obligatory functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GOI, 2007a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local governments’ mandated obligatory functions cover 26 basic services, to be implemented in the context of local government priorities and according to MSS regulations. In this new regulation 38/2007, the authority of each of the three different tiers of government (central, provincial, and district) are separately specified. The responsibilities of the district and municipal educational authorities are grouped in six categories: Policy, Financing, Curriculum, Facilities, Education Personnel, and Education Quality Assurance (GOI, 2007a). The detail of the different levels and responsibilities, as translated by this researcher, are listed in appendix 5.

Apart from the decentralization and regulation law above, there is also Law 20/2003 on the National Education System, stating explicitly that all education service provisions should be delivered based on the MSS standards.

**Figure 4-7:**
**Important Point of Law 20/2003 on the National Education System Concerning MSS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) The administration of early, elementary and secondary education institutions should be based on Minimum Service Standards and by considering school based management principles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line with the above law Government Regulation 19/2005 also clearly states that all local governments should prioritise the implementation of MSS in planning their education sector’s development. In turn, the implementation of MSS should be reported accordingly.

**Figure 4-8:**
**Some Points of Government Regulation 19/2005 on National Standards of Education**

... Part Two
Governance Standards in Local Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Local government propose annual education planning and budgeting by prioritizing the following programs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. compulsory education;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. increasing primary and junior secondary education participation rates;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. illiteracy eradication;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. quality assurance for education institution managed by local government or community private foundations;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e. improving the status of the teaching profession;
f. education accreditation;
g. improving educational relevancy to meet community needs;
h. fulfilling Minimum Service Standards (MSS) in the education sector;

(2) The annual planning as stated in point (1) above should be approved by and be accountable to the Governor or district head as required by current regulation.

Part Three
Governance Standards in Central Government
Article 60
Government propose annual education planning and budgeting by prioritizing the following programs;

a. compulsory education;
b. increasing secondary and higher education participation rates;
c. completing illiteracy eradication;
d. quality assurance for education institution managed by local government or community private foundations;
e. improving teachers status as a profession;
f. improving lecturers quality;
g. education standardization;
h. education accreditation;
i. improving educational relevancy to meet local, national and global needs;
j. fulfilling Minimum Service Standards (MSS) in education sector and
k. National education quality assurance.

Source: GOI, 2005b

It is clear that the fulfillment of education MSS should be among the eight priorities of local governments and one of the eleven priorities of the central government education sector priorities. To support all the above articles enshrining MSS in laws and regulations, the Indonesian government even stipulated a specific Government Regulation 65/2005 concerning Minimum Service Standards. Although this regulation was described in chapter 3, it is still important to note some of its important points for developing an MSS framework, as seen below.

Figure 4-9:
Important points from the Government Regulation 65/2005 On Minimum Service Standards (MSS)

1. Minimum Service Standard (MSS) is a regulation on what minimal basic services to citizens should be delivered by local government and the standard to which they should be delivered;
2. Obligatory functions are government functions related to the rights and basic services enacted by laws or regulations for local government institution to protect the constitutional, national security, community welfare, and public order rights of the citizen to guarantee national unity and to fulfill the commitments required by national or international conventions;
3. Basic services are all public services needed to fulfill all citizen needs in social, economical, and constitutional life;
4. MSS indicators are quantitative and qualitative achievement describing MSS targets covering the input, process, output and impact of the services;
5. Ministries from each sector should propose MSS drafts in consultation with MOHA before they are enacted as a Decree by the respective Ministry. This draft must include clear guidelines;
6. MSS must be referred to by all local governments in preparing sectoral planning including targets and timelines, based on their resources;
7. Each Ministry shall ensure and supervise the MSS implementation in each province; while Provincial governments supervise their respective district and municipal government;
8. Within three years after Government Regulation 65/2005 stipulation (by the end of 2008), MSS for all sectors should have been formulated and stipulated by all respective ministerial sectors including MSS for MONE. (GOI, 2005c)

Now it can be seen that there is a direct link between decentralization, transfer of authority, public basic service delivery and minimum service standards required as a result of Indonesian decentralization reforms. And the above discussion already outlined the building blocks laid down for the MSS framework. There is one important point in Government Regulation 65/2005 above; point 4 (in bold) states that MSS should cover input, process, output and impact of the services. This regulation mandates the systems approach described in chapter 3. The following diagram (referred to in chapter 3) provides a reasonably simple way of representing the MSS concept and its implementation.

Figure 4-10: Perceived MSS Framework Based on Reasonable Context

Prepared by researcher
This initial framework is useful in understanding how the DEO in an ideal world as an organization continuously transforms, becoming a new decentralized organization with many additional authorities. Using a cyclical process it can be seen that each aspect of the organization should be assessed to check its current condition and performance, and define necessary improvement effort which should be implemented accordingly. If DEO service quality is continuously monitored using MSS, and the quality of schooling is assessed using basic evaluation techniques, the education service in Indonesia will continuously improve and the decentralization reform would reach its final and fruitful goals.

The contextual and basic framework above gave some sense as to how we could position MSS at the DEO level, but as I examined relevant literature, I finally realized that there is no one right way of viewing service quality in an organization; it is more about the commitment of an organization’s stakeholders to their organization performance. Different frameworks, proposed by an MSS Team will be discussed in the following section.

**Designing MSS**

This section explores how MSS are developed. From this point on, I won’t be reporting individually but as a member of an MSS National Working Team which worked in developing MSS from different meetings. All members of the team (drawn from MONE main units) were made aware of my role as a researcher and were clearly informed about the ethical dimensions of this research.

Service quality is not an individual business; all ministries in the Indonesian government now have to have their own MSS. Why to this stage had I never met people from the MONE who are responsible for developing MSS? The answer was found accidently. On Friday, August 1st 2008, I was asked to attend a meeting representing my unit. To my surprise, I found that the meeting was about a grant from the European Commission through the ADB and one of its goals was to assist the MONE in developing MSS. More than 20 people were at that meeting. It was
attended by the donor representative, most representatives of units within MONE but most came from the secretariat general units and directorate general of primary and secondary education units where I used to work. After proposing the team members of MSS working team, the meeting continued to discuss the schedule and programs. It seemed that as an initial meeting people were initially brainstorming which unit should take the responsibility in administering the grant and developing MSS in education.

Finally, the decision was made. Although the responsibility for developing MSS at the ministerial level is held by the Bureau of Law and Organization within the Secretariat General, for many reasons, especially from the donor’s point of view, the role of executing agency was finally given to the Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education. Within the Directorate General there are many units, one of which is responsible for designing and developing MSS. However, for some reason, the project was installed in the finance division. This inconsistency, probably contributes to the slow process of MSS design and development. By law it was targeted to finish by the end of 2008, but at the time this report was written MSS development still had far to go.

The MSS working team consists of about 20 members from different units within MONE and is led by a local consultant hired by the donor. We worked from meeting to meetings, with occasional disagreement. During one meeting, on Wednesday, September 24th 2008, I found that many of the team members perceived MSS differently from what I so far understood. To some of the participants, MSS was linked directly to the Government Regulation 19/2005 on National Education Standards. While on the other hand, some, including me, believed that MSS originated from the law related to decentralization, law 32/2004. The group was split, and a solution was needed.

The group took two different paths in understanding MSS based on two different laws and their derivatives. One took an education path and the other took a decentralization path as follows.
Education
Law 20/2003: National Education System
Government Regulation 19/2005: National Education Standard

Decentralization
Law 32/2004: Local Governance
Government Regulation 38/2007: Central and Local Government Authorities and
Government Regulation 65/2005: MSS Development

MSS set for school level
MSS set for district level

Prepared by researcher

There was disagreement between the two groups regarding the level at which the Minimal Service Standards should apply. For those who argued the education path, decentralization authority was to be handed down to school level; that is, standards should be set to measure and assure performance at the school level. On the other hand, for those who supported the decentralization path, authority is held in district level, and standards therefore should be set for the district level. In relation to this, I remember how respondents perceived factors influencing MSS differently. Sometime they mentioned issues and personnel at the DEO level, but also many raised issues relating to the school level. Neither one is right and neither one is wrong. I believe it is only a matter of different views. The views can be illustrated below.

Prepared by researcher
As it is mandated by the government Regulation 65/2005 on MSS development, MSS should include input, process and output. In case of public schools, where schools are so dependent on DEOs, the DEO output would automatically contribute schools input. However, many people argued that education services are delivered at the school level. This is why they believe that MSS should be applied at the school level. On the contrary, decentralization had not handed education authority down to school level yet (school based management has been introduced, however school authority is still limited), but education authority is distributed to the district level through DEOs. Since both are right, there is a possibility that MSS should apply both at school and district levels. After long and tiring discussion in several meetings, finally most of the team agreed that MSS should be set for the two different positions; district and school level.

Before detailing how MSS should look, it was important that the team configure the position of MSS in a broader education context. After a series of meetings and consultations, finally the following framework (figure 4-13 on next page) was agreed by most of the team members. This was to be one of the most important steps taken by the team because in reality many people, even education personnel, are still confused in regard to MSS.

This framework positions MSS and NSE as two strategic instruments, to improve the education system. Since the state of education varies from DEO to DEO, each DEO might aim to reach MSS at different times depending on current conditions and available resources. Rich districts may have even already surpassed the MSS requirements. But for average districts, mainly in poor areas, reaching a MSS level would probably be challenging and take years. But if MSS are mandatory for all districts, they will be forced to comply with no further excuses, and improving education quality is only a matter of time.
The immediate problem was; what should MSS constitute of? There are many theoretical answers to this question. Back to context analysis (chapter 3) for example, SERVQUAL by Parasuraman proposes that service quality should cover five main factors; tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy. In general, Parasuraman’s factors can also be grouped into Input (tangibles as all organization needs to run the programs); and Process, including responsiveness, reliability, assurance and empathy. This concept focused on process in delivering quality service. As a comparison, respondents to the open ended questionnaires perceive that
MSS influencing factors consist of: personnel, facilities and funding (input), organization and management (process) and community as an external factor influencing services. Key factors tend to be overlooked.

Designing MSS components is not adequate if considering only the above factors. Laws or regulation to mandate MSS should not be forgotten. But understanding how laws and regulations inform MSS components was rather confusing for the team members. The Government Regulation 38/2007 on Local Government authorities mandated that each DEO should deliver educational service provision categorized in 6 items; policy, personnel, facilities, funding, curriculum and quality control. While Government Regulation 19/2005 on National Education Standard suggests that education should be viewed in relation to eight standards; content, process, competency, personnel, facilities, funding, administration and evaluation standards. It was a long and challenging process to combine so many different aspects from different sources as comprehensive elements of MSS.

Firstly, the team set out to identify the most important factors influencing education quality improvement from the NSE. This was suggested by the NSE team because MSS as a standard should be a subset or part of NSE. Based on that suggestion, the MSS team then identified all the necessary aspects or factors from about 700 indicators of NSE to be developed as MSS standards. Fortunately, most of those factors had been identified by the accreditation team who identified approximately 135 indicators depending on the school level. Since the MSS standards are supposed to be lower than NSE and accreditation, it was felt that its number of indicators should be lower too. It was later decided (version March 9th 2009) that there should be only 33 indicators for elementary and secondary education.

Based on the accreditation indicators derived from NSE, the team then drafted a set of standards. This draft was later used to check how stakeholders viewed the priority of MSS components. The draft consisted of eight main categories as identified by NSE in its accreditation instrument. Each of these categories was detailed, becoming several indicators. This detail can be seen in exhibit 18.
1. Teaching-learning content;  
2. Teaching-learning process;  
3. Education personnel;  
4. Principals;  
5. Supervisors;  
6. Education Facilities;  
7. School management;  

Over time, as a result of suggestions either from within or outside the team, the MSS draft was revised several times. The earlier draft of MSS could be seen in exhibit 19 dated May 13th 2009 while its final draft could be seen as exhibit 25 on portfolio.

Using the draft, the team then asked a range of stakeholders from central offices (MONE, MOHA, MORA, BAPPENAS and MOF) and regional (province, district, board and school personnel) for their views on how to prioritize each component of the above categories during some FGDs. Facilitated by these FGDs and involving education stakeholders from central MONE, PEO, DEO and school personnel, the team tried to define the most important factors influencing education quality improvement. The first FGD was conducted in Bogor (October 2nd 2008) and continued by an FGD in central MONE (October 9th 2008). In each FGD the first drafts of MSS standards and its indicators were introduced and feedback was gathered from the FGD participants.

Up to this stage, the team was able to design or formulate embryonic MSS. More work needed to be done by involving more stakeholders at the local government level. The next section discusses further activities in improving the MSS standards.
Testing the Design

Feedback on the first draft of MSS was sought from selected provinces through different FGDs. The team conducted three FGDs in the Lombok Raya Hotel in West Nusa Tenggara (October 16, 2008), the Sapphire Hotel in Yogyakarta (October 23, 2008) and the Quality Hotel in Riau (October 30, 2008). Within those FGDs, the draft MSS standards were introduced, and suggestions, criticism, input and support were provided by the participants.

Back in central MONE, after analyzing the results of the meetings, the team was able to determine how the detail of each MSS component or sub sector and its indicators should look. But again, some members of the team especially the MOHA team representative, argued that those factors were still too school oriented and queried the DEO’s obligatory function as mandated by decentralization law.

Finally the team managed to formulate the following matrix of more detailed MSS standards. This matrix illustrates the components of MSS for district and school levels. It can be seen that the eight standards of Government Regulation 19/2005 on National Education Standards can be matched to the six categories of district authorities mandated by Government Regulation 38/2007 on Government Authorities. This was a compromise between the two different views of MSS; the education and decentralization paths.

To simplify, it can be seen from the figure 4-14 that there are 6 MSS standards set for DEOs and 8 MSS standards set for schools. The substance of those divisions is similar. For example one DEO standard discusses ‘curriculum’, while at the school level this is separated into three different factors: the standard of content, the learning process and graduate competencies. This case reminds me of chapter two, where it was found that phenomenon can be viewed from a range of different perspectives.
Figure 4-14:  
Combined MSS Components for DEOs and Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed MSS to be the direct responsibility of DEOs based on GR 38/2007 (Decentralization Path)</th>
<th>Proposed MSS to be the direct responsibility of schools based on GR 19/2005 (Education Path)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Sub Factors/indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Curriculum</td>
<td>District plan and support to schools for curriculum development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Learning Process Standard | • Minimum hours of face to face teaching provided to students  
• Minimum hours of professional development  
• Teacher lesson preparation  
• Teacher weekly assessment program  
• School program to support student daily attendance |
| 3. Graduate Competencies | Conduct of exams according to standards and reporting to district and parents |
| 2. Teacher and Educational personnel | • Supervisor/school ratio  
• Teacher/student ratio  
• Qualifications of teachers  
• Qualifications of Principals and Master Teachers  
• Qualifications of Supervisors |
| 4. Teacher and Education Personnel Qualifications and Competencies | • Code of conduct for teachers and students  
• Regular daily attendance of teachers  
• Observation of teaching and provision of feedback  
• Teachers’ minimum hours of duty |
| 3. Facilities and equipment | • Access to schooling  
• Meet standards for building safety and quality  
• Sufficient classroom furniture  
• Number of wash room/toilet  
• Provision of room for teachers and other personnel  
• Science equipment; Science laboratory |
| 5. Equipment and Infrastructure Standards | • Number of Text Books  
• Number of enrichment materials and reference books |
| 4. Budgeting/funding and Policy/planning | • Evidence of planning and resource allocation for MSS  
• Plan directed to achievement of SNP and national goals |
| 7. School Financial and Budgeting Standard and School Management Standards | • School committee/PTA  
• Annual plan and budget  
• Annual report  
• Organization structure and job descriptions  
• Update statistics and report to district |
| 6. Education quality control | Number of Supervisor visits to schools to monitor performance and improvement |
| 8. Education Evaluation | Report on learning achievement each semester |

(Prepared by MSS Team, January 2009)

Compared to the old MSS, these newly proposed MSS indicators are much better because the old MSS (MONE Ministerial decree 129a/U/2004) are too output oriented.
It was agreed that the next draft of the MSS components and its indicators would then be presented for feedback to different stakeholders from central to local government and school level. However, at this stage, many of the team members questioned the relative position of MSS and the accreditation system. This became another challenging problem faced by the MSS team; how to position MSS beside the accreditation system.

After a series of meetings and consultations with the NES team and Accreditation team, finally it was agreed that MSS are part of NES and the Accreditation system. NES is considered to be the most appropriate standards, while accreditation comprises the steps needed to achieve NSE, and MSS are considered as the minimum requirements for a school to operate. The following diagram was used to map the position of MSS among NES and Accreditation system.

Figure 4-15:
MSS as part of National Education Standards and Accreditation System

(Prepared by MSS Team)
Normal or standard schools would most probably fall into A, B and C accreditation categories, but some schools can be classed as achieving an international standard (above A). On the contrary, schools which are not accredited (D level) are to be below standard. MSS are considered as guidelines in establishing the minimum standard for schools. This is why an MSS system is considered to be very strategic in improving the quality of lower level schools. Statistics reveal that there are still many of these, especially elementary schools. Most would fall into the D category. This would be a huge task for the DEO and local government. I was also agreed that accreditation and MSS should be consistent with the NSE as a higher policy instrument.

As the diagram below illustrates, the team agreed upon how the Indonesian education system can continuously improve its quality by using MSS principles. At first, MSS are based on the average low condition of schooling. After most of the schools pass the minimum required by MSS, the MSS standard should be set progressively higher, until the MSS standards are as high as the NSE, the standard that the Indonesian Government is aiming for.

**Figure 4-16: Continuous Education Quality, from MSS to NSE**

(Prepared by the MSS Team)
So far the team has only managed to propose the formulation of MSS. Many challenging tasks still lie ahead for example, describing its legal framework, developing costing mechanism, proposing a monitoring system, etc. However, I have to write up this research and continue working with the team. Otherwise this research will become a never ending process. Nevertheless, the team aims to finish the whole MSS system before the current cabinet is finished by the end of 2009.

Another challenge arose when some of the FGDS participants argued that the newly proposed MSS were considered too simple as they were proposed only for elementary and junior secondary education. According to the regulations, MSS should cover all levels and all types of education. This was to say that ideally MSS should be implemented not only for elementary education, but also for junior and senior high education, as well as non formal education. The donor however had only required MSS to be prepared for elementary and junior secondary education, not for the other components.

The participant claimed that this challenge would be faced, if the draft MSS concept were presented to the Dewan Pertimbangan Otonomi Daerah (DPOD, or Regional Autonomy Special Body) for approval. The DPOD is required to give approval for the MSS proposals from each ministry. The DPOD is composed of senior personnel from different ministries (MOHA, MOF, National Planning Bureau, etc.). Up to the end of this research in August 2009, the team has not yet been able to present the draft MSS to the DPOD.

Although I was a member of the MSS team, as an individual I also disagreed with the claim that for the time being MSS applies only to elementary and junior secondary education. The mandate given to DEOs is not only for managing elementary and junior secondary education, but all the new responsibilities devolved to DEOs after decentralization. If MSS are seen as an instrument to implement decentralization, it is obvious that MSS should cover all formal education levels and also all types of non formal education. Sooner or later the MONE will be asked for its complete comprehensive MSS standards, not only for its elementary and junior high education MSS.
Unfortunately, the rest of the team kept arguing that because the focus of Indonesian education is now at the elementary and junior high education (which used to be called basic education) and the donor was also supporting the same level education, therefore MSS should only apply to the same level of education too. The controversy continued until the writing of this paper.

**Initial Conclusions and Reflections**

After examining the service quality context, the literature reviews, stakeholders’ perceptions and responses from respondents during field visits, it can be concluded that a number of actions should be taken after decentralization, to prevent the stagnation or even deterioration of DEO service quality. The obvious alternatives would most likely involving physical and human capacity building activities such as improving facilities, and training personnel. But some suggestions provided during FGDs, workshops, field visits and consultations, stated that building service standards was the most strategic solution. This was reasonable because any efforts to improve DEO or school service quality would be started by establishing a measuring process. “What is the current condition?” is the first question to ask. Later, based on the results of a measuring process, planning can be formulated and actions taken.

Although theoretical background and suggestions were an important part of the MSS formulation, importantly, Indonesian laws and regulations concerning decentralization and public services needed to be considered. Otherwise, any effort could be illegal and destined to fail. However, any suggestions should address the next version or revision of laws and regulations. This was why NSE and accreditation indicators were used as the basis for formulating MSS standards. After some conflict, a compromise was reached, consisting of standards set for both DEO s and schools as shown in the exhibits 18.

From the second phase of this journey, finally the first draft of MSS was formulated and introduced to education stakeholders for further feedback and revision. Unfortunately, the team had only dealt with the application of a small part of MSS standards. Not all aspects of education authorities in DEO level have been required
to respond to MSS (only formal education), and not all levels of formal education were standardized (only elementary and junior secondary high school). Many of the team argued that MSS are formulated in steps, and since the Indonesian government is still focusing on basic education, their only concern was with MSS for basic education. I strongly disagreed, but I did not have enough power to change this. The team could have worked to formulate MSS for all the education authorities delegated to DEOs under decentralization. Based on their own situation and available resources, DEOs can then plan their own MSS strategies and achievements over time.

The above discussions conclude the second phase of this journey. In the next phase, the journey will continue and will garner support from a broader range of educational stakeholders as the MSS standards move closer to their final form.
Phase Three,
Garnering Supports

After passing the previous two phases of this journey, two steps had been taken; understanding DEO service quality in its decentralization context and formulating the most appropriate and strategic solution to improve DEO service quality: developing a set of MSS standards. In this last phase, the journey will mainly aim at garnering support from the key education actors at the central, provincial, district and school levels. This phase is as important as the previous two, because the team has to introduce MSS to education stakeholders and convince them that the new MSS are much better than the earlier one. Besides, support from all education actors was sought to facilitate the implementation process later on.

There were three activities taken during this last phase of this Research by Project; consultations with central MONE, MORA and MOHA key personnel; some FGDs with provincial, districts and school level personnel to gather more feedback or support and finally some workshops with Boards of Education to gain support from their members.

Consulting with Policy Makers;
(To higher ranking officials, in the three key ministries).

High ranking personnel in the three ministries (MONE, MOHA and MORA), were familiar with MSS terminology. But what the MSS really looks like, in real conditions, many of them might still be confused. This is not surprising because in reality only a small number of high ranking personnel are directly involved in formulating MSS as an important part of decentralization and public service quality. This is why the MSS team felt that introducing MSS to high ranking ministry personnel while gathering feedback and garnering support is a significant and important process. In addition, the team also consulted with the NSE and Accreditation team in central MONE.
For these purposes, the team secretariat scheduled a series of consultation with high ranking personnel from the three ministries. I did not attend all consultations but I was involved in at least fifteen of them. The first consultation was undertaken with the Director General of Non Formal and Informal Education on November 28th 2008, while the last one was held on January 23rd 2008 with the Head of Research and Development in MORA. Important themes below emerged from the consultations.

**MSS Conceptions and Perceptions**

Although the laws and regulations related to MSS were firstly enacted as part of decentralization policy more than five years ago, for most people the concepts were relatively new and not clearly understood. MSS are sometimes still misunderstood not only by ordinary people but even by many central government officials in MONE. This meant that the first attempt to implement MSS was not as successful as it should have been. MSS were not only misunderstood but also disregarded by some local education stakeholders. Consequently, measuring local government service quality remains a big problem after decentralization.

The following points have been abstracted from the results of these consultations. They represent only the most important and relatively new issues emerging from the consultations. These themes became very important for consideration by the MSS team since they were suggested by the high ranking personnel at the central level. It is acknowledged that there is some repetition here, but this account of phase 3 does indicate the strength of the debate about the need to improve education quality, the contributions made by senior government officials to the MSS deliberations and the very real need to inform and gain their support. Detailed minutes of each consultation can be seen at exhibit 20.

- It was recommended that before implementing the new MSS, we should consider the experiences of the first MSS implementation. There should be a formal evaluation concerning the implementation of Ministerial Decree 129a/U/2004 concerning MSS. Many claim that the first MSS are not successfully implemented, but more evidence is needed to reveal whether this was so;
On one hand the origin of education basic services can be traced back to the mandates handed down to DEOs after decentralization as described in the attachment of Government Regulation 38/2007 on Governments Authorities. But on the other hand people perceive that the basic education services are derived from the Government Regulation 19/2005 on National Standards of Education (NSE);

It was suggested consequently, that MSS standard are a mixture between the two government regulations because for district level using Government Regulation 38/2007 and 65/2005 is more suitable. While for schools as for accreditation purposes, MSS should be based on Government Regulation 19/2005. Since the education services are delivered in these two position levels (DEO and Schools), MSS should comprise standards assigned to these two institutions;

In addition, it was suggested that MSS should not only be an instrument consisting only of standards but should also be accompanied by proper introduction or explanations, guidelines, SOP, and a data collection and a monitoring system;

Finally, all concepts and definitions relating to MSS should be made clear to education stakeholders. In other words, a regulatory framework alone is not always clear and importantly, can never guarantee successful implementation. The dissemination process becomes challenging and crucial.

**MSS as Part of Accreditation and NSE**

Since the enactment of Government Regulation 19/2004 concerning National Standards of Education, all educational standards should comply with this new law. MSS are not an exception. The following items were suggested during the consultation:

- The Government Regulation 19/2004, explicitly states that NSE is the minimum standard that should be fulfilled by education stakeholders. Unfortunately, for many observers this standard is considered to be too high considering the school realities and local government capacities. This is why
they call it an ‘envision/ideal standard’ that can only be reached in steps, and MSS are part of the steps;

- The NSE is considered as the highest or the broadest standard comprised of accreditation and MSS. In reality most schools would fall into MSS standard level, the accredited schools would fall into accreditation C, B, or A. Above these levels would be the International Schools. MSS aims to measure poor schools that have not been accredited and DEOs are obliged to improve them to become at least C accredited schools.

**Figure 4-17:**
MSS as Part of Education Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSE (National Standard of Education)</th>
<th>A accredited Schools</th>
<th>Accredited Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B accredited Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C accredited Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum Service Standard (MSS) Schools</td>
<td>Non Accredited Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Prepared by researcher)

It should be clearer now that MSS and Accreditation is on a continuum, a process for education managers to improve the quality of education through school improvement. As mandated by the decentralization law and regulations, DEOs hold the greatest authority to direct and provide for school needs.

**MSS Coverage**

Government Regulation 38/2007 gives mandates to local governments (districts and municipalities) through DEOs to provide education services of all types and at all levels of education. This is to say that except for higher education, DEOs are obliged to manage formal and non formal education in their respective areas. During the consultation, the following points emerged.
• MSS should cover all education authority held by DEOs and all educational services provided by them. For example, formal and non-formal education are delivered in different ways, but MSS are supposed to cover both types of education;

• On the other hand, MSS should also be used to assess how well DEOs execute their responsibilities. This is why MSS should be applied to every level of government institution (Government Regulation 65/2005);

• This is where assessment of process and performance standards should also be applied. Currently MSS are concerned more about inputs and outputs at the school level but do not include process as suggested by Government Regulation 65/2005.

The variability of local government capacity and resources should also be considered in achieving MSS National targets:

• In many parts of the country, there are still schools without proper water and electricity as their basic needs, especially poor schools in rural/remote areas;

• Government Regulation 65/2005 suggests that the national MSS targets should consider the lowest and highest achievement in education service provision from the field. And based on its available resources, districts should plan their own targets to achieve MSS by using their own local government decrees;

• Not only its resources and fiscal capacity, but any special characteristic of a district such as ethnic, culture, language, and emergency situation should be taken into account in MSS implementation.

It was suggested that MSS should cover not only all types and levels of education, but also should accommodate different capacities of local government in fulfilling the standards. Since the ability of local government varies from province to province, it is impossible to achieve MSS national targets at one time. DEOs, as part of local government, should be given the flexibility to plan their own targets, based on their available resources.
MSS needs stronger regulation

No matter how sophisticated an MSS policy is, it would be useless if not supported by strong regulation and law enforcement. This issue was raised by many respondents during the consultation:

- In light of the earlier MSS implementation experiences, it seems that strong regulation and adequate law enforcement is a necessity. The old MSS was promulgated via a MONE Ministerial Decree. DEOs, as part of local government, are managed under the MOHA not the MONE. It was suggested that it would be better if the new MSS are imposed using a stronger regulation, for example presidential decree or government regulation;
- Although most authority and responsibility for management and implementation were delegated to district level, the responsibility to fund basic services is shared among the three tiers of government; central, provincial and district authorities. In addition, communities also play an important role in funding schools. Whenever a poor district faces financial difficulty in fulfilling MSS standards, strong coordination is required to remedy the problem;
- Poor districts, mostly outside the island of Java will probably face greater problems in achieving MSS targets. These DEOs are formally given flexibility in planning their MSS targets. Some would probably have fully achieved MSS already, but many would be still far below the MSS standards and need more time to reach them. This should be addressed clearly within the regulatory framework governing MSS;
- Based on a massive base line survey, all districts’ positions towards achieving the MSS could be mapped, and at a later stage, time and resources constraints can be identified as part of their annual or long term planning. This approach should be applied to all districts regardless of their capacity;
- Once the MSS standard is established, it should be monitored periodically by the local government. (There is still some debates within the team about who should have responsibility for this monitoring.) Whenever a district is close to fulfilling the MSS standards, higher MSS standards should be applied. This was why MSS should change over time. Consequently, the regulatory
framework should also be revised periodically. Incentive or disincentive mechanism to motivate the district success or failure in achieving MSS responsibilities was also suggested;

- So as not to add to the complexity of the existing educational organization, it was suggested that MSS be incorporated into the existing system of monitoring with minor modification, rather than be installed as a new system or regulation. Many school renovations for example could be standardized using the standard and the costing process used by the Ministry of Public Works. The MSS data collecting methods in addition, could also be incorporated into the existing system; with school indicators being gathered by supervisors, not only by the school principals. This would mean that MSS could be implemented without creating a new unit or organization. The enactment of proper regulations should be sufficient.

Up to the writing of this research MSS standards formulation was still in progress. Soon after the MSS standards formulation is completed the laws and regulatory framework should be designed. MSS formulation should always be in line with the existing regulations, no less or more. Otherwise, resistance or controversy would soon arise.

**MSS Data Information System**

Since its early stages, the MSS team realized that MSS’s standard assessments strongly depend on the availability of relevant valid data. Respondents in the consultation suggested the following:

- The types of data or information needed for MSS measurements should be defined. Regular data collecting procedures should be available whether from school or district level and could be gathered based on MONE’s regular reporting cycles;
- Each district should have its own comprehensive school data base; hopefully accessed from district, province or MONE central level as part of regular data collection;
• If all MSS indicators or variables are inserted into the regular statistic and data collecting process, then a special MSS survey or assessment would not be needed;

• Converting all MSS statements into indicators or variables is now an obvious and important task for the MSS team. For example when it is said that there should be enough teacher in every elementary school, the MSS indicator states; ‘In all elementary school, there should be a teacher for every 32 students and at least six teachers in every school.’

Without valid data illustrating the existing DEO and schooling condition, it would be impossible for any DEO or PEO to properly plan its education in order to reach MSS targets.

**MSS as a basis for Planning**

Many of the high ranking personnel during this consultation claimed that MSS should be able to facilitate the planning and budgeting process:

• It is sometimes questioned by DEOs personnel, how can MSS be used as part of District short term and long term planning process? How can MSS later on be converted to a budgeting process? This should be made clear by the MSS procedure itself, some respondents suggested;

• Based on the documentation of existing conditions according to MSS criteria and considering the improvement targets set but limited by the available resources, any DEO should be able to propose their short and long term education planning. At the same time, the costs to fulfill the existing gaps over a period of time could also then be identified. This is where MSS can be used as the basis for education planning at the school or DEO level;

• It was also suggested by one respondent from the National Planning Bureau that based on their fiscal capacity and MSS performances, district could be grouped into four categories and each quadrant should be treated with special interventions. Then it should be asked, How can we group them and what are the criteria to be used? The following illustration was suggested at that time:
Based on their MSS performance and fiscal capacity, DEOs could be grouped into four different quadrants, each with different treatments needed. First, in the unlikely situation where DEO has a low capacity but perform well incentives could be given. Second, those DEOs with high performance and high capacity deserve rewards. Next, DEOs with low performance but high capacity should be given corrective action or punishment and finally DEOs with low performance and low fiscal capacity should be given special allocation funds (DAK);

Although most education authority is now handed down to district level, education finance is still crucial because there is wide disparity in local government fiscal capacity throughout the country. This is why high ranking personnel from National Planning Bureau suggested the possibility of supporting the MSS by topping up its funding from two different sources; central and provincial budgets - if necessary. To fulfill one hundred percent enrolment rates with the appropriate quality of schooling, a continuous planning and budgeting process should be defined comprehensively as
illustrated in a figure below. Different schemes such as the de-concentration mechanism (MONE funding allocated to the DEO for new school buildings); and a special allocation funds (DAK/Dana Alokasi Khusus - central funding transferred to local government for decentralization purposes) for school rehabilitation, General Allocation Fund (Dana Alokasi Umum/DAU - central budget transferred to local government for governance operation) for teacher development and School Operational Fund (Bantuan Operasional Sekolah - BOS) for books and learning materials.

Figure 4-19:
Suggested Funding Schemes

Improving the quality of education components is a high priority for the Indonesian government. But, providing all the required funding within a short period of time would be a challenging task for all government levels. This would only be possible when the government sets a strong commitment and provide all necessary resources within two years for example; otherwise the district will need to prioritize on their own, and achieve the MSS targets in steps identified in their short and long term planning.
MSS Monitoring and Evaluation

MSS can also be seen as a performance measurement tool for schools or DEOs. Therefore during the consultations, it was also suggested that MSS should be accompanied by a monitoring system to ensure its achievement, as follows.

- MSS can also be used as a district performance measurement tool to evaluate the new authorities after decentralization. The results could also show how well schools serve students and community. As a result, MSS should be accompanied by a monitoring system;
- MSS therefore is not only a tool to improve school quality but also district capacity. The ability of schools to improve depends on its district DEO’s capacity to provide for all school needs especially for public schools. Private schools would only need standards, guidelines or evaluation from DEOs.

In order for a school or DEO to be able to monitor its MSS implementation, special personnel or unit in each school and DEO should be well prepared involving external reviewer from PEO, BOE and School Committee. (In the draft of MONE’s MSS guidelines supervisors are to assess schools while PEO assess DEO’s MSS indicators). This is also a suggestion to ensure that district personnel handling MSS are appointed properly and are not easily and frequently substituted.

MSS and Accountability

With decentralization, it is commonly understood that DEOs are not part of MONE anymore but come under MOHA administration. This presents some anomalies:

- DEOs are not the MONE’s subordinate and MONE is not their superior. This creates an ambiguous situation. DEOs, for example, when they got some funding from MONE’s, they tend to say, “Yes, you are our boss.” But when they are to finish work and required to send their report to MONE, immediately they would they say; “You are not our boss.” The same old leadership dualism exists after decentralization;
• In order for MSS to be used as part of an accountability mechanism, it should be considered how the government should sanction a school or district for not including MSS targets;

• Instead of using only one way accountability (to upper levels), accountability to horizontal level to the broader community (through school committees and boards of education) should be facilitated. School committees should be involved in MSS monitoring together with local supervisors, and accordingly BOEs should take part in the DEOs MSS monitoring mechanism;

• After the position of a district or school in MSS achievement is known, the next question is then what should be done and what action is needed. When a school or district does not perform well in MSS, a comprehensive analysis should be done to identify weaknesses and define follow up action needed.

All these accountability suggestions should be made clear within the MSS regulations; otherwise MSS will remain as a standard that changes nothing.

Installing MSS

Although MSS are stipulated in some laws and regulations, but not many government personnel at central or local government levels are truly aware of what MSS are all about and how they should be administered. The following suggestions may provide an answer.

• As a relatively new ‘business’, questions were raised as to how MSS should be installed within the education organization or systems, especially in DEOs. What unit should take care of this ‘business’ so that it can function normally without draining resources from the existing system. In some ways MSS have similarities with the accreditation system, only with a lower standard (not even equal to ‘C’ in accreditation standards). Should MSS be managed by the same accreditation board or be left as part of regular data collection procedures through regular school and district reporting? ;
In accreditation, unfortunately, the assessors assess certain schools that are proposed to be accredited, not necessarily the whole school, and often leave poor schools out. On the other hand, MSS standards are supposed to be used to assess poor schools regularly. In this case, coordinated by DEOs, school supervisors would be better placed to assess the achievement of MSS because they work on regular basis visiting schools;

• If, supervisors are to assess MSS indicators based on regular school data collecting procedures, will they be honest enough to fairly assess their own school in their own district?;

• Control from the community through BOE or Dewan Pendidikan and School Committee or Komite Sekolah becomes an important issue here. Their participation in MSS monitoring should be properly regulated, because if public accountability is to be effective, the community should be involved in handling MSS;

• There should be a mechanism ensuring that the DEO really follows and implements MSS. Consequently, a flowchart to show MSS process is needed as part of the whole MSS conception involving all stakeholders from central, provincial, district and school level personnel.

All the above activities would only become possible if MSS are properly disseminated and all personnel involved are well informed and technically capable. This will become a challenging task for the MSS team as time is limited; MSS are expected to be enacted by the end of 2009.

It is extremely important that the above suggestions are considered carefully to facilitate the implementation of MSS. Considering these valuable suggestions from high ranking personnel, it’s now up to the MSS team to decide how far they would follow them. (I distributed the complete minutes at that time, but the team was still too busy with its MSS formulation and has not been able to analyze these suggestions in detail, as a consequent, at this time, there has been no formal response).
Gathering Broader Feedback

Now that the MSS standards were better developed, they needed to be introduced again to the broader range of stakeholders. It was very important to see whether DEOs and school personnel can understand and be able to implement the proposed MSS system. This was also an opportunity to gather more feedback and support from the education actors in the field. Important parts of this trial will be discussed in the next section.

To recapitulate, in 2004, based on the first law of decentralization, the MONE had already promulgated Ministerial Decree 129A/U/2004 on MSS. Unfortunately its implementation in the field was thought to be unsuccessful. Learning from this experience, the team realized the importance of trialing the MSS concept to stakeholders in the field, either DEOs or schools. This was why; even from the very beginning, the team had tried to involve stakeholders from PEOs, DEOs and schools.

The following discussion is based on the trial process in some selected districts in 2008.

At the end of 2008, from December 17th to December 20th 2008 the team held some FGDs in West Nusa Tenggara Province. It was planned that the MSS concepts would be introduced to three different level of stakeholders; provincial, district, and school level. On day one, the team met with the provincial group in PEO. The FGD consisted of many different representatives from MONE provincial level, local house of representative, local bureau of planning, MORA, Boards of Education, the Accreditation Board and the Educational Quality Assurance Body. After an opening by the PEO representative and followed by MSS Team presentation, the discussion commenced. The following points were put forward during the discussion.
MSS as an Indicator for DEO and School Development

- MSS should be able to differentiate a DEO’s rank, based on their achievement in providing educational service to schools and the community. It is important to map which districts need more attention. The district performance on MSS should be used to identify the needs for interventions or grants from central government;
- Depending on the district’s ability to manage resources, schools might be below or above the MSS standards. Poor districts would have more schools below the MSS standards, and more efforts needed. To leave this effort to local government alone would inhibit the improvement of education quality. Shared responsibility among the three tiers would still be needed;
- The MSS standards are designed to improve the low performing districts and schools; this does not necessarily mean that those above standard should stop improving. In turn the MSS standards would be set higher.

Strong Legal Framework is needed

The accreditation system so far has not been effectively used for education improvement. Without strong law enforcement, it is assumed that MSS would also not be as effective as it should be. DEOs and schools are administratively under the MOHA not under the MONE. “People will only sing the song of those whose bread they eat”, just like the old saying. Enacting MSS under MONE ministerial decree would be unlikely to be obeyed by local governments. A higher degree of legal decree is needed.

MSS strongly depends on its Data Availability and Community support

- MSS as an assessment strongly depends on data availability relating to students, teachers, facilities etc. Consider carefully how to collect, process, and interpret MSS data. Based on these data, planners and decision makers should be able to identify the weaknesses of each school and district, where are they located, what should be their improvement over time, and so on;
• It should be identified who or which unit at each level of education organization holds the authority in administering MSS;

• Most importantly, citizens as the customer of education should be able to participate in MSS assessment through boards of education or school committees if the accountability mechanism is to work properly;

• Many of the FGD participants only commented on the grammatical aspect of the MSS and standards set for some of MSS items, but did not really contribute to the substance of MSS content.

From the provincial level FGD, the team learned much. It was obviously time to hold an FGD at district and school level. It is clear that the MSS team still has more work to do.

The following day, the team headed to West Lombok District. When we arrived, many of the DEO personnel had been waiting and were ready for the discussion. Most of the FGD participants were similar to that in provincial level; only they are from district level. The result of the discussion is recorded in the following points.

**MSS Coverage**

• Although *Madrasah* or Islamic schools are managed by MORA, they are also part of education system. Islamic schools should be treated equally by the MSS system. Unfortunately MORA District Offices are not part of the decentralized system since religious authority is still held by the central government;

• The proposed MSS only covers formal education especially elementary and junior high schools. MSS should be expanded, covering the all sectors of education for which a DEO is responsible.

**MSS Assessment**

• Who would assess MSS at the school level? DEO staff, accreditation assessors, or school supervisors? How could they judge the level of MSS that a school achieved?;
• It was suggested that school MSS be assessed by school supervisors who visit schools regularly. The report is then sent to DEO and analyzed by relevant unit. Since in the future MSS covers all education levels, it would be better to place MSS authority in a unit covering all levels of education such as in the secretariat of DEO. The question is then, who would assess the DEO’s MSS. Most likely, this authority will be held by higher institution, for example the PEO.

MSS as a minimum requirement

• In many areas, especially poor districts, the basic needs of many schools remain unfulfilled. MSS should be written or targeted so that DEOs fulfill all these basic needs such as, electricity, fresh water, appropriate buildings etc;
• MSS system should be able to force all DEOs and local government to provide appropriate resources to fulfill MSS requirements, budget, personnel, facilities etc., by stipulating a strong legal framework;
• Based on evidence from many cases, where a DEO approves a new private school operation, it is often found that the school is far below operational requirements. Unless new school proposals met the MSS requirements, no DEO should approve the proposal, otherwise students and community can become victims of educational entrepreneur’s speculation;
• SPM Dissemination is critically important to motivate and ask for commitment from all related stakeholders or institutions within and outside of MONE;

• Many participants suggested that MSS should not only cover basic and secondary education, but should also cover all aspects of education mandates held by DEOs including non formal and youth education. In addition it should also cover Islamic schools or even education institution under different ministries;

• Some participants suggested formulating MSS standards is one thing, but to make it happen effectively in day to day activity is more important;
As planned, after conducting the district FGD, the team then went to some nearby schools to introduce and to obtain feedbacks from the school level. At least five schools (elementary and junior high schools, good and poor schools) were visited in West Lombok District and Mataram City. Some significant feedback was recorded and is listed below.

**MSS as a Benchmark**

For good schools, MSS are thought to establish too low criteria. Most of them meet the MSS criteria already. This achievement is a result of committed school members and community where the principal’s leadership is the main factor. For poor schools MSS are important.

**MSS Coverage**

As part of universal basic education, there are many temporary open junior high schools in mosques, churches and sub district offices. Those institutions are also part of the education system that needs to be standardized. MSS should cover these institutions too.

**MSS as SOPs**

- In a poor school, many of its facilities do not work properly; libraries, laboratories, toilets, warehouses and even classrooms. It was suggested that MSS should standardize all of these facilities, not only the building but also furniture and materials;
- In case of dilapidated school buildings, there should also be standardized procedures on how schools plan a renovation program, and how DEO should handle this proposal. In many cases the deteriorating buildings remain un-renovated for a long time, until they finally collapse. A standard improvement process is seen to be important.
School Security and Teacher Housing

- In one school visited, the team could not find anyone because school time was over and the school was left unattended. This is an important issue because in some cases, school property is stolen due to poor security or lack of a guard. This should be included in the MSS standards;
- Teacher housing. In some rural areas, teacher housing is a crucial issue. This is one reason why it is difficult to place teachers in remote areas. Even if they go, soon they move to back to the cities. In one of the schools visited, the teacher housing was totally derelict and unsuitable to be used by the teacher. When asked, the school guard explained that the housing had long been neglected and teachers preferred to rent in nearby families’ houses.

From the above school FGDs some important points emerged which need to be considered by the MSS team. First, if MSS are aimed at poor schools, then good schools should use a different or higher standard for assessment, for example, using NSE through the accreditation system. Second, another suggestion, that MSS should be flexible enough to be able to be used for all type and all levels of education institution. So far, MSS has not touched improvement processes, for example how should a school propose its needs and, most importantly, how and how quickly should a DEO respond to this proposal.

Garnering Support

The previous two actions were aimed to gather feedback and support from central, local and schools levels. But as suggested by many respondents, the role of community or society in general for education development was also considered truly important. First, education is to serve citizens as part of community or society. Second, local governments are obliged to serve their people by providing a range of public services mandated by the decentralization laws or regulation. And most importantly, local governments are also accountable to their people, not only to the central government. This was why I proposed to the MSS team to introduce the new
MSS standards to Board of Education members, as they are supposed to be partner institutions as represent the community or citizens. Hopefully, they will not only understand the meaning of new MSS standards, but also that they are supposed to even control, drive or oversee the implementation of MSS in the near future after the regulations are enacted. Fortunately I had direct access to some national workshops of Boards of Education (BOE) held in Bogor, West Java Province. Of the four workshops scheduled, I attended three of them as follows.


- **2nd round of BOE Workshop**, Wisma Bahtera Hotel, Cipayung, Bogor, West Java, March 17, 2009. Grand Meeting Room, 13.00 pm, 112 members attended;


From each of the workshop, I took minutes which can be seen as exhibit 24. After analyzing these minutes; the following points relating to the role of BOEs were identified. These also need to be considered by the MSS team.

**BOE Roles**

It is explicitly stated in the regulation concerning BOE number 44/O/1999 that there are four important roles for BOEs; supporting, controlling, mediating and facilitating community participation in education issues. This was why BOE members were so enthusiastic when MSS policy was introduced. The following suggestions were noted during the workshops

- *As education board members for more than 6 years, what have we done so far to help local government improving education sector?* One BOE member from Kalimantan asked in the workshop. *In many ways, indirectly, the development of education in one district is also an indicator of its board’s performance. BOE members should not ask for something but provide something for the development of their local education;*
In rural and remote areas, many bureaucrats and even Board members are still having problems understanding the laws, regulations or decrees regarding education sectors. One board member suggested that key documents should be made available to all education stakeholders.

Since the institution of BOE is relatively new in the Indonesian education system, their roles in developing education have already questioned by stakeholders. Considering this institution is an important part of education decentralization and democratization, their roles should be increased over time, including in developing and implementing MSS in the education sector.

**MSS as a policy instrument**

The following points, related to MSS as a policy instrument, also emerged during the workshop of BOE members:

- Based on government regulation 38/2007 regarding local government authorities, especially on education facilities, it is still unclear who should fulfill school facility needs. It seems that the three tiers of government should participate in fulfilling those needs, and MSS as a policy instrument should explicitly elaborate this;

- There was Ministerial Decree on MSS (129a/U/2004), but its implementation has not been fully evaluated. The MONE should learn something from the implementation of this decree before implementing the new MSS policy. In addition, every local government has also stipulated their own MSS decree, and evaluation is needed accordingly before they implement the new MSS;

- The law 20/2003 on the National Education System requires a number of government regulations to be effectively implemented. Unfortunately, up to this time, one of the Government Regulation Draft on educational management (*Rancangan Peraturan Pemerintah tentang Pengelolaan Pendidikan*) is not yet approved by the central government. This situation inhibits many efforts in revising regulations, especially related to education. The BOE members urged MONE to really expedite the formulation of this draft regulation;
• MONE’s decree is thought as not strong enough by BOE members for stipulating MSS. For example, MONE’s decree on school principal recruitment is not fully obeyed by the local government; it is as if they believe they can change the school principal at any time they want;

• In order for MSS to be really implemented by local government, it should be stipulated by higher decree or regulation. For example by Government Regulation or at least Joint Ministerial Decree between MONE and MOHA, since it is known that many DEOs consider themselves as MOHA’s subordinate rather than MONE’s;

• If a district or municipality could not meet MSS standards, would its education authority be recentralized to province or central level? Would there be any sanction or punishment for any disobedient? One BOE member asked. This is what the team of MSS should work out. There should be clear consequences for schools or DEOs for not fulfilling MSS standards.

Of course, as a policy instrument MSS should involve the three tiers of government. Government Regulation 65/2005 stated that MSS should also be implemented at provincial level. This would become another challenging task for the team as so far they only consider the school and DEO levels. Even further, the team has not really touched on the process aspects especially at the DEO level. Some team members argued that his authority belongs to the MOHA.

MSS Implication

Formulating MSS standards and enacting the required regulations are challenging tasks. But to make it really happen is even more challenging. As BOE members suggested, many implications should be carefully considered:

• Education is the only sector that has its budget framework explicitly mandated in the regulations. It is mentioned that the educational budget should be at least 20 percent of national and local budget. It should be
carefully analyzed how this 20% is expended in relation to DEOs and schools MSS needs, nationally and by province and district;

- It should be established how long would it take for all schools to be elevated beyond the MSS borderline, equivalent to C accreditation standards?

- In the meantime, the Government is launching free basic education. This invited many questions from the board members. Would it be possible to fulfill and met MSS and NSE standards for free? It was suggested that citizens would only pay for students’ personal charges, but educational investment and operational needs are charged to the government authority. But still, fulfilling MSS standards in a short period of time would raise strong implication for national education budgeting;

- Different local governments manage their local authority differently. In Bogor, the sub district education offices (Kantor kecamatan) for some reasons were just abolished. This creates uncertainty in schools and among supervisors within this area. In some districts, school supervisors are managed at the provincial level, but in other areas are managed at the district level. Could MSS address and solve this? Asked one BOE member;

- Many local key personnel ask for school opening approval - many are madrasahs or Islamic schools. Isn’t this the DEO’s responsibility after decentralization? They know best what they need, why should we hinder them by imposing MSS? Can’t the standards be lowered just to accommodate them first and later on be improved? This case is actually about private Islamic schools in rural areas. Although to some degree they are willing to help the government by providing private education, unfortunately, sometimes they ignore the government regulations, viewing education as if it were a family business. MSS should still stand in this case, as MSS are the minimum requirement required for a school to operate adequately;

- It was suggested that in each school unit (especially elementary schools), there should be at least one person as an administrator to help the headmaster and teachers manage the school administration. Imagine if this is adopted in MSS, how many personnel should be recruited nationally, another important implication and financial burden. Probably, it is too expensive for the time being, especially for small schools in rural areas;
Nationally, Indonesia has enough teachers. But the problem in cities, there are more teachers than are needed. On the other hand, rural areas need more teachers but it is difficult to hire teachers. How would MSS address this teacher redeployment? MSS does address this case, but it would bring another budgeting implication. Teacher re-deployment is easy on paper but very difficult in reality. Not only costing consequences, but also individual and social implications would rise. This is another challenging implication in implementing MSS.

The above suggestions should be taken into account, especially by the MONE in order to be able to implement MSS standards smoothly in the near future. (When this report was written, the MSS final draft was still waiting for final approval from the Regional Autonomy Consultative Body (DPOD - Dewan Pertimbangan Otonomi Daerah) before being signed as a MONE decree and then implemented in all districts/cities).

**Education under District Government**

Considering the BEO’s functions and its relation to the DEO, the following suggestions by some of the board members are significant for both central and local governments, not only because it was suggested by BOE members who are relatively objective in viewing educational issues, but because they relate to the decentralization process:

- There is a tendency for local governments to implement their authority in their own way. As a consequence, there are many political and power interventions in the education sector after autonomy and decentralization. Personnel are not always recruited based on their professionalism for example, but sometimes on their political affiliations. Not all DEO heads for example, have a proper educational background. The district head could appoint any person from any background to lead the most important education organization. Could MSS anticipate this, and guarantee that the right person is always in the right place? This was why some of the MSS
team members were considering that MSS should also address DEO input and process aspects, but to other team members this belongs to the MOHA MSS domain not MONE;

- Many board members asked; could MSS be used to standardize the qualification and performance of local government personnel? Some BOE members even wondered whether education personnel and teacher recruitment should be centralized again. Based on their perceptions, within the last several years after decentralization, they stated that the personnel issue is becoming a chaotic problem in many local governments. Could it be specified in MSS? Team members felt that MONE alone would not be able to solve this. Strong commitment and teamwork with MOHA would probably help to solve this.

One of the key personnel from central level reported that there had been some serious talks at central level to revise the Government Regulation 38/3008 on local government authority, because this personnel issue is becoming urgent;

- So far, the local government accountability mechanism is still only a one way process; to the upper level, to their superiors. It was suggested that the accountability should be a reciprocal mechanism, to upper and lower levels. To lower levels means to the citizens or customers as local government’s main stakeholders. In case of DEO or school MSS, community organizations such as BOEs and School Committees should be involved in judging and evaluating DEO and school MSS performance. As constituents who pay local tax for government personnel salaries, citizens have the right to evaluate and judge DEOs’ and schools’ MSS performances.

This theory of accountability is possible and desirable, but in reality it is not easy to implement in Indonesia. It is even more difficult when related to social and cultural background, because bureaucrats are usually perceived as symbols of social power in the Indonesian context. They are to be in their positions to be served by citizens not to serve them. Asking for better services from the local government authority would be thought of as strange by most Indonesians. This is why, even if people know that there is something wrong behind the recruitment of district personnel; they would tend to remain silent.
All of the above suggestions show that basically most education stakeholders are very supportive of the initiation of MSS as part of the policy instruments to improve teaching and learning in the Indonesian decentralization policy. During the consultations, FGDs or workshops a number of significant themes emerged. Team members firmly felt that MSS are much more than just an instrument consisting of standards, and to make them happen in the real lives of education stakeholders is far more complex and demanding. It became apparent that the task of introducing and implementing MSS appear even more daunting.

**Initial Conclusions and Reflections**

In this last phase, the journey had, as its focus, gaining better support for MSS from education stakeholders at central, provincial, district and school levels. Unlike in the first phase which basically aimed to understand the service quality context and the second phase which intended to formulate the first draft of MSS, within this last phase, many important and even controversial themes or issues emerged.

For example, it was suggested that MSS should be stipulated by a stronger regulation than just a MONE Ministerial Decree. This creates a controversy because based on the existing regulation, mainly the Government Regulation 65/2005 on MSS, it is stated that MSS be stipulated by ministerial decree only and all local government should implement MSS in their respective areas. The problem is that many local governments do not really feel that MONE is their superior. They believe since decentralization they must answer to the MOHA. When this report was written, the legal processes for implementation of MSS was still in progress involving many high institutions at the central level.

Another important theme which emerged was the notion that education is now experiencing too much political intervention in professional decision-making at the district level. Respondents also suggested that education personnel are thought to be similar to any other personnel in other sectors, and there are no special qualifications
or requirements to hold important educational positions. The DEO heads, for example, are not always appointed with an education background.

It was also suggested during the consultations that community participation should now be involved in evaluating and judging schools and DEO achievements in fulfilling MSS.

Many other themes such as data collection, monitoring- evaluation and MSS installation in the education organization emerged during this last phase and need to be carefully considered to ensure the success of the MSS implementation process.

Lastly it was becoming a crucial issue as how far the current MSS should apply to the education authorities handed down to DEO level. Using a simplified diagram below, it can be seen that the newly proposed MSS still focus more on the output of a DEO as an organization, and make no reference to a DEO’s input and process. However, service was seen to be important and many service providers are willing to make improvements.

Figure 4-20:
Limitation of Proposed MSS standards

(Prepared by researcher)
Since the process aspect of DEO is not addressed, it was questioned for example, how long will it take for a school to get its rehabilitation proposal approved and finally the school fully rehabilitated?

Based on MSS regulations (especially government regulation 65/2005), it is required that MSS should comprise input, process, output and impacts on the service chain. In addition MSS should also cover all types of education service, both formal and non-formal education. And all levels of formal education should be covered, not only primary and junior secondary education. It seems that the team either misunderstood or experienced time constraints, so that not all aspects and all levels of education were covered by the proposed MSS standards.

The input and process at school level were addressed, but not the DEO level. It was proposed that MSS should cover both school and DEOs level. Probably, in the next version of MSS standards, these issues will be better addressed, since the current MSS team time frame is too tight and regardless of the continuing debate, a version of MSS should be soon be introduced to answer many stakeholders’ questions in this decentralized era.

So far, this journey has passed three main phases as it was planned in chapter 2. Many places have been visited and many people have been met to understand the essences of service quality in this decentralized era. From the first phase, the relationship between decentralization and service quality was identified, people’s perceptions concerning factors influencing service quality were gathered and analyzed using questionnaires, and finally observation during the field visits also strengthened all the finding from previous activities. Through this phase, common components of organization such as human capital, facilities, funding, organization or management and community or external influences were found to be the most influential factors determining the DEO service quality.

Based on those findings, initially capacity building at the DEO level was identified as the most effective solution to boost DEO service quality. But later on, based on further analysis of respondent’s responses and suggestions during FGDs, workshops and consultation, finally, formulating appropriate MSS standards was thought as the
most strategic action in improving DEO service quality, as also mandated by the
decentralization laws and regulations. This is why, finally, in the second phase the
journey was focused on formulating and testing the MSS standards. In the last phase,
the MSS draft was presented to policy makers, education stakeholders at provincial
and local levels, including DEO personnel and Board of Education members, for
consultation and to garner support, especially for the implementation process.

As an administrator in central MONE, I kept in touch with my colleagues in the MSS
team, but as a researcher I temporarily had to detach myself and step back from the
team activities to be able to reflect on and analyze the whole process during this
Research by Project. So far, I have followed the formulation of MSS standards as an
important part of this research. I acknowledge that this workplace research has
produced much more data than was originally intended. It was decided to include
significant data because this is, in all possibility, the only place where this data has
been captured and recorded. As a consequence, this exegesis has became a highly
significant documentation in that it recorded critical aspects of the development of
MSS for DEOs and schools which have real implications for the success of
decentralization in Indonesia.

The process of MSS finalization is continuing especially to formulate its funding and
its legal framework. But, as suggested by my supervisors, I had to stop following the
MSS development process to finish this dissertation. Obviously it is still possible for
me to get involved in the MSS development process because I am still in charge of
the data collecting unit in the Directorate General of Primary and Secondary
Education. Collecting data based on new MSS indicators will become a new exciting
task I presume. In addition, since the current MSS team is supported by the donors,
probably it will soon be dismissed. Most likely, the next team will have
representatives from various MONE units to continue the task unfinished by the
current team and to improve MSS standards, until all schools finally achieve at least
level C accreditation.
Chapter 5
UNCOVERING THE ESSENCES
OF THE JOURNEY

Before ending this journey I reflected on whether I had reached my intended destination outlined in chapter 1. I also reflected on whether I had enough evidence to answer the research questions raised at the beginning of this journey of knowing. In the following sections, whether or not the research aims were reached will be discussed. In addition, the significant evidence found and how research questions were answered will also be reviewed. Finally, reflections and recommendations for the future will be explored.

Did I Reach My Intended Destination?

In the early stage of this project, I was concerned by the fact that education service quality remained relatively unchanged after decentralization. I wanted to explore the possibility of improving DEOs educational services to the schools. This was stated as the intended aim or destination for my research project. However, somewhere in the middle of this journey I found that DEO service quality is influenced by many, complex and conflicting factors. I realized that to deal with all of those factors would be too complex and ambitious at that time, therefore it was important to define a more focused destination. On many occasions while collecting data during this journey, many respondents or participants suggested that I focus more on developing service standards as a strategic and reasonable destination of this research. In other words, I needed to refine or narrow my research aim, from improving DEO service quality in general to more specific destination; developing SPM or Standar Pelayanan Minimal (MSS/Minimum Service Standards) as a more strategic way to improve DEO service quality. The following section discusses in general activities and effort taken to reach this more narrowly defined destination.
Tracking Back Valuable Evidence

Along this journey of knowing, documents were analyzed, people met and places visited to search for convincing evidence to answer the research questions and to reach constructive conclusions. How good is the current DEO service quality? What are its influencing factors? What changes or improvements are needed? In the following discussions emerging evidence for answering those questions will be traced back to build concluding points for this research.

Back to the first phase of this journey: it is clear that both literature and research findings suggest that the decentralization process affected the practice of public service delivery at the local level, including the services to individual schools by the DEOs. Unfortunately, Indonesian education decentralization was not primarily designed to promote better public service delivery. It was more the result of abrupt changes in political and governance style after the centralized era failed to anticipate the financial crisis. This is considered to be one reason why the service quality of DEOs was relatively unchanged after decentralization. This aim therefore; to improve DEO service quality became the prime driving force for me in this research journey. In order to judge whether I have reached this intended destination several research questions need to be answered; What is the current status of service quality?, What are its influencing factors and what further efforts are needed?

Literature or document analysis as done in this first phase (detailed in chapter 3) strongly suggest that the Indonesian public service quality was still far from satisfactory after decentralization. In addition, open ended questionnaires (detailed in chapter 4) showed that many DEO stakeholders also perceived that the current service quality is not yet satisfactory. About 41 percent of them suggested that the quality remains the same, while about 25 percent suggested the service was even worse. Lastly, the observation of some selected districts, supported by their education statistics, confirmed that DEO service quality is not as good as expected as a result of decentralization policy. Many deteriorated school buildings, unqualified teachers and slow responses to school proposals were just a few factors to mention.
What factors contribute to the low performance of DEO service quality? Factors such as; the unclear division of authority among its tiers, unclear conceptions of service and its implementation, and also low local government capacities were revealed, among many other factors, in the document analysis. This is also supported by respondents’ perceptions in the survey that human capital, organization and management, facilities, funding and community are among the most influential factors for improving DEO service quality. In addition, this was also suggested by many DEO stakeholders during interviews and discussions during the visits to selected districts. Interestingly, most respondents prioritize that organization or management (31 percent) is a more important factor than human capital (29 percent). Probably this is an indication that there was turbulence, confusion or uncertainty in educational management after decentralization was implemented. It is too difficult for a DEO to exercise its new, delegated authority after decentralization without proper preparation. Many respondents explained during interviews and discussion that the same personnel with the same mindset and values (centralized views) were requested to implement the new responsibilities.

After current service quality and its influencing factors were defined, the next question was how to improve DEO service quality. In the document analysis many Indonesian and international reports directly or indirectly suggest various efforts for improving DEO service quality (detailed in chapter 3). Interestingly, these efforts are in many ways are similar to the factors influencing service quality. This indicates that whenever influencing factors are identified, efforts needed to improve them can be correspondingly designed. Considering the governance capacity among government levels for instance, one donor institution for example perceives that capacity building should be implemented at the individual, institutional and system levels. Meanwhile, DEO stakeholders perceive that the efforts should be related to influencing factors: human resources, management/organization, geography/community, facilities and finance (detailed in chapter 4). In this case, they also perceived that the organizational or management factor is more important (stated by 26 percent of responses) than human resources (only stated by 24 percent responses). This is comparable with the influencing factors discussed previously.
Among the suggested actions identified during this research, there is an important suggestion constantly supported both by the literature and respondents in their questionnaire responses, interviews and discussions. This is that the central government should start developing national minimum public service standards that local government can use as benchmarks. This strongly influenced me to develop relevant MSS for DEOs. As mentioned above, dealing with all service quality influencing factors above is far too complex for a single study. This is why I finally changed the aim of this journey to ‘developing MSS standards’ instead of directly aiming to ‘improving DEO service quality’ as the final destination. By developing, implementing and regularly monitoring DEOs’ MSS, gradually the DEO performances would improve and, in turn, their school and its schooling quality will improve. By that time, the original intended destination of this research journey will be reached; improved DEO service quality.

In phase two, after considering the strategic role of MSS in improving DEO service quality, the journey was focused on how to build a better educational MSS. Based on the document analysis; there are many ways to group factors influencing service quality. But based on respondents’ responses and the Indonesian laws and regulation related to decentralization and service delivery, the factors can be grouped into input (human, finance and facilities), process (organization and management), output (services delivery), outcome (schools and schooling quality) and external (geography and community) factors.

Unfortunately, during discussions within the MSS team, I found that many of the MSS team members viewed MSS from a different angle; from the view-point of educational standards. These standards comprised eight elements (teaching-learning process, teaching-learning content, education personnel, principals, supervisors, education facilities, school management and evaluation) applied at the school level. As a consequence, to solve the conflicting situation, DEO MSS were finally built based on two views; decentralization and education standards. These MSS were then called Education MSS instead of DEO MSS. Different indicators were then set for DEOs and schools. The development of this MSS from its early stage until this report was written can be seen in the attached portfolio as products or exhibit 19 and 25.
In the third phase, the final phase of this journey, support was sought from a broader range of DEO stakeholders. This was done primarily by consulting about the MSS draft to not only high level personnel in MONE, MORA and MOHA, but also to important personnel in local government either from province, district or school level. During this support garnering, many important themes emerged, suggesting that MSS should be seen in the broader context of decentralization and educational governance in Indonesia. Themes such as the relationship between MSS and National Education Standards, MSS as a government regulation, MSS as part of a planning and monitoring/evaluation or accountability mechanism, MSS indicator along with its data collecting procedures and community participation in assessing MSS, are among those emerging themes.

Although the final draft of MSS for the education sector has now been formulated, a more challenging situation lies ahead. The decentralization process delegated most education authority to the district level. Accordingly the MSS should cover those entire authorities, not only basic education (elementary and junior secondary education). This decision to formulate MSS only for elementary and junior secondary education was agreed by the MSS team because the main focus of education development in Indonesia nowadays is on improving basic education throughout the country. Later on, whenever possible, the MSS standards would gradually be set higher and for higher levels of schooling. If education MSS are set for all education levels under the DEOs, education financing would be too expensive and become un-affordable for the average DEO.

As mandated by laws and regulation, MSS should also comprise input, process, output and outcome for both DEOs and schools. At the time this report was written the final drafts had not been approved by the DPOD (National Consultative Body of Regional Autonomy). The fact that MSS are focused on basic education and do not fully comply with a systems approach would probably become a hindrance for its approval. However, its legal aspects and its technical guidelines were still being formulated.

Based on the evidence found during this research journey it can be concluded that DEO service quality has been strongly influenced by the decentralization process. First, DEOs were re-structured, then their personnel were moved around and most
importantly, greater authority was delegated to the hands of DEO personnel. Unfortunately, capacity building and dissemination of information about decentralization steps were not prepared in advance. The abrupt implementation of decentralization most probably caused this situation. It is not surprising therefore, that DEO service quality did not immediately improve as promised by the decentralization policy. Apart from continuous DEO capacity building as suggested by this research finding, MSS are chosen and formulated as the most strategic and affordable way for improving DEO service quality in the near future.

After redefining the original destination to developing MSS standards, I realized that due to the time limits on this study (from 2004 to 2009); I could not follow the whole process of MSS development. I had to end this research journey and defend it. This research so far, has only formulated the most important part of MSS; MSS indicators. Meanwhile, the MSS development process is continuing: legislation, dissemination, implementation and monitoring or evaluation processes. In order for the MONE to be able to assure and measure DEO service quality better and better, MSS should be continually assessed and improved.

What are valuable things that can be learnt from this exhaustive research journey then? The following section explores those learned lessons.

**Learning while Travelling**

During this research journey, I had two challenging roles; as a researcher and as an administrator or practitioner. According to RMIT’s Research by Project, a researcher should become a more informed and skilful practitioner. To some degree I believe that the previous discussions on found evidence proves that I am now a more informed and skilled practitioner, especially when dealing with decentralization and educational service delivery. It is also required that this research could contribute to scholarly or professional knowledge. In addition, this research by project should also promote changes in the workplace context as discussed in the following sections.
Understanding Decentralization

Frankly speaking, I did not know much about decentralization before taking this research journey. As any other ordinary administrator does, on many occasions I heard or read about decentralization but what it really meant was of little concern to me. Only after I was impressed by the fact that many school personnel and DEO staff experienced difficulties in exercising their daily activities did I finally question; what does decentralization actually mean? Why are there difficulties in its implementation? What should be done?

Decentralization became a popular terminology in Indonesian governance after an economic crisis struck the country in 1997. Many assumed that by implementing decentralization the crisis would resolve and public services smoothly improve. As an administrator working in the central MONE, I also initially thought that after decentralization, education service quality would automatically improve. Unfortunately, years after the enactment of decentralization laws and regulations, many school personnel and DEO staff from various districts started complaining that education services had not improved and, in some cases, were even worse.

One school employee from West Nusa Tenggara, for example, reported that the amount of the school operational fund had not only decreased but also could not be disbursed on time. The media reported a teachers’ strike demanding their late salary in some districts and, in addition, many DEO personnel claimed that the number of deteriorating school building were still relatively high in many parts of the country. Decentralization in fact could not guarantee automatically improved education service quality.

The above notion suggests how important it is for all education managers to really understand the relationship of decentralization with public service delivery. In this case the researcher’s role is very important. The following quotation supports this contention.
Two of the more significant shifts in the 21st century have been the increased attention to the delivery of public services on the one hand, and greater decentralization of responsibility for these services on the other. …the relationship between these two phenomena is complex and far from being fully understood. Yet countries are taking decisions that affect the welfare of millions of people, many of them poor. The challenge to researchers is to provide the knowledge base so that these decisions will improve the welfare of these poor people (Ahmad, 2005).

This study should be part of important contributions in understanding the complexity of the relationship between decentralization and education service delivery processes. Unfortunately, the findings of this research reveal that, after experiencing centralized governance for decades, many district authorities in Indonesia perceived decentralization to be a way of gaining more power instead of providing better public services.

This is exactly what Achmad (2005) actually means that the relationship between public services and decentralization is far from being fully understood and researchers are challenged to provide a knowledge base so that the decentralization policy is not only well conceptualized but also well implemented for the benefit of all citizens. This is the reason why I finally embarked on this research, trying to contribute to an understanding of the relationship between decentralization and service delivery.

Decentralization has been implemented in many organizations. In the private sector, this reform is adopted to make local services more flexible to the need of customers and in the end improve profitability. In public organizations like government offices, the same principles can be applied; to make the local services more responsive to local needs, and in the end improve accountability to citizens. Decentralization as a concept appears very simple and enticing. However the key challenge with decentralization is not in the concept but in effective implementation.

The ultimate aim of decentralization in Indonesia is to improve participation and service quality in local government, especially at the district level. In a decentralized system this means that District Education Offices (DEO) ought to be more responsive in serving school needs. But in reality, deteriorating school facilities still exist in most districts throughout the country, and most importantly many
respondents in chapter 4 (mostly education personnel at district and school levels) remain confused about the meaning of decentralization and service quality.

Indonesian decentralization was forced to be implemented by strong internal and external forces and proper design and preparation were disregarded. It was a rapid decentralization with enormous challenges. For most people at the district level, education decentralization seems to be a complex, contradictory, and confusing concept because three big ministries MONE, MOHA and MORA are involved. It is still too early to expect Indonesian decentralization to provide better public service delivery. There are more challenges to solve, more work to do and more time is needed. Although in its design the decentralization policy appears positive, its implementation is challenging and complicated at the local level.

If the Indonesian government, especially MONE is to implement education decentralization effectively, the best practices implemented by foreign countries (see portfolio, exhibit 34) should be carefully considered and then implemented.

**Understanding Service Quality in the Indonesian context**

Based on literature reviews discussed in chapter 3 and suggestions found in this research as detailed in chapter 4, service quality could be understood as the ability of an organization to fulfill its obligatory functions in satisfying customer needs. In this case, DEO service quality is meant as how good are DEOs in delivering their obligatory functions and fulfilling school needs. Unfortunately based on this research, problems related to DEO service quality remain and need to be resolved.

As a means to ameliorate deteriorating service quality, the Indonesian government initiated a concept called *Standar Pelayanan Minimal (SPM)* or Minimum Service Standard (MSS). The idea was to assure that all DEO really exercise their new authority effectively. Instead of becoming better after decentralization was implemented, unfortunately many respondents reported that DEO service quality is as bad as in the centralized era. Some respondents perceive that DEO service quality is even worse nowadays as revealed in chapter 4. No doubt, the Indonesian government has strong reasons to implement MSS.
Supposedly, DEO service quality is assured using National Education Ministerial Decree 129a/2004 on Educational Minimum Service Standard. Each local or district government should then enact their own decree to assure its DEO service quality accordingly. Unfortunately, for many reasons, the MSS as a decentralization instrument in assuring improved DEO service quality is not very effective. To some degree, some respondents explained that its indicator is too output and outcome oriented, disregarding DEO’s input (capacity) and process (activity). On the other hand, there is no clear understanding about the concept. There is no monitoring and evaluation mechanism because MSS are not explicitly stated in any regulation as part of accountability mechanism, there are no rewards or punishments for obeying or disobeying MSS standards, no clear mechanism to measure DEO service quality, no data collection or information system supporting MSS. And most importantly, there is no guidance at all as to what DEO resources and managerial skill level are required, to implement these service standards.

Before a DEO can really implement its new obligatory functions properly, focused capacity building is a necessity, but as mentioned before, it was not meant as the focus of this research. Mainly because improving the current DEO service standard is considered more strategic and knowing the degree of DEO service quality is the basis of any capacity building effort. Moreover, to many observers, revising the latest ministerial decree regarding MSS is necessary to catch up the newest laws and regulations regarding decentralization, district government mandates, and most importantly new government regulations about MSS itself. Without adequate legislative support, information and capacity, even the most well-intentioned DEO administrators are unable to improve their service and contribute to improving access to quality basic education.

MSS therefore, should be seen as a foundation for the betterment of public service delivery because of their multiple roles, not only for assessing local government service performance, but also as a benchmark or monitoring system, basis for planning and most importantly as an accountability mechanism. MSS implementation in DEOs or other district offices is necessary for successful decentralization.
Although this research is conducted within the education context, the above understanding of decentralization and service delivery can be broadly applied to different sectors such as health and or other public services decentralized to local government. As mandated by decentralization laws and regulations, all sectors should implement MSS in the near future, otherwise there is no way of measuring performance and worse, citizen’s rights and needs are again neglected. What is decentralization aiming for if not for improving government services to satisfy citizens’ needs?

Just like private service quality that strongly focuses on customer satisfaction, public services in government institutions should gradually shift their accountability orientation, not only to their superiors but importantly to their main customers: citizens. District Offices service quality should be targeted to improve citizens’ satisfaction.

Research by project also requires that demonstrable changes or improvements should emerge from the research process. These research outcomes are discussed as follows.

**Tracking Changes**

Although the whole activities within each phase of this research have been completed, this does not necessarily mean that all DEO service quality has improved. In fact, this research has only contributed to the development of a MSS instrument as part of the Indonesian education quality improvement policies suggested by the research participants and literature review. Even the MSS instrument itself was still in the process of central government approval when this report was written. The inevitable changes were mostly related to the process of developing MSS indicators during this research. Soon after the proposed MSS as a policy instrument is approved, enacted and imposed by law to the whole districts throughout Indonesia in 2010, gradually DEOs service quality will improve and so generally will education services. That will be the time when the real changes will happen.
Based on the literature review, there are a number of ways to see how changes happened, for example changes in ideas, skills or attitudes (Bunning, 1991). Changes can also be seen from an individual, institutional or system context (ADB-JBIC-WB, 2004). Based on respondents’ perceptions, these changes can even be seen as the five ‘Ms’; factors influencing service quality (Man as personnel or human resources, Money as financial, Management as organization, Material as facilities and Milieu as external influences). This research has identified that there are problems related to these factors, and changes are needed. MSS was formulated based on those factors and intended to function as a strategic tool to change practice by improving service quality in the education sector especially at the DEO level. Instead of directly changing all these factors in its current condition to becoming its ideal positions, this research focused more on transforming the previous MSS into revised MSS; a strategic way to gradually improve service quality. In other words; this research has been successful in contributing to the development of MSS. Consequently, in the following section, only the changes which occurred during the process of developing MSS are discussed: ideas, skills and attitudes.

Research participants from selected schools, districts, provinces and the central level and the whole MSS team were just like people within the same vehicle during this project journey. We were in the same bus, heading in the same direction; aiming to improve DEO service quality. We experienced the same learning process related to decentralization, public service and MSS. Participants’ ideas were varied at first when embarking on the journey. That was why synthesizing people’s conceptions was really challenging. Fortunately, on many occasions, agreement was reached and conclusions made after ideas and interaction during the trip. Unavoidably, differences occurred during the research journey, but most of us agreed upon factors influencing service quality and most importantly, agreed on the importance of using MSS as a strategic way for improving DEO service quality. This is a sign I believe, that there was a change in most participants’ ideas concerning decentralization and service quality. How I and most of research participants finally arrived at this understanding is detailed in phase one of chapter 4.

Based on the above understanding, as a researcher and administrator I sought a solution. Working to gather with the other MSS team members we finally decided to
propose a new MSS instrument as a revision to the MONE’s ministerial decree 129a/U/2004 on MSS. Revising this regulation at first sounds easy, but the whole process during the second phase of this research as described in chapter 4 was a challenging process. The tracks of this process can be seen from exhibits 3, 19 and 25 which can be found in the Portfolio. This is the phase when I as a researcher together with the MSS team and DEO stakeholders collaboratively constructed MSS indicators through a range of activities. This is an indication that to some degree, especially in constructing MSS indicators, some broad-based skills were achieved.

Following the newly-devised indicators, another process was achieved; bringing the proposed MSS to higher and broader stakeholders at the central level. This was when the team consulted and met high ranking personnel to get the MSS draft approved before it was stipulated as a policy instrument by a MONE ministerial decree. By the end of 2009, the proposed MSS were approved by the DPOD. Soon the MONE’s ministerial decree concerning MSS would be proposed by the team. This was another improvement in the skills achieved when finally MSS guidelines were proposed. This process is described in detail in the third phase of chapter 4.

Borrowing Bunning’s approach, new ideas and skill changes were achieved. The last change suggested by Bunning is attitude. Since the MSS instrument is not stipulated yet, it is not easy to monitor whether or not there are changes here. But during the interaction with research participants there were many indications showing that they are enthusiastic and willing to implement the MSS standards. Unlike private institutions, schools and DEOs have to wait until the forthcoming regulations on MSS are enacted to implement them in their institution. Nevertheless, I believe that there is also an attitude change among DEO stakeholders towards an understanding of the importance of applying MSS for assessing, assuring and improving education service quality.

The above small system-wide changes show that policy formulation and its implementation on a state wide scale are complicated and time consuming. Even though many DEOs are willing to implement the MSS instrument, as a government institution they have to wait until the MSS regulations are enacted, sometime in 2010. It means that I would not be able to observe the whole process of MSS phases
or cycles for my dissertation purposes because at this point I can only participate in its formulation, but not its implementation at DEO level. This suggests that another study of MSS implementation is necessary to determine their effectiveness in the field. Some selected districts need to be observed and studied quantitatively and qualitatively to see MSS’s effectiveness and implications in different DEOs with various characteristics.

Certainly, after MSS are enacted, DEOs should review and ratify their regulations to implement the new MSS regulations. By assessing their education services using MSS standards regularly and supported by appropriate resources and capacity building, gradually DEO service quality would improve and the quality of Indonesian education would improve. That would be the expected change of this research project. From the ADB point of view, I believe that there has also been some degree of improvement at the individual, institutional or system level as a result of this research process especially to those individuals or institutions involved during this research journey. As a result of this research, the following recommendations are offered and need to be carefully considered.

**Proposing Future Trips**

Based on the data gathered during this research journey, it is not too surprising if anyone states that the first MSS implementation is far from satisfactory and has failed to improve DEO service quality and education quality after decentralization. Considering this situation, the Indonesian government should implement a new approach in formulating and implementing DEO service standards or MSS. As mandated in Government Regulation 65/2005 on Minimum Service Standards (MSS) each ministry or department should propose a revised MSS concept through the Ministry of Home Affairs to be considered by a team called the MSS National Consultative Team. Later on the concept will be approved by *Dewan Pertimbangan Otonomi Daerah* or Local Autonomy Consultative Body.

Although the roadmap for improving MSS is set by now, but more short trips need to be undertaken. In order for the MONE to be able to formulate and implement a better
version of DEO MSS in the near future, several recommendations below need to be carefully considered:

1. The MSS team should finalize the Education MSS draft proposed by this research so that it becomes a complete document which includes technical guidelines (including its assessment instrument/questionnaires), costing analysis, and legal document (MONE Ministerial Decree);

2. The MSS team together with relevant units (MONE’s Bureau of Laws and Organization) should send the completed Education MSS document to the MSS National Consultative Team for approval. Later on the concept will be sent and approved by Dewan Pertimbangan Otonomi Daerah or Local Autonomy Consultative Body for approval;

3. After the above approvals, the MSS documents should then be processed within MONE becoming a new Ministerial Decree on MSS for the education sector, revising the old Ministerial Decree 129a/2004 on Educational MSS;

4. Based on this new Ministerial Decree, distribution and dissemination processes should be planned and implemented throughout the entire education system from the central level of MONE down to province, district and school levels. The process can be done in chains, MONE disseminate to provincial level, province to district level and finally DEOs to school level.

During this dissemination process, anything related to the MSS should be clearly elaborated. For example, the significant reasons, concepts, relationship to other policies or regulations should be clearly stated. In addition how MSS is positioned within the National Standard for Education (NSE), Educational planning, accountability mechanism, data collecting procedures and community participation also need to be addressed;

Because the implementation of new practices in DEO service quality is rarely self-executing and it requires preconditions (such as improving DEO management capacity, access to relevant regulations and necessary guidelines), it is important that strategies for implementing improvement should involve key players/actors and arenas, and should be generated from the bottom up (from the perspective of consumers of new practices of DEO service quality) and be managed or guided from the top down.
5. Soon after receiving the new regulations on Education MSS, districts and municipalities should enact their own Education MSS regulations explicitly based on the new MONE ministerial decree;

6. After all districts and municipalities enact their own MSS regulations, continuous monitoring and evaluation should be implemented to assure that each DEO and Municipality really implements the new MSS regulation. This should be done by supervisors assessing schools and Provincial officers assessing DEOs. The implications of schools and DEOs for not implementing MSS regulations should then be defined;

7. The three tiers of education should then review how well each school, DEOs and provinces improve in terms of MSS implementation. The result can then be used as a basis for future policy implementation and, if necessary, incentives or sanctions given.

In the long run, after the first implementation period of MSS is evaluated, its weaknesses should be identified and, if necessary, its instrument and/or regulations be revised accordingly and regularly. Below are recommendations for the long term improvement of MSS;

1. As suggested by this research, the newly proposed MSS indicators only focus on elementary and junior secondary education. Meanwhile, as mandated by decentralization laws and regulations the DEOs’ new authority covers the whole education system except for higher education. In the next MSS revision, the MSS team and MONE should ensure that MMS indicators cover all education aspects except higher education;

2. As also suggested by this research, MSS indicators should include a system-wide approach covering all components including inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and an evaluation process for DEOs and at the school level. As is known from this research, the current MSS indicators do not cover the input and process aspects within DEOs. Consequently, it is difficult for education stakeholders to ask for better DEO services if its inputs and processes are not governed by any minimum standards. DEO input might consist of human resources, financial resources, material/facilities resources and consideration of client demands, while its process could consists of management,
leadership, technical skills, service quality and governance indicators. This is why in the long run the MSS team work in MONE should make sure those indicators of input and process in DEOs are included in the new MSS regulations;

3. Ideally, the MSS team and the MONE must ensure that the formulation and implementation of DEO MSS involves all education stakeholders at all governance levels, to build up strong commitment, ownership, involvement, partnership, cooperation and coordination among them. This involvement could even be broadened to MOHA, MORA and other relevant ministries at the national level; Provincial Education Offices, District Education Offices, Sub District Education Offices (if any, depending on its district), District Boards of Education, School Committees, or any interest group in education such as community organizations and, most importantly, school personnel as the main customers of DEO service provision. It is important to promote a learning culture in improving organization service quality through the continuous MSS developments.

It should also be considered that in this decentralized system the principles of participation, transparency and accountability should never be neglected by any government institution, and the process of MSS implementation is no exception. Even further, the MSS implementation should be viewed as how DEOs (as learning organizations) learn to understand the principles of decentralization and to provide better public services;

4. Too important to neglect to mention is that the MONE, together with the MOHA, through their provincial units should ensure that adequate resources and managerial skills in each DEO should be provided through focused capacity building prior to the implementation of reviewed and revised MSS;

5. Based on the old MSS implementation experiences, the possibility of implementing new MSS using stronger laws or regulations with serious consequences should be considered both by MONE and MORA. These regulations should explicitly state that MSS is part of the accountability mechanism which regularly monitors and evaluates with reward and punishment. Any DEO that fails to follow the required indicators should be placed on probation and special action (either sanctions or personnel replacements) should be taken to improve its weaknesses. In order for MONE
and MOHA to do that, a MSS Information System should be developed and made available to generate (at least) annual reports, along with MSS indicators to judge the degree of DEO service quality.

If all parties mentioned above can really take and implement the above recommendations, in the short run, MSS can be successfully implemented. Should any weaknesses or relevant suggestions emerge afterwards, MSS should be revised and the next version should be formulated and evaluated continuously leading to better and better service standards. Gradually, in turn, DEO service quality will improve and so finally will education quality.

Although there are more things that need to be resolved as a consequence of this research, but being able to conduct this research this far has been such an extraordinary experience for me. Many hindrances have I passed during this journey. The following is my reflection on research by project as part of this conclusion.
Reflecting on the Research Journey

Throughout this research, I was imagining that someday all DEOs in Indonesia would be able to fulfill their obligatory functions in satisfying school needs. In order to achieve that, clear MSS standards proposed by this research should be implemented, on all aspects of organization process and capacity. This was my main motive and intention for conducting this research.

The principles and steps undertaken to gather information related to decentralization and service standards for this exegesis are organized on the basis of RMIT’s Research by Project approach which is informed by the practitioner research approach. Practitioner research is an umbrella term for a research methodology that covers all forms of research carried out by practitioners, including action research or action learning (see the literature review in chapter 2). My perceptions on the implementation of research by project are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Unlike traditional research that tends to contribute to the individual researcher’s knowledge and (too often) ends up on the bookshelf; this research approach involves greater participation in the researcher’s work place. Consequently, the resulting knowledge belongs to the organization, at least to personnel involved directly or indirectly in the research process, and not just the individual researcher. Perhaps, in this case, initially a smaller scale workplace is a more appropriate focus due to time limitations, the nature of the research and student limitations. But in the real organization, the wider the member participation involved the better the result that can be gained.

The MONE services 33 provinces, over 470 districts/municipalities and more than 310,000 schools; it is truly a big organization. Developing MSS standards while promoting the learning process to facilitate service quality improvement in such an organization was an extremely challenging process. Brainstorming and discussing service changes with all personnel in a single place at the same time would be impossible. If this research were a journey, there would be too many passengers from the entire organization to embark on one research vessel or vehicle at once. This is
why only selected personnel from certain units, either from national, provincial, district or school level were involved representing the whole DEO stakeholder population. Consequently, only those involved personnel experienced the learning process facilitated by the research, and only those people can feel and understand the changes associated with developing and implementing DEO MSS.

To some extent, action research can be used to facilitate the social or organization learning process. In a wider context this learning process could invite experts from universities to view the existing problems from theoretical perspectives. But in reality this is not easy because usually the workplace is represented only by the research student, and the university is represented only by supervisors and selected literature. However, the university involvement is important because in many cases people in the workplace are blind folded or wearing blinkers in viewing reality or a problem and consequently they hardly ever see a better possibility. From theoretical perspectives, anything might be possible, but in the real workplace only realistic options can be chosen and finally only the feasible solution is selected and carried out.

Although at the beginning I started this research as an individual, from the point of interpersonal involvement, action research can be seen from different points; first, second and third person action research as suggested by Reason (2001). In my case, I have tried to invite research participants’ involvement in viewing decentralization and its impact on public service delivery. Based on their perceptions, a solution is formulated leading to the development of MSS indicators in the education sector and finally support was sought for its implementation. Indirectly, I have utilized the three levels of the learning scale; First person inquiry, involving only the individual learner; second person, with others in a group or team work; and third person on a larger scale such as a government or nation-wide scale. At first I tried and managed to understand the issues associated with decentralization and service delivery, then met MSS team members to seek solutions and finally asked the MONE as part of government institutions to impose the MSS as mandatory for all DEOs throughout Indonesia. In finalizing this dissertation as a result of research journey, one significant thing could not be forgotten; the supportive role of supervisors who
attempted to represent the MONE academic understanding of the research by project approach.

Although doing research by project has some advantages, I think completing a doctoral degree using this research approach is actually conflicting in many ways. The first conflict emerged during fields visit; whether I should act as a researcher or a manager. In many cases I mixed these up, especially in a familiar situation where many respondents knew me well. The second conflicting situation was about time management, working full time in a busy situation while doing research with a lot of discussion, reading, and writing is truly demanding. As a consequence, as I mentioned before, sometimes fun and family are sacrificed. In a certain situation, more work with less sleep is necessary, especially when workload increases and assignments are due; consequently health is sometimes at risk. The third challenge is language. Although most of students learned and passed English requirements, but in practice sometimes I misunderstood. For example, based on our language, the word socialization is a perfect translation for dissemination. But when I used it, my supervisors became confused, explaining that this was not an appropriate translation into English.

Another conflicting situation is whether this research is meant for the sake of academic study or for resolving a real problem. In my case, although some steps to resolve the real problem are still needed, unfortunately I had to end the research due to time limitations. Consequently I was not able to follow the whole MSS development process to its implementation and monitoring process is done. This was when I finally realized that time is always limited for research and writing an exegesis. The most important thing is that the whole cycle or phases of the research were identified and most of its fundamental steps or phases were completed so that the learning process of an organization happened. The rest of the steps would then become predictable and future research actions and implementation can be taken when needed. (The research and writing might have stopped, but my work – better informed work – continues.)

To conclude this dissertation, I feel like I have arrived at a point closer to my intended destination. During the last five years I have gone through three action
research journeys and have been done much reading, discussing and observing to seek a solution for improving DEO service quality. At the end I realized this research by project have brought me to the development of MSS, a strategic basis for improving DEO service quality. This research project approach has inspired me to develop a learning culture in DEOs by continuously assessing their service performance by periodically implementing improved MSS. If these research principles are implemented constantly in any DEO, many DEO personnel could learn from nearby universities either as an individual or as part of their learning organization. In the end, hopefully, organizational development can be achieved gradually. If to know or to learn is to change, this research approach can become an effective tool to promote changes in any organization if implemented properly. This research approach is like a vehicle to transfer an organization or a community from its current condition to a better place where they need and deserve to be.

This research has also left some tiny, but I hope significant, learning tracks, and all these tracks or products of this research journey can be seen in the separate document as part of this exegesis. These products are displayed as exhibits representing the process and output as artifacts that resulted from this research journey.
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Appendices:

Appendix 1: Formal Letters from RMIT

Wednesday, 1 September 2004

Mr Agus Haryanto
JL Garuda A-5 Pondok Kelapadua
Depok
JA BAR 16951
Indonesia

Dear Agus

Re: Application for Offer of Enrolment

I write to inform you that your application for offer of enrolment in the Doctor of Philosophy program in the School of Education has been successful.

I am pleased to advise that you are being offered an ‘Offshore’ Part Time, Full Fee paying place. The cost of this place is $6,000.00 per annum (tuition) plus a negotiated delivery fee.

The offer is conditional on

- Acceptance of the offer by contacting the Higher Degrees Officer, Ms Heather Porter on 9925 7877 or heather.porter@rmit.edu.au by return email.
- Completing the enrolment form.

To accept this offer please

- Print of the attached document, complete in full and sign.
- Fax these pages to School of Education Research Office on + 61 3 9925 7184, to arrive no later than 12 noon (Melbourne Time) on Friday 3 September 2004

If there is any difficulty accessing these documents please email me and I will fax them to a nominated fax number.

The time allowed for students to complete their research degrees is set out in the guidelines for Higher Degree students, which can be found at http://mams.rmit.edu.au/8pizhtr9gw9o.pdf

Details of your enrolment are as attached. Please check the details carefully.

For further information please consult the Research Office website and familiarize yourself with the University and School regulations and processes.
http://www.rmit.edu.au/elcs/research

If you are have any questions please do not hesitate to call the Research Office.
We welcome you to the School of Education and hope that your time with us is both enjoyable and successful.

**PROGRAM DETAILS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Title:</th>
<th>Doctor of Philosophy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Code</td>
<td>DR 016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode:</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load:</td>
<td>Part Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Principle Supervisor</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected date for Program Approval</td>
<td>August 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Date of Thesis Submission</td>
<td>August 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enrolment**
Enclosed enrolment form to be completed in full and returned to the Research Office. Upon receipt of the completed form all details will be entered into the Academic Management System. You will then be sent a Confirmation of Enrolment.

**Fees**
Full fee paying student’s will receive a tax invoice in by post. Payment should be made directly to Revenue.

**Student Cards**
A Student Card will be provided. To enable the student card to be processed you will need to provide us with a passport photograph of yourself that has been endorsed on the back by an appropriate person.

If you require any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me in the Research Office.

*Heather Porter*
Higher Degrees Officer
School of Education
Dear Agus

Re: Human Research Ethics Application

The Design and Social Context Human Research Ethics Sub-Committee, at its meeting 11th November 2004, considered your Doctor of Philosophy application entitled Service Quality in District Education Offices: Study of the Decentralization of Education in Indonesia”.

I write to advise that your application will receive approval as Risk category, Level 2/MR classification subject to Higher Degree Proposal approval and the following minor amendments being sighted to the satisfaction of the Chair:

PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT (PLS)

i) Use RMIT letterhead
ii) Introduce yourself first
iii) State School and Portfolio you are studying in after the sentence “This study is being undertaken as part of a ……….Degree”.
iv) State the title of your project
v) Add a paragraph or two about the project
vi) Invite the participants to become involved
vii) State exactly what is expected of the participants
viii) Add sentence you may withdraw at any time and any unprocessed data may also be withdrawn.
ix) ADD For further information. Contact me at ….or my advisor Professor Slamet on …
x) Sign the Plain Language Statement
xi) Add the HREC ethics contact details box at the bottom of the page.
You are required to complete the above amendments and submit them to the secretary of the DCS Human Research Ethics Sub-committee prior to the next meeting. The next meeting will be held on 2/12/2004.

Should you have any queries regarding the above amendments please seek advice from the Chair of the sub-committee Assoc. Prof. Heather Fehring on 9925 7840, heather.fehring@rmit.edu.au or contact me on (03) 9925 7877 or email heather.porter@rmit.edu.au

I wish you well in your research.

Yours sincerely

Heather Porter

Heather Porter
Secretary
Design and Social Context
Human Research Ethics Sub-Committee
Operational Unit - Bundoora

For further information refer to Portfolio Ethic website. URL: http://www.rmit.edu.au/browse;ID=nfsd2752o3wm
Appendix 3: Sample Interview Questions

Open Ended Questionnaires and questions for Interview or discussion;

The questionnaires were distributed mainly to explore how to improve service quality at the DEO within the environment of the decentralized education system in Indonesia? This overall research question was broken down into the following four sub-research questions:

- What is the current status of service quality at the DEOs?
- What factors influence DEO service quality?
- What efforts are needed to improve DEO service quality?

In addition to the above main questions, the following questions were also used in discussion or interview when appropriate;

Decentralization

1. What are the organization structure differences before and after decentralization?
2. How is the climate or culture of organization change before and after decentralization?
3. What are the missions of decentralization to be accomplished?
4. What are the probable impacts (positive/negative) of education decentralization toward the quality of education?
5. Has there been any activity to improve/build the capacity of district levels prior or after the implementation of decentralization?

Individual/Institutional Factors

6. How do district education office staffs perceive the new organization structure?
7. How do your superiors (senior education officers, politicians, legislators, etc.) support the implementation of the new organization structure?
8. How committed are your superiors in implementing the new organization structure?
9. How motivated are your staffs toward the new organization?
10. How is the relationship between individual and institutional capacities influencing the service quality within the new organization structure?
Service quality

11. How is the service quality of your district education office after decentralization?
12. What factors influences the service quality of your office?
13. Who has the responsibility to control and assure the service quality in your district education office?
14. How to measure the service quality in district education offices?
15. How is service quality of district education offices developed to improve the quality of education?
16. What do you or your staffs actually do to satisfy education stakeholders?
17. What should you or your staff do to satisfy education stakeholders?
18. How do district education office staff develop their capacity to serve stakeholders with high degree of quality?

Any complaints about your participation in this project may be directed to the Secretary, RMIT Human Research Ethics Committee, University Secretariat, RMIT, GPO Box 2476V, Melbourne, 3001. The telephone number is (03) 9925 1745. Details of the complaints procedure are available from: www.rmit.edu.au/council/hrec
Appendix 4:

DEO Obligatory Functions/Authorities formulated and proposed by Baedhowi (2003) based on Government Regulation 25/2000,

1. Defining and stipulating guidelines for kindergarten, primary, and secondary education based on government regulations;
2. Defining local content curriculum for kindergarten, primary, and secondary education
3. Administering national curriculum based on national government guidelines/regulations
4. Developing student competency standards for kindergarten, primary and secondary students based upon minimum competencies stipulated by national government
5. Administering, supervising and evaluating learning processes and school management based on government regulations
6. Administering final education evaluation for kindergarten, primary and secondary education based on government regulations
7. Stipulating local annual academic calendar and its effective days/hours based on central government guidelines
8. Planning, defining and administering the procurement, maintenance, and utilization of kindergarten, primary and secondary education facilities and infrastructures
9. Providing certificates for primary and secondary education in the district/municipality
10. Providing text books and its additional materials for kindergarten, primary, and secondary education
11. Supervising and evaluating the utilization of education facilities for kindergarten, primary and secondary education
12. Defining student activities guidelines for kindergarten, primary and secondary education
13. Managing student activities in kindergarten, primary and secondary education
14. Defining student recruitment policies based on government regulations for kindergarten, primary and secondary education
15. Defining student recruitment guidelines for kindergarten, primary and secondary education based on government regulations
16. Supervising and evaluating student activities in kindergarten, primary and secondary education
17. Planning and defining the opening and closing of schools/education institution based on minimum service standards defined by government regulations
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18. Administering school accreditation for kindergarten, primary and secondary education
19. Administering the monitoring and evaluation of school performance in kindergarten, primary and secondary education
20. Administering partnership with foreign institutions in primary and secondary education based on government regulations.
21. Administering kindergarten, primary and secondary education operations including remote/distance education, open education, piloting education, and education in disaster/difficult areas
22. Formulating, planning and supplying the education facilities needed for distance education in remote areas based on government regulations
23. Administering, supervising, and evaluating distance education according to government regulations.
24. Stipulating educational financing guidelines and preparing educational budget in order to be proportionally prioritized based on government regulations.
25. Developing education administration guidelines for schools
26. Facilitating community participation in education
27. Planning, recruiting, and distributing education personnel for kindergarten, primary and secondary education based on national standard
28. Administering the transfer and or mutation of education personnel in kindergarten, primary and secondary schools
29. Administering career path for educational personnel in kindergarten, primary and secondary education
30. Adopting and developing communication technology for educational administration
31. Developing test items to measure the student achievement based on local content curriculum in the district
32. Administering educational innovations in the district/municipality
Appendix 5:

DEO Obligatory Functions/Authorities
Based on Government Regulation 38/2007
(Researcher’s translation)

1. Policy Formulation
   a. Formulating District education policy in accordance to Provincial and National policy
   b. Designing formal (early, elementary, secondary) and non formal education operational planning in accordance to provincial and national strategic planning
   c. Disseminating and implementing national education standard in district level;
   d. Managing and administering formal (early, elementary, secondary) and non formal education;
   e. Issuing or holding formal (elementary, secondary) and non formal education foundation permits/licence
   f. Managing and administering district’s internationally standard elementary school
   g. Issuing or holding elementary, secondary education based on local excellence foundation permits/licence
   h. Managing and or administering local based excellence elementary and secondary education
   i. Provide resources support to higher education administration
   j. Internationally standard education monitoring and evaluation
   k. Data updating and managing district’s education information system

2. Financing
   a. Provide necessary funding for administering early, elementary, secondary and non formal education based on district’s authority
   b. Provide quality assurance funding based on district’s authority

3. Curriculum
   a. Basic education curriculum development coordinating and supervising;
   b. Disseminating of Early, elementary, secondary education basic structure;
   c. Disseminating and implementing standard of content and standard of competence in basic education;
   d. Disseminating and facilitating early and basic education curriculum implementation
   e. Supervising basic education curriculum implementation

4. Facilities
   a. Supervising early, elementary, secondary and non formal education basic facility construction
   b. Supervising the utilization of education building and facility
   c. Supervising early, elementary, secondary and non formal education books utilization
5. Education Personnel
   a. Planning Early, elementary, secondary and non formal education personnel needs based on valid data as mandated by district’s function
   b. Recruiting and distributing early, elementary, secondary and non formal civil service education personnel based on district authority
   c. Administering educational civil service personnel mutation within district area
   d. Improving early, elementary, secondary and non formal education personnel welfare, appreciation and protection
   e. Managing and developing early, elementary, secondary and non formal education personnel
   f. Firing early, elementary, secondary and non formal civil service education personnel due to non regulation violation

6. Education Quality Assurance

   Student Achievement/National Examination
   a. Administering elementary, secondary and non formal examination
   b. Coordinating, Facilitating, monitoring and evaluating the school examination implementation
   c. Provide adequate funding to administer school examination in district.

   Evaluation
   a. Administering early, elementary, secondary and non formal education providers evaluation in district level
   b. Implementing early, elementary, secondary and non formal education national standard in district level

   Accreditation
       Helping government in non formal education accreditation

   Quality Assurance
   a. Supervising and facilitating early, elementary, secondary and non formal education in assuring education quality to fulfill national education standard
   b. Supervising and facilitating international quality educations in assuring its quality to fulfill national education standard
   c. Supervising and facilitating locally based excellence in education by assuring its quality
   d. Evaluating the implementation and impact of education quality assurance at the district level.
IMPROVING SERVICE QUALITY
OF DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICES (DEO)
IN THE INDONESIAN DECENTRALIZED EDUCATION SYSTEM

Volume2
The Portfolio

Agus Haryanto
M.Ed.

School of Management
College of Business
RMIT University
May 2010
This page is left blank intentionally
Introduction

RMIT Regulations for Higher Degree by Project requires that three components need to be presented by all PhD candidates; Exegesis, Portfolio, and Oral Presentation. The Exegesis is presented in a separate volume (volume 1), while this volume 2 contains the portfolio which comprises three groups of exhibits which were developed as the journey of this research progressed:

Phase One: UNDERSTANDING THE ISSUE
Phase Two: FORMULATING A SOLUTION
Phase Three: GARNERING SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION

These exhibits represent the significant learning track which emerged from this research journey. Some exhibits: the final indicators; fact sheets; guidelines; survey forms and the MONE decree should be seen as artifacts or products of this research journey. Since the products are meant to be used in Indonesia, many of them are written in Bahasa Indonesia. In some cases, only part of the document is included, but is available locally on request. Not all exhibits are relevant to all readers. Judicious reading is important. It is expected that the exhibits will illuminate critical events and interventions that flow from this research.

A short description or summary is included with each item to provide a brief context statement outlining who wrote, developed or translated it, my role, date of development and the significance of the exhibit.

This portfolio should be seen as a significant resource for the MONE and other educators and donors working in Indonesia.

The accompanying exegesis explains the relevance and of significance of the exhibits contained.
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</tr>
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<td>1. The Research as a journey of Knowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Matrix of International Decentralization experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MSS Indicators in the MONE decree 129a/U/2004 on MSS</td>
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</tr>
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# GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APBD (Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah)</td>
<td>Regional/Local Government Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APBN (Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara)</td>
<td>Central Government Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AusAID</td>
<td>Australia AID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Self sufficiency/self government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banten</td>
<td>One of provinces in Java Island Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPPENAS</td>
<td>National Bureau of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bekasi</td>
<td>One of districts in West Java Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOE</td>
<td>Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOS (Biaya Operasional Sekolah)</td>
<td>School Operational Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bupati</td>
<td>District Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>Methodology used in qualitative study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daerah Istimewa</td>
<td>Special Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAK (Dana Alokasi Khusus)</td>
<td>Special Allocated Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAU (Dana Alokasi Umum)</td>
<td>General Allocated Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBEP</td>
<td>Decentralized Basic Education Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization</td>
<td>Transfer of authority to peripheral unit organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGMPSE</td>
<td>Directorate General for Management of Primary and Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharma Wanita</td>
<td>group of wives of Indonesian civil servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinas</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dias Pendidikan</td>
<td>District Education Office (under district head/MOHA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Third tier of Indonesian Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Education Board</td>
<td>District Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPOD (Dewan Pertimbangan Otonomi Daerah)</td>
<td>Regional Autonomy Consultative Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Parliaments/ House of Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPRD</td>
<td>Local parliaments/Local House of Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Out Rate</td>
<td>Percentage of students who discontinue their study for the next level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable record</td>
<td>‘Product’ of the research or ‘Portfolio’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Nusa Tenggara</td>
<td>One of provinces in Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exegesis</td>
<td>A critical explanation of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Gross Enrolment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOI</td>
<td>Government of Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Regulation 25/2000</td>
<td>On National and Provincial Government Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Regulation 38/2007</td>
<td>On Local Government Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Regulation 65/2005</td>
<td>On Minimum Service Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Regulation 8/2003</td>
<td>On Local Government Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubernur</td>
<td>Governor, Head of Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guru</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Degree by Project</td>
<td>RMIT mode in pursuing Doctoral Degree by project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDA</td>
<td>Indonesian Rapid Decentralization Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>The capital city of Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabupaten</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandep (Kantor Departemen)</td>
<td>Ministerial Office (in district under the MOEC or MONE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanwil (Kantor Wilayah)</td>
<td>Ministerial Office (in province)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kecamatan</td>
<td>sub-district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelas</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepala Daerah</td>
<td>Local Government Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketua Dewan</td>
<td>Chairman of Board (Board of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketua Komite</td>
<td>Chairmen of Committee (School Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kota</td>
<td>Municipal/city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law 22/1999</td>
<td>On Regional Governance (Autonomy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law 25/1999</td>
<td>On Fiscal Decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law 33/2005</td>
<td>On Fiscal Decentralization (New)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law 32/2004</td>
<td>On Regional Governance (Autonomy) (New)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Content Curricula</td>
<td>Curricula based on Local Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombok</td>
<td>One of islands in east Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombok Tengah</td>
<td>A district in West Nusatenggara Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/Madrasah Aliyah</td>
<td>Islamic Senior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mataram</td>
<td>One of towns in West Lombok Province in Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI/Madrasah Ibtidaiyah</td>
<td>Islamic Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEC</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Culture (now become MONE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHA</td>
<td>Ministry of Home Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONE</td>
<td>Ministry of National Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORA</td>
<td>Ministry of Religious Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPR</td>
<td>People’s Consultative Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS (Minimum Service Standard)</td>
<td>Service Standard for DEO level, indicating obligatory function performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murid</td>
<td>Student/pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTs/Madrasah Tsanawiyah</td>
<td>Islamic Junior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Education Ministerial Decree 129a/U/2004</td>
<td>On Minimum Service Standard/MSS (Old one, need revisions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NER</td>
<td>Net Enrolment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngayogyakarta Hadiningrat</td>
<td>Name of Yogyakarta Sultanate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE</td>
<td>National Standards of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligatory functions</td>
<td>Mandates given by laws or regulations to local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendapatan Asli Daerah</td>
<td>Local District Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendapatan Per Kapita</td>
<td>Annual Per Capita Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendidikan</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEO</td>
<td>Provincial Education Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peraturan Daerah</td>
<td>Government Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port folio</td>
<td>See durable record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner Research</td>
<td>Any research methodology or methods done by practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praya</td>
<td>The capital city of Central Lombok district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propinsi</td>
<td>Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puskesmas</td>
<td>Local Health Centre (usually in sub districts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPBS (Rencana Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Sekolah)</td>
<td>School Budgeting Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDIP</td>
<td>Regional Education Development Improvement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition Rate</td>
<td>Percentage of students who still stay at the same grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research by Project</td>
<td>An alternative of Research in RMIT, not by academic research (not theoretical approach)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ruang Kelas**  
Class room

**RMIT**  
Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology

**Rusak Berat**  
Poor/heavily broken condition

**Rusak Ringan**  
Not too bad condition/slightly broken

**School Committee**  
Community organization to support school

**SD/Sekolah Dasar**  
Elementary School

**Selamat Datang**  
Welcome

**Service quality**  
The ability of an organization to fulfil its obligatory function in satisfying customer needs

**SMA/Sekolah Menengah Atas**  
General Senior/High School

**SMK/Sekolah Menegah Kejuruan**  
Vocational High School

**SMP/Sekolah Menegah Pertama**  
Junior High School

**SOP/Standar Operasional Prosedur**  
Standard Operating Procedure

**SPM (Standar Pelayanan Minimal)**  
Minimum Service Standard

**Sultan**  
[Sultanate](#)

**Tangerang**  
One of districts in [Banten](#) Province Indonesia

**Transition Rate**  
Percentage of students who attend to the next level

**UNDP**  
United Nation Development Program

**Universitas**  
University

**USAID**  
United States AID

**UUD (Undang Undang Dasar) 1945**  
1995 Indonesian Constitution

**Walikota**  
Mayor

**West Nusa Tenggara**  
One of provinces in Eastern Indonesia

**Yogyakarta**  
One of Provinces/towns in Java Indonesia
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Phase One:

UNDERSTANDING THE ISSUE
1. The research as a Journey of Knowing in Three Phases

This research could be described using the journey of knowing metaphor divided into several different trips or phases. These phases emerged from the main activities undertaken during this research process in trying to answer my research questions as described in chapter 1: How to improve DEO service quality in this Indonesian decentralized era? The phases could be illustrated using the figure on the following page and grouped into three phases;

1. Phase One: UNDERSTANDING THE ISSUE
   October 2004 – February 2006

2. Phase Two: FORMULATING A SOLUTION
   April 2006 – July 2008

3. Phase Three: GARNERING SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION
   August 2008 – March 2009

These three phases are reflected and detailed in Chapter 4 as ‘A Challanging Journey for Improving DEO Service Quality’ which critically describes the action that I took during the research project. Those three phases above were implemented using various data collecting methods.

Although this action research model looks nice and tidy on paper, but in reality it is not as neat as that. The three phases did not always occur in a linear way, because the action researcher could go back and forth from data collection to data analysis and to his work in MONE.
The Journey of Knowing in Three Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASE ONE</strong></td>
<td><strong>PHASE TWO</strong></td>
<td><strong>PHASE THREE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>FORMULATING</td>
<td>GARNERING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Exploring the Context</td>
<td>4. Developing an MSS Framework</td>
<td>7. Checking the Concept to Policy Makers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those three phases above were implemented in many different activities using various data collecting methods as described in this summary below;

**Phase One:**
UNDERSTANDING THE ISSUE

1. **EXPLORING THE CONTEXT**
   a. Readings Documents (Exploring the Printed Worlds, understanding decentralization and service quality, a continuous activity)
   b. Meetings (Hearing and catching what people might be saying, 8 meetings, on average 25 people each)

2. **UNDERSTANDING DEOS’ STAKEHOLDERS’ VIEWS** (Open Ended Questionnaires)
   a. National Board of Education Workshops,
      71 from 110 respondents, 14 July 2005
   b. National Teachers and School Principals Workshops,
      140 from 160 respondents, 25 July 2005
   c. National District Staff Workshop,
      73 of 109 respondents, 10 October 2005
   d. Yogya Teachers and School Principals Workshops,
      20 of 20 respondents, 24 August 2007
3. VISITING THE FIELD (Field Visits to observe, discuss and interview with DEO Officers, Board members and School personnel)

   a. Yogyakarta, 22, 23 August 2005,
      FGD, observe and Interview DEO personnel, Board member, School personnel.
      Bantul District in Yogyakarta, October 30, 2006,
      School Rehabilitation Program, Struck by severe earthquake.
   b. Praya,   25, 26 August 2005,
      FGD, observe and Interview DEO personnel, Board member, School personnel.
   c. Bekasi,  23 February 006,
      FGD, observe and Interview DEO personnel, Board member, School personnel.
   d. Tangerang, 24 February 006,
      FGD, observe and Interview DEO personnel, Board member, School personnel.

Phase Two:
FORMULATING A SOLUTION

4. Developing MSS framework, Initial National MSS Team Meeting, Team Building, Friday,
   August 1, 2008. Attended by 18 people (donor representative, main unit representatives, proposed
   team members);
5. Designing MSS Standards, Discussing the 1st Draft of MSS. Wednesday, September 24 2008, 23
   people attended.
6. Testing the first Draft of MSS through FGDs, Finding the Basics of MSS
   a. NTB, Hotel Lombok Raya, Thursday October 16, 2008; 3 different groups (DEO staff,
      SD/SMP principals) about 60 people all.
   b. Sapphire Hotel in Yogyakarta (October 23, 2008); 3 different groups (DEO staff, SD/SMP
      principals) about 60 people
   c. Riau, Quality Hotel, Thursday October 30, 2008; 3 different groups (DEO staff, SD/SMP
      principals) about 60 people all.

Phase Three:
GARNERING SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION

7. Consulting with policy makers, interviewed 15 key personnel, mainly in central level (MONE,
   MORA, MOHA, National Standard, and National Accreditation)
8. Gathering Feedback from Stakeholders. MSS Focus Group Discussion, Implementing MSS
   Instruments’ NTB December 17-20, 2008; 2 DEO FGDs, 4School FGDs
9. Garnering Support; Board of Education Member Dissemination, Introducing MSS Discussion
   a. 1st Round, Purnama 2 Hotel, Cipayung, Bogor, West Java,
      March 11, 2009. South Meeting Room, 13.00 am, 99 members attended;
   b. 2nd round, Wisma Bahtera Hotel, Cipayung, Bogor, West Java,
      March 17, 2009. Grand Meeting Room, 13.00 am, 112 members attended;
   c. 3rd Round, Wisma Bahtera Hotel, Cipayung, Bogor, West Java,
2. Matrix of International Decentralization Experiences and Its Implementation in Indonesia

The literature on decentralization explored in collaborative paper (see exhibit 34) provides useful guidelines for Indonesian educational managers. Many of those experiences are relevant to the Indonesian setting. Based on these expert findings, a matrix or a table for decentralization implementation was constructed for discussion and as a possible tool to analyze Indonesian decentralization.

The matrix or table compares international experiences in education decentralization (Best Practices) to education decentralization in Indonesia. From 29 suggested best practices, only 8 best practices have been adopted. This suggests that the Indonesian education decentralization process still has far to go. In addition, the matrix is a useful assessment tool to determine whether each district is prepared for and capable of implementing decentralization.

If public service quality is understood as one of the promises of decentralization, much remains to be done in Indonesia.
## International Decentralization Experiences and Its Implementation in Indonesia
(Based on FGD about Alec Ian Gershberg and Donald R. Winkler, Vic Paqueo and Jill Lammert, and E. Mark Hanson experiences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Experiences from a range of different countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Implementation incomplete</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accountability Mechanism</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only implemented to upward level, not to wider stakeholder/customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stakeholder Participation Schools/principals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>School Based Management introduced, but with limited authority. Community participation through School Committee and Board of Education introduced with many obstacles faced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stakeholder Participation Parents</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stakeholder Participation Community</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Restructure governance to provide new function</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandated on law 22/1999 revised to 32/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Transfer teacher management to local government</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>All central office personnel and facilities transferred to district level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Capacity building to manage education; Sub national governments, communities, and/or schools.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity building mostly only dissemination of the regulations to limited of personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Real changes in governance, accountability.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as no. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Schools to determine the degree of success of education decentralization</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schools/classrooms are not used as barometer of education decentralization. Limited to management in district level using MSS (still in process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Impact in the classroom/teaching learning process.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Legislative and constitutional changes, change responsibilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Numerous regulations still needed to facilitate the main law on decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Central support is vital; demand, encourage, empower</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>More capacity building needed but decentralization supervision is also needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Effective linkages, between the national, district/local and school levels.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Many districts perceive decentralization as freedom from central influences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Competent supervision and monitoring system</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed administration of MONE and MOHA complicates monitoring and evaluation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Build structures and capabilities at all levels, institution-building based on sustained commitment works.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restructuring happened, but building capabilities still far to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed Experiences from a range of different countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Implementation incomplete</td>
<td>Explanations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Focus on classroom practice, supporting materials should be of good quality.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>In many cases supporting materials such as books, equipments, lab materials are very poor or even inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Commitment at all levels.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only to limited personnel, still far to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Effective participation includes a real role for parents in school decision-making.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Being introduced with many obstacles in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Transferring positive opportunities to the regions.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most technical and operational authorities are handed down to local government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Accepted vision of decentralization between the distinct centres of power.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Still need to build a strong vision of decentralization across and within governance level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is easier to initiate a decentralization initiative during times of political, economic and social stress or turbulence, than it is during times of relative stability.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decentralization was initiated at once after forced by critical situations; funding crisis, foreign aids, regional demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Strong management infrastructure at the regional levels.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing personnel lack necessary skills, knowledge, and motivation, little or limited capacity building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Transfer authority only when meet specific tests of readiness.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>No such tests were administered, not even the tool was constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Decentralizing in incremental stages.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>1998 initiated, 1999 the law was enacted, 2001 was implemented. A “Big Bang” process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Appropriate number of experienced personnel in managing a decentralized system.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only limited personnel experienced in decentralization. Never been implemented before. Limited research and capacity building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. A decentralized organization should function as parts of whole rather than simply independent parts.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is a learning process, most districts perceive it as independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The central ministry still must have the tools to safeguard that the regions follow national educational policy.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Law 23/2003 (National Education System) safeguards education unity, but frameworks dissemination is incomplete and guidelines are unavailable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Educational policy on decentralization should be set through debate</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only limited debate in government offices with People’s Representative. This research is a substantial contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Experiences from different country implemented/not implemented</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. MSS Indicators in the MONE decree 129a/U/2004 on MSS

Although there have been many reports suggesting that Indonesian decentralization is actually a “Big Bang” policy with limited preparation, this decree shows that some efforts to improve public service quality in education had been made.

In its early stage, this decree of MONE describes what MSS (Minimum Service Standards) should be fulfilled by DEOs (District Education Offices) to satisfy schools and education stakeholders’ basic education needs. Unfortunately it was seen as too output oriented and out of dated by observers and needed to be revised. Chapter 3 of the exegesis discusses in more detail DEO minimum service quality.
### MSS Indicators in the MONE decree 129a/U/2004 on MSS

**MONE’s MSS in Junior Secondary Education:**
**Too Output Oriented?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment of 13-15 age</td>
<td>&gt; = 90</td>
<td>At least 90% in Junior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Out rate</td>
<td>&lt; = 1</td>
<td>Drop Out Rate less than 1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Facilities</td>
<td>&gt; = 90</td>
<td>Facilities comply with National Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative personnel</td>
<td>&gt; = 80</td>
<td>Schools having enough Non Teaching Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Teachers</td>
<td>&gt; = 90</td>
<td>Adequate Number of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher certification</td>
<td>&gt; = 90</td>
<td>Comply with National Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Books</td>
<td>&gt; = 100</td>
<td>Subject matter books fulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>&lt; = 30 - 40</td>
<td>Number of student in each class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>&gt; = 90</td>
<td>Satisfactory achievement test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Transition Rate</td>
<td>&gt; = 70</td>
<td>Continue to Senior High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: National Education Ministerial Decree 129a/U/2004, p. 5)
4. Summary of findings from the preliminary data meetings;

In the early stages of this research, a range of activities were implemented in order to gain preliminary understandings of the current status of decentralization and service quality. One of the activities was by attending various meetings to understand how education stakeholders viewed the issues related to decentralization and public service quality.

This exhibit shows some example of these meeting minutes recorded sometime in early 2005.
### Summary of Findings from the preliminary data meetings;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Meeting Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | **Meeting for National Workshop Preparation (Department Level),** April 4, 2005, Representatives from all main units in MONE National Biro for Planning Room, Senayan Jakarta  
  After decentralization arise two important problems  
  • Although there are some regulation concerning national planning, but still people are questioning their implementation; How to synchronize national and regional strategic planning in education?  
  • What indicators to be used in measuring the national and regional education development? For example how do we know if DEO really implement their mandates, how good are they, what indicators to be used? |
| 2   | **Meeting for Compulsory authority and Minimum Service Quality**  
  May 12, 2005, Representatives from all main units in MONE  
  **DG Office, Senayan Jakarta**  
  Some publications need to be revised in line with the enactment of new laws related to decentralization;  
  A. *Buku Induk Desentralisasi Pendidikan* (Decentralizing Education in Indonesia)  
  B. *Standar Pelayanan Minimal* (Minimum Service Standard)  
  C. *Standard Teknis* (Technical Standard)  
  Educational Performance Indicators  
  Some issues are still being discussed continuously: Whether Senior High Education is under provincial or district level authority, Under whose responsibility is the improvements of education, because there are many institutions dealing with this issue (District or national Auditor, Quality Assurance Office, Accreditation Office, Central Research and Development Office)  
  In general there are three different level qualities of schools; over, standard and below standard schools. District office are supposed to serve mainly those under standard schools (How are these defined?), because good schools are in some ways begin to entering ’market’ situation where wealthy family are willing to ’buy’ their qualified education for their children.  
  My study is direct/indirectly related to the publication of ”Standard Pelayanan Minimal” (Minimum Service Standard) while my advisor proposed to call it as ”Minimum Service Quality” |
1. **District poor preparation prior to decentralization implementation**
   *Indonesian decentralization was happened in ‘a second’ as a ‘big bang’ without proper preparation as it is forced by the economic and political turbulence after Suharto step down.*

2. **Low resources of human capital, financial and or facilities to support good decentralization.**
   *As a developing country, Indonesia had already experiencing some difficulties related to its resources except for some ‘rich’ provinces or districts. This situation is even worse when poor districts had to step on their own feet. How about*

3. **Funding for regular activities is considered too slow to reach the target (district, board, and or schools)**
   *Local management and bureaucracy sometimes inhibit the resources delivery from central government. Local management is relatively unchanged after decentralization took place, they do business as usual.*

4. **Relationship change between schools and their respective ‘superiors’ occurred in some places,** it was under *Kantor Departemen Pendidikan* (district office under central ministry of education), now it is under *Dinas Pendidikan* (district office under local government).
   *Before decentralization, junior and secondary schools had already ‘good’ relationship to the district offices (elementary had long been decentralized under district offices, yet their quality are considered relatively low). Financial, facilities and or managerial support were regularly delivered by the district office at that time. Now this middle schools had to face the fact that the district office as their ‘superior’ is ‘somebody new’ with different ‘characters’ and culture or even behavior.*

   *District office itself is a mixed of people from the Dinas under Local government and Kandep under central government. The problem is that those people from local government who relatively know a little about education do not want to loose their role, interest or power; they want to remain ‘dominant’. This is why in some area the district head is appointed without considering his or her educational background. This might gives bad impact on the education management at the district level, and put the schools at risk.*

5. **Islamic schools or Madrasah is another form of schooling that also have important contribution to the development of human resources but treated unequally compare to regular schools.**
   *The ministry of religious affairs was still considering whether this institution is a religion (centralized) or education institution (decentralized). It is part of the decentralization problems if education is not administered under one ministry or management. A good coordination should be held between the two ministries if madrasah should be treated equally.*
IQECP Preparation

May 20, 2005; WB and Units within Prim Second DG

DG Primary and Secondary Education Office

Basically three pillars should be empowered to improve public service quality:

* Community → School Committee
* Politicians/Decision Maker → District Office/House of Representatives
* Service Providers/Producers → Schools

This study will focused on the improvement of School Committee in central Java and Jogjakarta (10 districts) using experiments via treatments in schools committee level.

Some probable causes why government institutions are lack of quality visions:

1. Non profit oriented
2. Low civil servant salaries
3. Serve the boss ‘culture’ not customers
4. Not knowing stakeholders/customers
5. Complaining is not usual (silent/passive customers)
6. Lack of entrepreneurship
7. Low Accountability, transparency, responsibility and efficiency

Obligatory Functions and Minimum Service Standards

May 23, 2005; Representatives from all main units in MONE

Gedung E Lantai 3 13.30 PM

After some years of activities, decentralization project has produced some important documents. Among these is called SPM (Standard Pelayanan Minimal/Minimum Service Standard) which is a Ministerial Decree No 129a/U/2004.

But, by the enactment of new Law No 32 on Central and Regional Authorities and new Government Decree no 19/2005 on National Education Standard, this ministerial decree is subject to revised, because some parts of it is not relevant any more.

Each level of administration (Central, Province, and District/Municipality) has to have its own SPM. But for schools level it is called ‘standard teknis’ (technical standard).

Notes:

- Although all level of administration has to have its own minimum service performance, district level is the most crucial one due to its new authorities in carrying out education administration especially for secondary education.
- On the other hand, it can be seen that district experiences in handling elementary schools is relatively poor. It is too risky to let the district offices to run their authorities without some kind of instrument to measure their performance.
- After decentralization, District Education Office Heads are under the “Bupati/Walikota” (District and Municipality Head) who are accountable to the Ministry of Home Affairs. There is no more direct command from the Ministry of Education, meaning loosing the ‘grip’, unless all the instruments are enacted as Government regulation or presidential decree.
| 6 | Discussion on ‘Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah/MBS’  
May 24, 2005; Reps from DEO MORA Principal in regard to junior High school  
Judicial Training Center, Jakarta  
Discussion in ‘Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah/MBS’ (School Based Management) Training  
a. District office is not the only actor in deciding school/education funding. People from local House of representative, local government agencies and Regional Planning Bureau are the key actors. As an addition there are other competitors in district or national level among sectors. This makes school funding even more complicated and difficult, Why not centralized instead? One participant exclaimed.  
b. Local government is more interested in developing physical infrastructure rather than human resources; this is why education is considered relatively less important.  
c. Many district education personnel (head or staff) are not having educational background at all; this is why many district offices experiencing lack of educational vision. |
|---|---|
| 7 | Prof Slamet discussion  
May 31 2005; RMIT Doctoral Student consultation  
MONE Office 15th floor Jakarta  
District Offices are supposed to give to schools:  
- Policies: Vision, mission, planning management etc.  
- Guidance Handbook, instructions, and manual, training  
- Monitoring and Evaluation Auditory, supervision,  
- Regulations Legislation, regulation, qualification, specification, certification, accreditation  
- Support of funding and facilities  
- Facilitate school and community relationship |
5. Open ended questionnaires and questions for interviews or discussion

I realized that there are many people working out there struggling to improve education service quality. I started to realize that these people could become resources for my research on decentralization and service quality. I identified three groups of people, usually stakeholders from DEO offices. These included Board of Education members, DEO staff and, most importantly, principals and teachers, the DEOs’ main customers. To these three different groups of stakeholders I distributed open ended questionnaires on 3 different occasions.

The questionnaires were distributed mainly to explore three issues: the current status of DEO service quality in fulfilling school needs; group perceptions on factors influencing service quality and what efforts are needed to improve service quality. This was important because at that time I had only gained information from the printed word. Knowing stake holder’s perception of DEO service quality would complement my initial understanding. In particular I was interested mostly to see factors influencing DEO service performance in the decentralized system.

The questionnaires were distributed between 2005 and 2007 in separate workshops attended by those three different groups of people. The number of respondents and their returned responses are as follows:

a. National Board of Education Workshops, 71 from 110 possible respondents, Bogor National Workshop, 14 July 2005
b. National Teachers and School Principals Workshops, 140 from 160 possible respondents, Purnama Hotel Cipayung, 25 July 2005 and Yogya Teachers and School Principals Workshops (Teacher/Principals Association Workshop), 20 of 20 respondents, MGMP Office Yogya, 24 August 2007
c. National District Staff Workshop, 73 of 109 possible respondents, Surabaya, 10 October 2005

Those respondents represented districts and cities from 33 different provinces throughout Indonesia. In this case I took advantage of being a senior administrator to meet many respondents from districts and ask them to fill out my open ended questionnaires (See chapter 4 for detailed discussion: Understanding DEO Stakeholder Views).
Open Ended Questionnaires and questions for Interview or discussion;

The questionnaires were distributed mainly to explore how to improve service quality at the DEO within the environment of the decentralized education system in Indonesia? This overall research question was broken down into the following four sub-research questions:

- What is the current status of service quality at the DEOs?
- What factors influence DEO service quality?
- What efforts are needed to improve DEO service quality?

In addition to the above main questions, the following questions were also used in discussion or interview when appropriate;

Decentralization
1. What are the organization structure differences before and after decentralization?
2. How is the climate or culture of organization change before and after decentralization?
3. What are the missions of decentralization to be accomplished?
4. What are the probable impacts (positive/negative) of education decentralization toward the quality of education?
5. Has there been any activity to improve/build the capacity of district levels prior or after the implementation of decentralization?

Individual/Institutional Factors
6. How does district education office staff perceive the new organization structure?
7. How do your superiors (senior education officers, politicians, legislators, etc.) support the implementation of the new organization structure?
8. How committed are your superiors in implementing the new organization structure?
9. How motivated is your staff toward the new organization?
10. How is the relationship between individual and institutional capacities influencing the service quality within the new organization structure?

Service quality
11. How is the service quality of your district education office after decentralization?
12. What factors influence the service quality of your office?
13. Who has the responsibility to control and assure the service quality in your district education office?
14. How to measure the service quality in district education offices?
15. How is service quality of district education offices developed to improve the quality of education?
16. What do you or your staff actually do to satisfy education stakeholders?
17. What should you or your staff do to satisfy education stakeholders?
18. How do district education office staff develop their capacity to serve stakeholders with high degree of quality?
6. Some examples of responses to the open ended questionnaires;

Reading or understanding people’s minds through questionnaires was not as easy as I thought. I was always challenged to justify whether respondents really understood what they were saying. I often asked myself, “How do I know that what they say is true?” For example; to illustrate the current status of DEO service quality, some respondents replied; “Supportive enough”, “Very appreciated” or “It is not optimal yet”. As a result, I was questioning myself; did I ask the right question to the right person in a right way?

Secondly; euphemism in language or culture was challenging. Many Indonesians, especially Javanese, find it difficult to speak frankly especially if he or she is to assess something related to somebody’s status or reputation like DEO performance. In many cases, they just want to please me as a MONE official; they would tell what they think I want to hear. This is evidence that the Indonesian acronym called ‘ABS’ (Asal Bapak Senang-as long as the Boss is pleased) still existed and become an important issue in determining issues.

Another difficulty was how to separate or group responses into similar categories. For example, to assess the current status of DEO service quality three categories were adequate: good, medium or bad. But when it came to categorizing factors influencing service quality, problems emerged. This was as a consequence of my open ended questionnaires. There are so many responses when respondents were asked about the factors, and to group them was not easy.

Note: For ethics reasons, names are deleted
Some examples showing responses from the respondents to the open ended questionnaires;

a. Board of Education Members responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Java, Subang</td>
<td>Negative: Sub District office becoming a burden because it deducts / cut schools operation fund.</td>
<td>1. Office Management 2. Office operational fund 3. Office Facilities; building, vehicle</td>
<td>1. Improve Management 2. Increase funding 3. Improve facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Karawang</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Human Resources Quality</td>
<td>1. Training 2. Field/comparative Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bekasi (Municipal)</td>
<td>Good enough</td>
<td>1. Coordination and communication 2. Human resources</td>
<td>1. Improve schools coordination and communication 2. On time information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bandung (Municipal)</td>
<td>Doing improvement, difficulties still exist</td>
<td>1. So many schools to be served, 2. Weak school committees, 3. Low income families,</td>
<td>1. Training for school committee 2. Improve community part 3. Identifying family economic background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Teachers and principals responses

1. Guru
   Kabupaten / Propinsi: Bima Nusa Tenggara Barat.
   1. Belum memadai misalnya Pelayanan dalam sarana dan Kelengkapan alat pembelajaran masih sangat sulit.
   2. Kabupaten Bima belum siap menerima Otonomi daerah karena masalah dana terutama Otonomi di dunia Pendidikan.
   3. • Anggaran ujian kiranya dapat dicairkan sebelum ujian di laksanakan
      • Pendidikan di kembalikan ke pusat.

2. Guru
   Kabupaten / Propinsi: Bengkalis / Riau
   1. Pelayanan pendidikan yang telah di berikan oleh Dinas Pendidikan Kab. Bengkalis menurut pengamatan saya, masih kurang, terlihat dari laporan bulanan sekolah (kondisi sarana prasarana sekolah) yang hanya untuk kelengkapan administrasi tanpa ada tindak lanjut.
      Janji adanya pengawasan yang datangnya tiap bulan untuk memberi bimbingan dan diskusi tentang kesulitan-kesulitan guru dilapangan belum terealisasi sampai saat ini. Namun untuk penataran dan pendanaan biaya sekolah pihak pemerintah cukup tanggap, yaitu untuk D2,D3,S1,S2 bagi guru-guru di beri kesempatan dan bantuan dana.
   2. • Kesadaran dan keikhlasan pihak dinas untuk meningkatkan mutu Sekolah peserta didik harus ada dan kuat.
      • Pihak dinas pendidikan harus di sertakan dalam kepelatihan yang melibatkan guru, biar ada sinkronnisasi, ex. Penataran KBK, kalau mereka tidak mengerti apa KBK bagaimana mau melayani sekolah yang akan menggunakan KBK, mereka tidak akan tahu kesulitan-kesulitan guru dan sekolah dalam melaksanakan KBK.
      • Memperhatikan laporan bulanan, turun lapangan, mencari solusi penyelesaian bersama pihak sekolah/ada tindak lanjut.
      • Adanya konsultan bukan pengawas yang biasanya Cuma memberi nilai guru yang diawasi, tugas konsultan adalah membantu guru memecahkan kesulitan-kesulitan yang dihadapi, cukuplah sebulan sekali tapi tuntas bukan main borong sehari 2-3 sekolah.
      • Mengikut sertakan pihak dinas pendidikan mengikuti penatara yang diperuntukan bagi guru, bukan sebagai panitia tapi sebagai peserta.
3. KEPALA SEKOLAH

Kabupaten / Propinsi : LEBONG / BENGKULU

1. Kondisi kualitas pelayanan pendidikan oleh Dinas terhadap Sekolah masih kurang, hal ini terjadi karena di Kabupaten Lebong (Kab Baru), hal-hal yang mempengaruhi pelayanan itu masih sangat kurang. Seperti kurangnya tenaga / pegawai kurangnya sarana/fasilitas dan kurangnya dana.

2. Faktor yang mempengaruhi pelayanan adalah
   - Tenaga/pegawai yang ada ( kualitas / kuantitas )
   - Sarana dan Prasarana
   - Tersedianya dana.

3. Upaya yang harus dilakukan untuk meningkatkan kualitas pelayanan adalah :
   - Menambah jumlah pegawai dan meningkatkan kesadaran dan kinerja pegawai yang bersangkutan
   - Menambah dan melengkapi sarana / Prasarana
   - Mengusahaakan dana yang mencukupi

c. DEO personnel responses

1. Kabid Perencanaan Sarolangun Jambi

1. Bagaimanakah kualitas pelayanan publik Dinas/PEMDA di bidang pendidikan terhadap sekolah-sekolah di lingkungan wilayah Saudara?

   - **Sudah baik**, namun kita tetap berharap supaya pelayanan dimaksud menjadi lebih baik, dengan alasan pelayanan Dinas/Pemda selalu memerlukan waktu yang agak lama dalam pelayanan, dengan kata lain, setiap layanan tidak dapat diselesaikan secara menyeluruh dengan tepat waktu.
   - Hal ini mungkin disebabkan karena banyaknya birokrasi yang harus dilalui.

2. Faktor-faktor apa saja yang mempengaruhi kualitas pelayanan publik bidang pendidikan di tingkat kabupaten /kota kepada sekolah-sekolah?

   - Sarana /Prasarana yang belum memadai
   - Jangkauan untuk mencapai antara tempat yang satu dengan tempat yang lainnya karena masih banyaknya daerah yang terisolir.
   - Anggaran biaya yang masih terbatas, yang semestinya bidang pendidikan yang harus lebih diprioritaskan.
• Seringnya terjadi mutasi jabatan dilingkungan pemda setempat

3. Upaya-upaya apa yang harus dilakukan oleh PEMDA untuk meningkatkan kualitas pelayanan pendidikan kepada sekolah-sekolah tersebut?

Diantaranya adalah:

• Memberikan tunjangan insentif bagi setiap Guru dari TK, SD, SMP, dan SMA.
• Memberikan tunjangan khusus untuk daerah terpencil dan ini memang sudah terlaksana.
• Memprogramkan studi banding setiap tahunnya ke daerah-daerah yang dianggap lebih baik

2. Kepala Dinas Pendidikan dan Pengajaran Raja Ampat, Irian Jaya Barat

1. Bagaimanakah kualitas pelayanan publik Dinas/ PEMDA di bidang pendidikan terhadap sekolah-sekolah di lingkungan wilayah Saudara?

Kualitas pelayanan publik Dinas/Pemda di bidang pendidikan terhadap sekolah-sekolah di daerah wilayah kerja kami masih rendah. Apalagi sebagai kabupaten yang baru dimekarkan terdapat berbagai masalah/kekurangan/keterbatasan yang tentunya tidak dapat mendukung program/ kegiatan dibidang pendidikan.

2. Faktor-faktor apa saja yang mempengaruhi kualitas pelayanan publik bidang pendidikan di tingkat kabupaten / kota kepada sekolah sekolah?

Faktor-faktor antara lain :

• SDM ( Sumber Daya Manusia ) untuk sekolah dasar masih kurang .
• Daerah kepulauan sehingga sulit dijangkau apalagi terbatas alat transportasi.
• Kesadaran / tidak betahnya guru di tempat tugas, karena masalah rumah guru / tempat tinggal.
• Masyarakat kurang berpartisipasi dlm memajukan pendidikan

3. Upaya-upaya apa yang harus dilakukan oleh PEMDA untuk meningkatkan kualitas pelayanan pendidikan kepada sekolah-sekolah tersebut?

Upaya-upaya yang harus dilakukan ialah :

• Anggaran Pemda harus lebih banyak diarahkan untuk pendidikan.
• Pemda harus membangun fasilitas/pembangunan seperti rumah guru/ asrama murid
• Perlu diperhatikan transportasi dan komunikasi
7. Example of analysis of responses

Collected from Board of Education Workshop Members, 
Safari Garden Hotel, June 24, 2005 
Off 100 questionnaires, 71 Questionnaires submitted 
Answers analyzed and displayed as below:

People’s or stakeholders’ views were needed to contribute to building a comprehensive understanding about the issue of decentralization and service quality. Without support from the grassroots level, any formulated policy would have the possibility of failing, and a policy for improving DEO service quality is no exception.

There were about 300 questionnaires returned from DEO staff, BEO members and school personnel. Analyzing those 300 questionnaires was very challenging. One by one, each questionnaire was read, and responses typed in using a word processor (Words 2007). Then, themes were identified and their occurrences were counted as in quantitative survey. As a consequence of the open ended questions, respondents responded in many different ways, and many themes emerged.

By using spreadsheet software (Excels 2007), all responses were sorted, grouped and counted to establish frequency. To simplify this process, I only took the most frequently emerging themes. To see the detailed discussion on data analysis, please check chapter 4; Understanding DEO’s Stakeholder Views.
Example of Open Ended responses Data analysis
Collected from Board of Education Workshop Members,
Safari Garden Hotel, June 24, 2005
Off 100 questionnaires, 71 Questionnaires submitted
Answers analyzed and displayed as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Current Service Quality/Condition</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Factors Influencing</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>What to Improve</th>
<th>Freq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>access ok</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accommodative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aspects varied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>bureaucratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administrative services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benchmarking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Efforts done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Centralization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Enough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Character Building</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Generally enough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collective Vision</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Good but need</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conducive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comparative Study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Computerized</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>grant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Partially Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>improvement effort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Relatively good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dichotomy public education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>So so</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual Background</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disciplinary action</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>un satisfied yet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inputs, suggestions, critiques</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Edu and Household</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Good already</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>internships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Not as expected</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Job description</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Improving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Keep working regardless of low income families</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In favor to</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Un optimized</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>low income families</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory yet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>loyalty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Need Improvements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nepotism/Collution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Not maximized</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Number of schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Generally good</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Political will</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mobility personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Priority scaling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Good enough</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resources distribution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Office Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>On time information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Road Facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Based</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School District relation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Side</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Priority Scaling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Share Responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pro Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>skilled personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Programs inline</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proportionality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Service Culture</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Factors Influencing</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>What to Improve</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Bureaucratic Nuance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Related Factors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Routine Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Salary incentives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>School Incentives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Law regulation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>School Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structure of Educa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>professionalism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>School Number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Service Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>School Side</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Service Standard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Board of Educa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Involvment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Suggestion control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Synchronizatio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>reward and punishment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Mental attitude</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Transparency and</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Training rotating</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8. **Matrix showing three questions and responses from the three groups of respondents (Board members, DEO Staff and School Personnel)**

This exhibit shows the overall responses given by three groups of stakeholders; BEO members, DEO staff and school personnel to the three main questions; current service status, influencing factors and needed efforts.

The majority of respondents perceived that the service is in medium state (41.02%), many would perceive it as good (34.59%) and the rest would say not good (24.39%). This suggests that almost approximately 65% percent are less than really satisfied with DEO performance. Based on the responses from the questionnaires, there are five main factors influencing poor DEO service quality; managerial or organizational, human resources, and facilities, external and financial factors. Consequently, any effort to improve DEO service quality after decentralization in Indonesia, should consider the quantity and quality of these main factors.

Identifying influencing factors is an important step for improving DEO service quality, but what to do next is a more important question. Based on information from the context analysis and respondent responses it is clear that in order for decentralization to be fruitful and promote better public service quality, some conditions should be met, one of them is local government capacity. Literature and respondents also suggest the importance of defining certain standards for measuring service quality as part of the decentralization process. (Please see chapter 4 for detail discussion; Understanding DEO’s Stakeholder Views).
The matrix showing three questions and responses from the three groups of respondents (Board members, DEO Staff and School Personnel) is seen as follows;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THREE QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSES IN PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS</td>
<td>DEO STAFFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1: What is the status of current service quality?</strong></td>
<td>Good 54.9</td>
<td>Good 42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium 16.9</td>
<td>Medium 42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Good 28.2</td>
<td>Not Good 15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2: What factors influence its delivery?</strong></td>
<td>Human Capital 32.7</td>
<td>Human Capital 27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management/Orgnzt 35.4</td>
<td>Management/Orgnzt 24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geograpgy/Community 13.5</td>
<td>Geograpgy/Community 18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility 8.1</td>
<td>Facility 17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding 10.3</td>
<td>Funding 11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3: What efforts are needed to improve its quality?</strong></td>
<td>Human Capital 29.7</td>
<td>Human Capital 28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management/Orgnzt 37.2</td>
<td>Management/Orgnzt 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geograpgy/Community 17.4</td>
<td>Geograpgy/Community 8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility 7.0</td>
<td>Facility 23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding 8.7</td>
<td>Funding 24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Pictures from the Field Visits

As an addition to the document analysis and stakeholder views, field visits were conducted to triangulate and illustrate research findings.

The following pictures show the real problems of DEO service quality in the field, mainly related to its school facilities. Deteriorating school facilities are too often worsened by natural disasters, such as earthquake as shown by these pictures. The DEO responsibilities for satisfying school needs became even more challenging when disaster struck in 2006.
Pictures from the Field Visits

Earthquake destroyed school facilities in Yogya City

Many schools are flattened to the ground

Only part of the school walls left

NB: Research has too often interrupted by natural disaster, including tsunami, earthquakes and floods.
Education cannot wait; temporary classroom for an elementary school in Jogja City was built after the earthquake destroyed a school.

Temporary classroom

Inside temporary classroom
Coordination with Yogyakarta Education Stakeholders to rebuild education facilities in Yogyakarta PEO

Too many promises made by different institutions to rebuild schools but nothing happened yet at that time. As a representative of central government I had to convince school principals and board members that the central government is going to rebuild the schools. (I am seated at the desk with my hand raised.)

School principals and board members discuss school rehabilitation requirements and procedures.
Bantul District was worst hit by the quake and so were its education facilities

Many classrooms were flattened to the ground

To rebuild the existing school is the best choice to continue education
Education in Bantul District must go on, even in temporary classrooms

One of the temporary classroom in Bantul district

A view in one elementary school temporary classroom
Since the meeting rooms were unavailable because of the quake, meetings were held in a lobby of Bantul District Office for reconstruction planning

Meeting Board member and school principle to convince that the central government would rebuild their classrooms

Only certain school with certain condition would receive block grant from the central government to rebuild their broken classrooms
Rebuilt education facilities, from ground zero to a new building

One of the elementary schools in Yogya City hit by the quake, and no classrooms left

Rebuilt classrooms at the same school
Children too often become the victims of a disaster

Hot and windy temporary classroom

Social worker volunteering as trauma councilor singing with students
In this emergency situation citizen participation is important

Teachers’ rooms and the principal’s office was moved to a house

A generous family turned their home into a temporary school in Yogyakarta to help students keep learning and take final exams
10. Sample of DEO Statistics

The field visits clearly indicated that what was written in reports and claimed by respondents about the current condition of DEO service quality is actually true. I wished I could visits all schools in selected districts, but I realized it would be impossible.

As an alternative, analyzing DEO statistics was chosen to simplify the research process. Again, in many cases the problems of DEO service quality (mainly related to school facilities and personnel) emerged.

This is an indication that decentralization has not been so fruitful enough for the education sector and interventions are needed to improve DEO service quality.

For more DEO statistics please see chapter 4, the Field Visits to Yogyakarta, Praya, Bekasi and Tangerang Districts.
Sample of DEO Statistics

Quality of Teachers and Facilities
In Bantul Elementary Schools 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sekolah (Schools)</strong></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kelas Classrooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Baik (Good)</strong></td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Rusak Ringan (Medium)</strong></td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Rusak Berat (Poor)</strong></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guru (Teachers)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Layak mengajar (qualified)</strong></td>
<td>3,774</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>3,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>semi layak (semi qualified)</strong></td>
<td>845</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>tidak layak (not qualified)</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Profile of Bantul District Education, DEO of Bantul, 2005

Quality of Teachers and Facilities
In Bekasi Elementary Schools 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sekolah (Schools)</strong></td>
<td>773</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kelas Classrooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Baik (Good)</strong></td>
<td>2,939</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>3,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Rusak Ringan (Medium)</strong></td>
<td>751</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Rusak Berat (Poor)</strong></td>
<td>825</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guru (Teachers)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>S1 or Higher (qualified)</strong></td>
<td>7.189</td>
<td>1.623</td>
<td>8.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>D3 or Bachelors (semi qualified)</strong></td>
<td>1.837</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>2.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>D2 or Lower (not qualified)</strong></td>
<td>5.124</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>6.323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Profile of Bekasi District Education, DEO of Bekasi, 2005
11. Legal Framework for MSS

As suggested by one of respondents during the MSS consultations, legal aspects are critically important in developing MSS frameworks. Implementation should consider legal aspects carefully, otherwise resistance might emerge

*No matter how good is an idea for improving service delivery, but if it is not in line with the current regulations, it would be useless*

(Consultation with one of the important respondents in National Planning Bureau, 2009)

The following pages contain critical parts of some of the laws, regulations or decrees related to the MSS, particularly as they refer to decentralization, education and service quality issues. These have been as translated by the researcher.

For more detail discussion please see chapter 4; Developing the MSS Framework.
Legal Framework for MSS

a. Some MSS Points on the Law 32/2004 on Regional Government

Article 11

(4) the administration of government obligatory functions should be based on Minimum Service Standards, implemented in steps and stipulated by the government.

Article 14

(1) obligatory functions as the local governments authorities become the district’s and municipality’s own responsibility in their respective areas.

f. Education administration

Article 16

(1) The relationship between central and local government concerning public service as mentioned by the article 2 point (4) and (5) covers;

a. authority and responsibility in defining Minimum Service Standard;

Article 167

(3) Local government spending as mentioned in above point (1) shall consider spending analysis, price standards, performance analysis and Minimum Service Standards as stipulated by government regulation

Points in the ELUCIDATION of Law 32/2004 on Regional Government

Article 167

Point (3)

- Minimum Service Standard is standards in service provision fullfiling its minimal service adequacy requirements.
- Included within the regulation are spending standard analysis guideline, price list, performance measurement and Minimum Service Standards stipulated by the Ministry of MOHA
b. Some Points of Government Regulation 38/2007 on Central and Local Government Authorities

Article 7

(1) Obligatory functions as stated in article 6 point (2) is government authorities that should be administered by provincial and district/municipal local government concerning public basic services

(2) Obligatory function as stated in above point (1) covers:
   a. education;
   b. health;
   c. Environment;
   d. Public works;
   ...
   x. statistics;
   y. archives, and
   z. library.

Article 8

(1) the administration of government obligatory functions as stated in above article 7 point (2) should be based on Minimum Service Standards, stipulated by government and implemented in steps.

Points in the ELUCIDATION of Government Regulation 38/2007 on Central and Local Government Authorities

Article 8

Point (1)
Since the feasibility of local governments budget are limited, therefore the enactment and implementation of Minimum Service Standards concerning the local government obligatory functions should be carried out in steps by prioritizing the most important sub sector of related obligatory functions.

...
c. Some Important Point of Law 20/2003 on National Education System Concerning MSS

Article 51
(1) The administration of early, elementary and secondary education institutions should be based on Minimum Service Standards and by considering school based management principles.

d. Some Points of Government Regulation 19/2005 on National Standards of Education

Part Two
Governance Standards in Local Government
Article 59
(1) Local government proposes annual education planning and budgeting by prioritizing the following programs;
   a. compulsory education;
   b. increasing primary and junior secondary education participation rates;
   c. illiteracy eradication;
   d. quality assurance for education institution managed by local government or community private foundations;
   e. improving the status of the teaching profession;
   f. education accreditation;
   g. improving educational relevancy to meet community needs;
   h. fulfilling Minimum Service Standards (MSS) in the education sector;
(2) The annual planning as stated in point (1) above should be approved by and be accountable to the Governor or district head as required by current regulation.

Part Three
Governance Standards in Central Government
Article 60
Government propose annual education planning and budgeting by prioritizing the following programs;
   a. compulsory education;
   b. increasing secondary and higher education participation rates;
   c. completing illiteracy eradication;
   d. quality assurance for education institution managed by local government or community private foundations;
   e. improving teachers status as a profession;
   f. improving lecturers quality;
   g. education standardization;
   h. education accreditation;
   i. improving educational relevancy to meet local, national and global needs;
   j. fulfilling Minimum Service Standards (MSS) in education sector and
   k. National education quality assurance.
**e. Important points from the Government Regulation 65/2004 On Minimum Service Standards (MSS)**

1. Minimum Service Standard (MSS) is a regulation on what minimal basic services to citizens should be delivered by local government and the standard to which they should be delivered.

2. Obligatory functions are government functions related to the rights and basic services enacted by laws or regulations for local government institution to protect the constitutional, national security, community welfare, and public order rights of the citizen to guarantee national unity and to fulfill the commitments required by national or international conventions.

3. Basic services are all public services needed to fulfill all citizen needs in social, economical, and constitutional life.

4. MSS indicators are quantitative and qualitative achievement describing MSS targets covering the input, process, output and impact of the services.

5. Ministries from each sector should propose MSS drafts in consultation with MOHA before they are enacted as a Decree by the respective Ministry. This draft must include clear guidelines.

6. MSS must be referred to by all local governments in preparing sectoral planning including targets and timelines, based on their resources.

7. Each Ministry shall ensure and supervise the MSS implementation in each province; while Provincial governments supervise their respective district and municipal government.

8. Within three years after Government Regulation 65/2004 stipulation (by the end of 2008), MSS for all sectors should have been formulated and stipulated by all respective ministerial sectors including MSS for MONE.
12. MSS DEVELOPMENT FLOWCHART (Based on Government Regulation 65/2005 on MSS) illustrating some of the complexities of decentralization and the development of MSS

MSS regulation mandates that each Ministry within the Indonesian government should formulate and implement its MSS regulations by the end of 2008. But for many reasons, mainly for the complexity of process and procedure in developing the MSS standards and approval processes, the education MSS would not be enacted until 2010.

This exhibit shows a diagram based on Government Regulation 65/2005 on MSS illustrating some of the complexities on decentralization and the development of MSS. It can be seen that all tiers of government are involved. Having so many higher institutions in the central government involved also contributes to complexity.

The formulation of MSS indicators are even more complicated when the MSS team members viewed MSS from different angels: decentralization (based on Government Regulation 38/2007 on decentralization) and education standards (based on Government Regulation 19/2005 on National Standards of Education) as discussed in chapter 4; Designing MSS.
MSS DEVELOPMENT FLOWCHART (Based on Government Regulation 65/2005 on MSS) illustrating some of the complexities on decentralization and the development of MSS
13. **Proposed DEO MSS Conceptual Framework by researcher based on preliminary research and government regulations**

Based on my preliminary research and relevant government regulations, a conceptual framework for MSS development was proposed. Respondents or DEO stakeholders proposed five major factors influencing DEO service quality; personnel, facility, funding, management and external factors. On the other hand, government regulation states that MSS should comprise three components; input, process and output.

Based on the above findings, a conceptual framework for MSS was proposed as shown in this exhibit.
Proposed DEO MSS Conceptual Framework by researcher based on preliminary research and government regulations

Three Dimensions of DEO Minimum Service Standard (MSS)

- **EXTERNAL**
- **INPUT**
  - HUMAN
  - FINANCE
  - FACILITIES
- **PROCES**
  - ORGANIZATION
  - MANAGEMENT
- **OUTPUT**
  - DELIVERY OF OBLIGATORY FUNCTION
- **OUTCOME OR IMPACT**
  - SCHOOL AND SCHOOLING QUALITY CONTROL
14. Expected Improvements/Changes as an impact of MSS

The following photographs show how an MSS policy could contribute to improving education quality at the grassroots level; schools.

Better school facilities not only show better DEO service quality, but at the end also show the positive impact of a successful decentralization policy.

These pictures were taken in different schools in Java and Sumatera in 2005 showing the impact of the school rehabilitation program.
Expected Improvements/Changes as an impact of MSS

It is planned that poor classrooms will disappear and better classrooms will be available everywhere as the impact of MSS implementation spreads across Indonesia.

A classroom before MSS was implemented

A rehabilitated classroom
Better teaching and learning processes should happen in every elementary and secondary school if MSS is implemented properly in every DEO and school.

Teaching and learning activity before MSS was implemented

A better teaching and learning activity
As a result of MSS implementation, school is a better place for learning and playing, this is a sign of better education and DEO service quality.

A school before implementing MSS

A better school playground
Prior to meeting MSS National Team, I had already proposed by own DEO MSS based on preliminary research and many DEO stakeholders were willing to implement it. But I was reminded that as a government official I needed to propose the MSS draft to the central government for approval.

Fortunately I met the MSS National Team, which finally changed my perceptions on MSS procedures and indicators based on collective opinions and perceptions. At first I believed that MSS should focus on DEOs, but the team suggested focusing on the school level. A compromise solution was found, MSS for both DEO and school level as shown by exhibit 19 and 25 in this portfolio. (See chapter 5; Reflecting on the Research Journey.)
My Proposed DEO MSS:

PROPOSED FIRST MINIMUM SERVICE STANDARD (MSS) IN EDUCATION AT THE DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICE (DEO) LEVEL

(This is based on my preliminary research and relevant GOI regulations.)
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MINIMUM SERVICE STANDARD (MSS) IN EDUCATION

AT THE DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICE (DEO) LEVEL

A. Background and Rationale

The following is a proposed Minimum Service Standard (MSS) for Formal Education as a contribution to revising of the current MSS (the Decree of the Ministry of National Education number 129a/U/2004). The following proposed MSS at the district level is based on my research findings. My research findings concluded that the current MSS in education is no longer relevant due to its incomplete content. The current content of MSS covers output only and thus does not include input and process should be done in DEO level. In addition, the Government Regulation number 65/2005 on Guidelines to Produce Minimum Service Standard requires that MSS shall cover components of input, process, and output. Lately, the new Government Regulation number 38/2007 on Division of Obligatory Functions between Central, Province, and District Governments requires that the current MSS be adjusted to this new Regulation. Furthermore, DEOs are obliged by Government Regulation 19/2005 to reach National Education Standards.

B. Definitions

The following terms are defined as they are used in this proposed Minimum Service Standard (MSS) process:

1. Minimum Service Standard (MSS) is a regulation on what and how good basic services should be delivered by local government (Province and District/Municipal) as their obligatory function to fulfill the minimum rights of citizen. It contains a criterion of types and quality of basic services delivered by DEO based on its obligatory functions to fulfill school needs in order for schools to be able to deliver basic
education needs of children in accordance with the rights of every citizen for education. Thus, the DEO
has to have the ability to fulfill its obligatory functions in satisfying education needs of children.

2. Obligatory functions are government functions related to the rights and basic services enacted by laws or
regulations for local government institution to protect the constitutional, national security, community
welfare, and public order rights of the citizen to guarantee the national unity and to fulfill commitments
related to national or international conventions.

3. Basic services are all public services needed to fulfill all citizen needs in social, economical, and
constitutional life including education.

4. MSS indicators are quantitative and qualitative achievement describing MSS targets covering the input,
process, output and impact (outcome) of the services.

5. Inputs are resources (human, financial, material) required by the district education office to undertake or
enable the processes to take place and to produce the desired outputs.

6. Processes, as the hearts of the education infrastructure at the district education office, are the group of
tasks carried out using required inputs to produce the desired outputs. Generally, all activities under
management or administrative terms are considered as process.

7. Outputs are goods or services delivered by DEO based on its authority or obligatory functions mandated
by the decentralization law or regulation grouped into; policy, funding, curriculum, facility, personnel, and
quality control in education.

8. Outcomes are education performance/achievement delivered by the district education offices to school
level as measured by access/equity and quality.

9. Equity reflects the fairness of distribution of education resources, opportunities and/or outcomes across
relevant categories such as school, income classes, social classes, ethnic group, and sex as measured by
gross enrollment rate, net enrollment rate, dropout rate, and transition rate.

10. Quality is the educational value that is added by the education system, i.e. gains in achievement as a result
of education process and usually measured by national examination and school examination scores.

C. Scope of MSS in Education at the DEO Level

The scope of MSS in education at the DEO level shall include input, process, and output in accordance with the
The following MSS is written with the reference of the Government Regulation number 19/2005 on National
Education Standard containing eight (8) standards, namely: graduate competency standard, content/curriculum
standard, process standard, personnel (teachers and school administrators), finance, facility, management, and
learning assessment. The following proposed MSS is also written with reference to the Government Regulation
number 38/2007 on Division of Obligatory Functions between Central, Province, and District Governments (PP
38/2007) contains the following dimensions of obligatory functions, namely: policy, funding, curriculum,
facility, personnel, and quality control in education. Consequently, the following MSS is made with references to the Law 32/2004 on Local Governance, Government Regulations 65/2005 on MSS, 19/2005 on National Education Standard, and 38/2007 on Division of Obligatory Functions between Central, Province, and District Governments, respectively.

The following Figure 1 outline the scope of MSS in accordance with PP 65/2005 covering dimensions of input, process, and output with reference to dimensions of obligatory functions (PP 38/2007). To implement all of obligatory functions, many organization elements are needed and then categorized into input, process, and output. The input includes human, financial, and material resources as well as client demand quality. The process covers management quality, leadership quality, professional or technical quality, and service quality dimensions. The output includes directions, guidance, DEO regulations, monitoring and evaluation, and education performance e.g. access/equity and quality as it is mandated by DEO obligatory functions. The outcome is the benefit of DEO services received by schools. In a more detail, DEO MSS components and parameters are illustrated in Figure 2 on page 19.

D. MSS for Inputs

MSS for inputs shall include human, financial, and material (software and hardware) required for the implementation of DEO activities that shall be allocated in accordance with adopted policies of this MSS in order to produce the desired outputs. For example:
1. The certificated staff of District Education Office (DEO) including school supervisors shall be recruited, selected, employed, assigned, developed, and evaluated based on Government Regulation Number 19/2005 on National Education Standards without discrimination on the basis of ethnic group, sex, and religion.

2. Capital and operational funds shall be available and adequate to support the DEO staff to undertake activities in order to produce the outputs based on written strategic and operational/annual plans.

3. Facilities and equipment, both software and hardware, shall be available to support DEO staff to undertake the activities in order to produce the outputs. Facilities and equipment shall be adequate, relevant, and updated to enable activities to take place.

4. The DEO staff records covering the number, qualification, competency, and performance evaluation shall be maintained.

5. Recruitment and selection, employment, assignment, development, performance evaluation, and termination shall be processed in accordance with established procedures.

6. The DEO staff attendance and conduct shall be administered in accordance with established procedures.

7. The DEO shall provide the clients (particularly schools) what they want and what they need based on demand-driven approach. Assessment of school needs is therefore required in order to find the real problems/needs and the right solutions or the right services quality.

E. MSS for Processes

MSS for processes shall include management quality, leadership quality, professional or technical quality, and service quality dimensions. For example:

1. 90% of DEO works are well managed in terms of management functions (planning, organizing, actuating, coordinating, and evaluating) in all aspects of education (curriculum, teaching-learning process, personnel, facilities, finance, assessment, student organization, school organization, and school administration.

2. The DEO shall have strong transformative leadership and shall be able to bring about change in staff, institution, and system levels. Staff empowerment shall be undertaken by the DEO leaders.

3. The DEO staff shall undertake the activities professionally based on assigned positions and responsibilities in accordance with written position descriptions.

4. The DEO shall implement service quality dimensions covering: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, competence, courtesy, credibility, security, access, communication, and understanding the customers/clients (Parasuraman et al, 1985: p. 47)
5. Conformance of implementation to design/plan shall be undertaken by the DEO consistently by considering the turbulent changes of environment.

6. The following MSS for process is adopted from Parasuraman et al 1985 (p.47)
   a. Reliability: 95% of DEO staff keeps commitments and performs tasks consistently.
   b. Responsiveness: 95% of DEO staff are aware of and obligated to serve the schools.
   c. Competence: 95% of DEO staff has appropriate skills to perform the service.
   d. Access: 95% of schools are easy to contact or to get to the service required.
   e. Courtesy: 95% of DEO staff is polite, friendly, and client-oriented.
   f. Communication: 95% of DEO staff keeps the schools informed, in understandable terms, and interest in listening to the schools’ concerns.
   g. Credibility: 95% of DEO staff possesses trustworthiness and honesty and reputation.
   h. Security: 95% of DEO staff implements safety and confidentiality.
   i. Understanding: 95% of DEO staff work hard at understanding the schools’ needs and concerns and demonstrate their understanding in action.
   j. Physical tangibles: 95% of physical environment and appearance of staff are perceived positively by the schools.

7. 90% of education policies at the DEO provide clear direction and guidance for schools to increase access and equity, improve quality, and strengthen governance of education.

8. 90% of stakeholders in education at the district level are involved in education policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation.

9. 95% of DEO staff undertake the activities professionally as shown by the service that meets the professionally-assessed needs of the schools

10. 95% of the DEO staff provides the service well by correctly selecting and carrying out the techniques and procedures believed to meet the needs of the schools.

11. 95% of the DEO staff undertakes their obligatory functions with good governance as measured by participation, transparency, accountability, rule enforcement, responsiveness, and professionalism, not to mention all.

Note: The percentage is based on reasonable expectation given the nature of the district.

F. MSS for Outputs (in general)

MSS for outputs contains directions, guidance, DEO regulations, monitoring and evaluation for schools with reference to UU 32/2004, PP 65/2005, PP 19/2005, and PP 38/2007. In addition, an MSS output also contains three basic education objectives/pillars: increased access and equity, improved quality, and strengthened governance at the district level. The DEO education system performance is measured against these three basic education objectives/pillars. Specifically, the MSS for outputs in these three basic education pillars shall
include: gross enrollment rate, net enrollment rate, drop-out rate, completion rate, transition rate, and national examination score. However, considering the relationship between DEO and school as a chain of service, MSS for DEO output may contain inputs and processes for the schools because school inputs and processes are affected by DEO outputs. For example:

1. The DEO shall have clear goals, purposes, and expected education outputs to provide directions for education policy, planning, programs and daily operations of the DEO as well as for the schools.
2. The DEO shall provide clear district education policies on how to increase access and equity, improve quality, and strengthen governance in education.
3. 90% of education policies at the DEO provide clear directions and guidance for schools to increase access and equity, improve quality, and strengthen governance of education.
4. The DEO shall provide clear guidance to its staff and schools on how to increase access and equity, improve quality, and strengthen governance of education. The guidance can be in the forms of, for example, effective communication, training/workshop, written guidelines, standard operating procedures, to mention just a few.
5. Through dissemination, facilitation, support and empowerment, 80% of district schools implement National Education Standards.
6. 80% of kindergarten, primary and secondary education, and non-formal education are well managed, well planned, well financed, and well delivered.
7. Each DEO shall have at least one well managed, well planned, well financed, and well delivered internationally recognized school for primary, junior secondary, general senior secondary and vocational secondary school.
8. A new school may be established and operated, and existing schools may be amalgamated in accordance with the existing procedures.
9. Each DEO shall have at least one locally based potential school for primary, junior secondary, general senior secondary and vocational secondary school.
10. Each school shall be evaluated at least once every five years to determine compliance with the National Education Standards which assess graduate competency standards, content/curriculum standards, process standards, personnel (teachers and school administrators, finance, facility, management, and learning assessment.
11. Each DEO shall update education data annually using an education management information system (EMIS), and EMIS shall be implemented, sufficiently financed and well sustained.
12. Based on its authorities (obligatory functions), the DEO shall be able to provide sufficient financial support to all primary, junior secondary, general senior secondary, and vocational senior secondary schools as well as non-formal education in its area.
13. 100% of school level curriculum dissemination shall be done by the DEO
14. 90% of school level curriculum development at primary, junior secondary, general senior secondary, and vocational senior secondary schools shall be well facilitated, coordinated and well supervised.
15. 90% of instructional materials, facilities, and equipment shall support attainment of standards specified for each subject matter.

16. Appropriate school facilities shall be available in all schools to accommodate the enrollment and to achieve the national education standards.

17. 90% of school facilities, equipment, books, and other soft and hardware shall be well used, well supervised, well reported, and well followed-up.

18. 90% of educational personnel at the schools shall be well managed in terms of personnel planning based on real needs, recruitment and selection, placement, utilization, development, transfer, welfare, termination, and pension.

19. National examinations provision at the schools is well implemented, well financed due to assistance, facilitation and coordination from the DEO.

20. 80% of district schools (primary, junior secondary, senior secondary (general and vocational) are well accredited.

21. 90% of district schools (primary, junior secondary, and senior secondary (general and vocational) shall assure the quality of inputs, process, and outputs.

G: MSS for Output (in Detail)

DEO MSS output could also be monitored or evaluated using details drawn from DEO Obligatory Functions mandated by Government Regulation 38/2005 as follows:

1. Framework for Policy Formulation and function
   a. Formulating District education policy in accordance to Provincial and National policy
   b. Designing formal (early, elementary, secondary) and non formal education operational planning in accordance to provincial and national strategic planning
   c. Disseminating and implementing national education standard in district level;
   d. Managing and administering formal (early, elementary, secondary) and non formal education;
   e. Issuing or holding formal (elementary, secondary) and non formal education foundation permits/license
   f. Managing and administering district’s internationally standard elementary school
   g. Issuing or holding elementary, secondary education based on local excellence foundation permits/license
   h. Managing and or administering locally based excellent elementary and secondary education
   i. Provide resources support to higher education administration
   j. Internationally standard education monitoring and evaluation
   k. Data updating and managing district’s education information system
2. Financing
   a. Provide necessary funding for administering early, elementary, secondary and non formal education based on district’s authority
   b. Provide quality assurance funding based on district’s authority

3. Curriculum
   a. Basic education curriculum development coordinating and supervising;
   b. Disseminating of Early, elementary, secondary education basic structure;
   c. Disseminating and implementing standard of content and standard of competence in basic education;
   d. Disseminating and facilitating early and basic education curriculum implementation
   e. Supervising basic education curriculum implementation

4. Facilities

   Supervising early, elementary, secondary and non formal education basic facility construction

   a. Supervising the utilization of education building and facility
   b. Supervising early, elementary, secondary and non formal education books utilization

5. Education Personnel
   a. Planning early, elementary, secondary and non formal education personnel needs based on valid data as mandated by district’s function
   b. Recruiting and distributing early, elementary, secondary and non formal civil service education personnel based on district authority
   c. Administering educational civil service personnel mutation within district area
   d. Improving early, elementary, secondary and non formal education personnel welfare, appreciation and protection
   e. Managing and developing early, elementary, secondary and non formal education personnel
   f. Dismissing early, elementary, secondary and non formal civil service education personnel due to violation of regulations.
6. Education Quality Assurance

Student Achievement/National Examination

a. Administering elementary, secondary and non formal examination
b. Coordinating, Facilitating, monitoring and evaluating the school examination implementation
c. Provide adequate funding to administer school examinations in the district.

Evaluation

a. Administering evaluation of early, elementary, secondary and non formal education providers at district level
b. Implementing early, elementary, secondary and non formal education national standards at district level

Accreditation

Assisting government in formal and non formal education accreditation

Quality Assurance

a. Supervising and facilitating early, elementary, secondary and non formal education in assuring education quality to meet national education standards
b. Supervising and facilitating international quality education to assure national education standards are met
c. Supervising and facilitating locally based excellence in education by assuring its quality
d. Evaluating the implementation and impact of education quality assurance at the district level.
H. MSS for Outcome Based on Types and Levels of Schools

All of DEO outcomes are also meant to improve input, process, and output quality at schools level as follow:

1. Elementary Schools
   a. Input
      1). All schools develop annual, mid-term, and long term realistic plans involving school stakeholders.
      2). 90% of curriculum and instruction shall be characterized by systematic planning, implementation, and evaluation.
      3). 90% of schools have necessary curriculum documents: curriculum structure, syllabuses, lesson plans, textbooks, and instructional materials
      4). 90% of teachers possess or are working toward S1/D4 degrees.
      5). 90% of school principals possess S1/D4 with strong school management and leadership skills
      6). 90% of schools have necessary facilities that accommodate the enrollment and support the teaching and learning process (laboratories, equipment, library, etc.)
      7). 90% of schools have necessary funds to operate both the strategic and operational school plans

   b. Process
      1). 95% of teachers develop, implement, and evaluate lessons plans progressively.
      2). 90% of schools employ student active, effective, creative, cooperative, enjoyable, contextual/realistic, and mastery learning.
      3). 95% of classes begin and close as schedule and time on task is above 95%.
      4). 95% of classrooms use learning materials and textbooks regularly.
      5). 90% of school committees contribute to schools significantly in the forms of financial, material, and in-kind supports.
      6). 100% of schools implement school based management innovatively.
      7). 75% of schools implement situational and transformational leadership.
      8). 95% of schools conduct learning evaluation and school evaluation.
c. **Output**

1. 100% gross enrollment rate (GER) for children aged 7-12 years.
2. 95% net enrollment rate (NER) for children aged 7-12 years.
3. 100% of elementary school students complete schooling.
4. 100% transition rate for elementary school students.
5. Dropout rate is less than 2%
6. 0% repetition rate for elementary school students
7. 75% of elementary school students receive average score 7 on national examination (scale 0-10).
8. 75% of school receive accreditation at “the good and excellent levels”
9. DEO has at least one locally based excellent elementary school
10. DEO has at least one internationally recognized standard school

2. **Junior Secondary Schools**

a. **Input**

1. All schools develop annual, mid-term, and long term realistic plans involving school stakeholders.
2. 90% of curriculum and instruction shall be characterized by systematic planning, implementation, and evaluation.
3. 90% of schools have necessary curriculum documents: curriculum structure, syllabuses, lesson plans, textbooks, and instructional materials
4. 100% of teachers possess or working toward S1/D4 degrees.
5. 95% of school principals possess S1/D4 with strong school management and leadership
6. 95% of schools have necessary facilities that accommodate the enrollment and support teaching learning process to take place (laboratories, equipment, library, etc.)
7. 90% of schools have necessary funds to operate both the strategic and operational school plans

b. **Process**

1. 95% of teachers develop, implement, and evaluate lessons plans progressively.
2. 90% of schools employ student active, effective, creative, cooperative, enjoyable, contextual/realistic, and mastery learning.
3. 95% of classes begin and close as schedule and time on task is above 95%.
4. 95% of classrooms use learning materials and textbooks regularly.
5. 90% of school committees contribute to schools significantly in the forms of financial, material, and in-kind supports.
6). 100% of schools implement school based management innovatively.
7). 75% of schools implement situational and transformational leadership.
8). 95% of schools conduct learning evaluation and school evaluation.

c. **Output**
1). 95% gross enrollment rate (GER) for children aged 13-15 years.
2). 85% net enrollment rate (NER) for children aged 13-15 years.
3). 100% of school students complete schooling.
4) 75% transition rate for junior secondary school students.
5) Dropout rate is less than 2%
6) 0% repetition rate for elementary school students
7) 75% of school students receive average score 7 on national examination (scale 0-10).
8) 80% of school receive accreditation at “the good and excellent levels”
9) DEO has at least one locally based excellent Junior secondary school
10) DEO has at least one internationally recognized standard school

3. **Senior General Secondary Schools**
   a. **Input**
1). All schools develop annual, mid-term, and long term realistic plans involving school stakeholders.
2). 90% of curriculum and instruction shall be characterized by systematic planning, implementation, and evaluation.
3). 90% of schools have necessary curriculum documents: curriculum structure, syllabuses, lesson plans, textbooks, and instructional materials
4). 100% of teachers possess or working toward S1/D4 degrees.
5). 100% of school principals posses S1/D4 with strong school management and leadership
6). 90% of schools have necessary facilities that accommodate the enrollment and support teaching learning process to take place (laboratories, equipment, library, etc.)
7). 90% of schools have necessary funds to operate both the strategic and operational school plans
b. Process
1). 95% of teachers develop, implement, and evaluate lessons plans progressively.
2). 90% of schools employ student active, effective, creative, cooperative, enjoyable, contextual/realistic, and mastery learning.
3). 95% of classes begin and close as schedule and time on task is above 95%.
4). 95% of classrooms use learning materials and textbooks regularly.
5). 90% of school committees contribute to schools significantly in the forms of financial, material, and in-kind supports.
6). 100% of schools implement school based management innovatively.
7). 75% of schools implement situational and transformational leadership.
8). 95% of schools conduct learning evaluation and school evaluation.

c. Output
1). 85% gross enrollment rate (GER) for children aged 16-18 years.
2). 70% net enrollment rate (NER) for children aged 16-18 years.
3). 95% of school students complete schooling.
4). % transition rate for elementary school students.
5). Dropout rate is less than 2%
6). 0% repetition rate for elementary school students.
7). 75% of school students receive average score 7 on national examination (scale 0-10).
8). 80% of school receive accreditation at “the good and excellent levels”
9). DEO has at least one locally based excellent senior secondary school
10). DEO has at least one internationally recognized standard school

4. Senior Vocational Secondary Schools
a. Input
1). All schools develop annual, mid-term, and long term realistic plans involving school stakeholders.
2). 90% of curriculum and instruction shall be characterized by systematic planning, implementation, and evaluation.
3). 90% of schools have necessary curriculum documents: curriculum structure, syllabuses, lesson plans, textbooks, and instructional materials
4). 100% of teachers possess or working toward S1/D4 degrees.
5). 100% of school principals posses S1/D4 with strong school management and leadership
6). 90% of schools have necessary facilities that accommodate the enrollment and support teaching learning process to take place (laboratories, equipment, library, etc.)
7). 95% of schools have necessary funds to operate both the strategic and operational school plans

b. Process
1). 95% of teachers develop, implement, and evaluate lessons plans progressively.
2). 95% of schools employ student active, effective, creative, cooperative, enjoyable, contextual/realistic, and mastery learning.
3). 95% of classes begin and close as schedule and time on task is above 95%.
4). 95% of classrooms use learning materials and textbooks regularly.
5). 90% of school committees contribute to schools significantly in the forms of financial, material, and in-kind supports.
6). 100% of schools implement school based management innovatively.
7). 75% of schools implement situational and transformational leadership.
8). 100% of schools conduct learning evaluation and school evaluation.

c. Output
1). 85% gross enrollment rate (GER) for children aged 7-12 years.
2). 70% net enrollment rate (NER) for children aged 7-12 years.
3). 95% of school students complete schooling.
4). 70% transition rate for elementary school students.
5). Dropout rate is less than 1%
6). 0% repetition rate for school students
7). 75% of school students receive average score 7 on national examination (scale 0-10).
8). 80% of school receive accreditation at “the good and excellent levels”
9). DEO has at least one locally based excellent senior vocational secondary school
10) DEO has at least one internationally recognized standard school
SERVICE CAPACITY

1. Human resources. Adequate Number and Quality personnel for DEO and Schools
2. Financial resources. Sufficient funding for DEO and schools
3. Material resources Proper facility (buildings and equipment) in DEO and schools
4. Client demands. Available current school profiles and their immediate needs
5. Relevant Regulations

SERVICE SKILL

- Management quality
  1. planning,
  2. organizing,
  3. actuating,
  4. evaluating,
  5. controlling
- Leadership quality
- Good governance
- Technical quality
- Service quality
  - Tangible, Responsive, Reliable,
  - Empathy, Assurance

SERVICE DELIVERY

DEO performances based on DEOs obligatory functions (Government Regulation 38/2007);

1. policy,
2. funding,
3. curriculum,
4. facility,
5. personnel, and
6. quality control in education.

SERVICE OUTCOME

Schools Quality based on Government Regulation 19/2005 (National Education Standard) and its ministerial decree;

1. graduate competency standard,
2. content/curriculum standard,
3. process standard,
4. personnel (teachers and school administrators),
5. finance,
6. facility,
7. management, and
8. learning assessment

Figure: Parameters of DEO Minimum Service Standard (MSS)
H. How to Implement MSS at DEO level based on this research and relevant regulations

According to Government Regulation 65/2005 on Guidelines for Minimum Service Standard, at national level, each ministry should propose MSS for its respective sector. In this case, MONE should propose a complete Education MSS for formal and informal education for provincial and district/municipal levels. Since the Indonesian decentralization process is focused on the district/municipal level, this product focuses on MSS for DEO level.

1. Ministries from each sector should propose MSS drafts in consultation with MOHA before it is enacted as a Decree by the respective Ministry. This draft must include clear guidelines.
2. Approved MSS proposal should be enacted by respective ministry, in this case MSS in education in enacted using National Education Ministerial Decree.
3. This ministerial decree on Education MSS must be referred as a guideline by all local governments in formulating, targeting and implementing MSS in education by enacting local government decree either in provincial and or district/municipal level.
4. The MSS targets should also be considered in preparing education planning including its targets and timelines based on their available resources.
5. Each Ministry shall ensure and supervise the MSS implementation in each province; while provincial governments shall supervise their respective district and municipal governments.
6. Since the capacity of about 450 district/municipalities varies from place to place, some flexibility in setting standards should be given. In this decentralized era, a once fixed for all policy is no longer appropriate. The central government could only standardize the minimum (proper/adequate/basic) requirements in order for DEOs to plan their own targets in delivering services to satisfy school needs. In return this would improve education at the school level. This is why MSS indicators should be formulated as simple, concrete, easy to measure, open, attainable, accountable and as time bounded as possible.
Phase Two: FORMULATING A SOLUTION
Working with the MSS team
16. Survey forms for gathering MSS main indicators to be used in Elementary education (developed by MSS Team, early 2008)

Formulating MSS indicators was a real challenge. What factors contribute most to the improvement of education quality in school level was the first question to be answered. The NSE proposed about 700 indicators for education quality, but to implement them all throughout Indonesia would be an impossible practice. That is why the accreditation system only adopts about 130 indicators depending on the school level. MSS as the minimum standards should adopt simple, fewer but more significant indicators for improving education service quality.

This exhibit shows the elementary school basic indicators drawn from the NSE and accreditation system. These indicators were placed in a format for stakeholders to select which indicators they considered as the most influential factors for improving education quality. In several FGDs the formats were distributed and discussed, respondents were asked to explain whether indicators were considered to be; 1 (important), 2 (less important) and 3 (not important).
Survey for gathering MSS main indicators to be used in elementary education (developed by MSS Team, early 2008)

### SPM SD/MI - Isi Pembelajaran

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Komponen SNP</th>
<th>Prioritas Berdasarkan Relevansi dan Urgensi Bagi Peningkatan Kualitas Pembelajaran</th>
<th>Keterangan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Struktur Kurikulum dan Waktu Belajar

- a. Kurikulum SD/MI memuat 8 mata pelajaran, muatan lokal, dan pengembangan diri.
- b. Pembelajaran IPA dan IPS pada SD/MI dilaksanakan sebagai “IPA Terpadu” dan “IPS Terpadu”.

### Struktur Kurikulum SD/MI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Komponen</th>
<th>Kelas dan Alokasi Waktu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Mata Pelajaran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pendidikan Agama</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bahasa Indonesia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Matematika</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Seni Budaya dan Keterampilan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pendidikan Jasmani, Olahraga dan Kesehatan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Muatan Lokal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Pengembangan Diri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2'</td>
<td>2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUMLAH</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Ekuivalen 2 jam pembelajaran
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Komponen SNP</th>
<th>Prioritas Berdasarkan Relevansi dan Urgensi Bagi Peningkatan Kualitas Pembelajaran</th>
<th>Keterangan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. Silabus dan Rencana Pembelajaran:

2. Guru menyiapkan sylabus bagi masing-masing kelas/subyek yang merupakan penjabaran kurikulum.

Guru menyusun dan menginformasikan kepada siswa rancangan pembelajaran dan kriteria penilaian pada awal semester.

### B. Pelaksanaan Proses Pembelajaran

2. Sekurang-kurangnya 24 (dua puluh empat) jam tatap muka dalam 1 (satu) minggu.

Proses pembelajaran dilaksanakan dengan menerapkan berbagai pendekatan, strategi, metode, dan teknik pembelajaran yang mendidik secara kreatif.

Guru menumbuhkan cita-cita dalam diri para siswa dan berusaha secara terus menerus memberikan dorongan untuk mencapainya.

Guru mendorong para siswa untuk selalu berkreasi dan mengembangkan ide-ide baru.

Guru mengakomodasi kemampuan dan minat individu siswa dalam rangka mengembangkan potensi yang ada pada diri siswa.

Alokasi waktu satu jam pembelajaran setidaknya sepanjang 35 menit.

Minggu efektif dalam satu tahun pelajaran (dua semester) adalah 34-38 minggu.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Supervisi Proses Pembelajaran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Kepala sekolah dan/atau pengawas melakukan supervisi proses pembelajaran pada tahap perencanaan, pelaksanaan, dan penilaian hasil pembelajaran dan memberikan umpan balik untuk perbaikan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kepala sekolah dan/atau pengawas melakukan evaluasi terhadap implementasi pembelajaran oleh guru dengan mengacu pada standar kompetensi guru dan standar proses pembelajaran</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. **Survey for gathering MSS main indicators to be used in junior secondary education/SMP (developed by MSS Team, early 2008)**

This exhibit is the survey for Junior Secondary Schools. It is similar to exhibit 16 for elementary schools.
Survey forms for gathering MSS main indicators to be used in junior secondary education/SMP (developed by MSS Team, early 2008)

SPM SMP/MTs - Isi Pembelajaran

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Komponen SNP</th>
<th>Prioritas Berdasarkan Relevansi dan Urgensi Bagi Peningkatan Kualitas Pembelajaran</th>
<th>Keterangan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Struktur Kurikulum dan Waktu Belajar

a. Kurikulum SMP/MTs memuat 10 mata pelajaran, muatan lokal, dan pengembangan diri.

b. Pembelajaran IPA dan IPS pada SMP/MTs dilaksanakan sebagai “IPA Terpadu” dan “IPS Terpadu”.

c. Kegiatan pengembangan diri difasilitasi dan atau dibimbing oleh konselor, guru, atau tenaga kependidikan yang dapat dilakukan dalam bentuk kegiatan ekstrakurikuler.

Struktur Kurikulum SMP/MTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Komponen</th>
<th>Kelas dan Alokasi Waktu</th>
<th>Keterangan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Mata Pelajaran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pendidikan Agama</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bahasa Indonesia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bahasa Inggris</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Matematika</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Seni Budaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pendidikan Jasmani, Olahraga dan Kesehatan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Keterampilan/Teknologi Informasi dan Komunikasi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Muatan Lokal</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Pengembangan Diri</strong></td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jumlah</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2<sup>7</sup> Ekuivalen 2 jam pembelajaran
### Komponen SNP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Komponen SNP</th>
<th>Prioritas Berdasarkan Relevansi dan Urgensi Bagi Peningkatan Kualitas Pembelajaran</th>
<th>Keterangan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A. Silabus dan Rencana Pembelajaran:

2. Guru menyiapkan sylabus bagi masing-masing kelas/subyek yang merupakan penjabaran kurikulum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Guru menyusun dan menginformasikan kepada siswa rancangan pembelajaran dan kriteria penilaian pada awal semester.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Pelaksanaan Proses Pembelajaran

2. Sekurang-kurangnya 24 (dua puluh empat) jam tatap muka dalam 1 (satu) minggu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Proses pembelajaran dilaksanakan dengan menerapkan berbagai pendekatan, strategi, metode, dan teknik pembelajaran yang mendidik secara kreatif.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Guru menumbuhkan cita-cita dalam diri para siswa dan berusaha secara terus menerus memberikan dorongan untuk mencapainya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Guru mendorong para siswa untuk selalu berkreasi dan mengembangkan ide-ide baru.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Guru mengakomodasi kemampuan dan minat individu siswa dalam rangka mengembangkan potensi yang ada pada diri siswa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alokasi waktu satu jam pembelajaran setidaknya sepanjang 40 menit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Minggu efektif dalam satu tahun pelajaran (dua semester) adalah 34-38 minggu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C. Supervisi Proses Pembelajaran

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Deskripsi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Kepala sekolah dan/atau pengawas melakukan supervisi proses pembelajaran pada tahap perencanaan, pelaksanaan, dan penilaian hasil pembelajaran dan memberikan umpan balik untuk perbaikan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kepala sekolah dan/atau pengawas melakukan evaluasi terhadap implementasi pembelajaran oleh guru dengan mengacu pada standar kompetensi guru dan standar proses pembelajaran.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. **How the two views of MSS (Decentralization and Education) finally coincided**

Never did I imagine that soon after joining the MSS team I would face a controversy. Many of the team members believed that MSS should be drawn from education laws and regulations. But I and several team members kept suggesting that MSS should be based on decentralization laws and regulations.

The education and decentralization views controversy finally ended after I formally wrote an email to a consultant assuring her at least there should be a compromise for MSS. For a win-win solution MSS should comprise two different indicators; for DEOs and schools. The consultant’s agreement was then emailed to the other MSS team member. For ethics reasons named were hidden.

From that time on, MSS is seen from two different angles; DEOs (based on decentralization principles) and schools (based on NSE principles) as shown in this exhibit. For detail discussions please see chapter 4, designing MSS.
How the two views of MSS (Decentralization and Education) finally compromised
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed MSS to be the direct responsibility of district PP 30/2007</th>
<th>Proposed MSS to be the direct responsibility of school PP 19/2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Develop and support schools for curriculum development</td>
<td>Minimum hours of face to face teaching provided to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum hours of professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher lesson preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s meeting and assessment program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School programme to support student daily attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher and Educational personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervision ratio</td>
<td>Code of conduct for teachers and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher/student ratio</td>
<td>Regular attendance of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Qualifications of teachers</td>
<td>Observation of teaching and provision of feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Qualifications of Principals and Master Teachers</td>
<td>Teachers’ minimum hours of duty 40 = 2 or 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Qualifications of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities and equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Access to schools</td>
<td>Number of Text Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Standards for building safety and quality</td>
<td>Number of enrichment materials and reference books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sufficient classroom furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of toilets and washrooms and handwashing stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provision of classroom furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Science and Science Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budgeting/funding and Policy/Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Evidence of planning and resource allocation for MSS</td>
<td>School committee/PTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Plan directed to achievement of SNP and national goals</td>
<td>Annual plan and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation structure and job descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update statistics and report to district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education quality control</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of Supervisors visits to schools to improve</td>
<td>Report on learning achievement each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two MSS views met in a matrix. MSS finally defined as a set of indicators for both DEO and school level (Combined MSS components for DEOs and Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed MSS to be the direct responsibility of DEOs based on Govt. Reg. 38/2007 (Decentralization Path)</th>
<th>Proposed MSS to be the direct responsibility of schools based on NSE or Govt. Reg. 19/2005 (Education Path)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Sub Factors/indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Curriculum</td>
<td>District plan and support to schools for curriculum development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learning Process Standard</td>
<td>Minimum hours of face to face teaching provided to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Graduate Competencies</td>
<td>Conduct of exams according to standards and reporting to district and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher and Education Personnel Qualifications and Competencies</td>
<td>Code of conduct for teachers and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Equipment and Infrastructure Standards</td>
<td>Number of Text Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School Management Standards</td>
<td>Number of enrichment materials and reference books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. School Financial and Budgeting Standard and 6. School Management Standards</td>
<td>School committee/PTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Education Evaluation</td>
<td>Report on learning achievement each semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Prepared by MSS Team, January 2009)
19. MSS Draft Indicators (Version 1, May 13, 2009);

After passing many different activities, the MSS team was finally agreed to propose a first draft of MSS. This first draft consists of 35 indicators; 14 indicators related to DEOs and 21 to school level, as shown in this exhibit.
The MSS Draft Indicators (Version May 13, 2009);

These indicators were developed by the MSS Team (Of which I was a senior contributive member) and are based on a process described in the MSS guidelines which are available in Bahasa Indonesia on request. Costing guidelines are also available. I have included one example of these guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Services</th>
<th>No. SPM</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Evidence/measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. MSS for District and City Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy and Planning</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The district/city government has a plan which shows the allocation of human, financial and physical resources and the district targets in order to achieve national RENSTRA targets for education.</td>
<td>Copy of the Plan and budget with targets. Chart or schedule showing allocation of responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities and Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The district provides for all students to have access to schools. Unless there are special local circumstances, each village/community will have a primary school within safe walking distance of 3 km and a junior secondary school within 6 km safe walking distance.</td>
<td>District statistics; school mapping; evidence of demographic planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Each classroom meets technical standards and is furnished with a desk and chair for each student, a teacher desk and chair, board, storage cupboard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The maximum class size for SD/MI should not exceed 32 students. The maximum class size for SD/MI should not exceed 40 students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Each SMP/MT is equipped with a basic Science Laboratory with sufficient desks and chairs for 32 students and at least one set of science equipment for demonstration and observation of experiments.</td>
<td>District register of the condition of schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Each school is provided with at least two wash-rooms, one for males and one for females with operational washing and toilet facilities, at ratio of 1 for every 80 male students and 1 for every 60 female students.</td>
<td>Observation and professional judgment of the Supervisor for each school visited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Each SD/MI is provided with at least one teacher room, furnished with a desk and chairs for every teacher, non-teaching personnel and the school principal; announcement and statistics board, lockable storage cupboard, clock. Each SMP/MTs has a separate Principal’s office with a desk, 3 chairs, lockable cupboard, shelves and clock.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching and Education personnel</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Each SD/MI provides one teacher for every 32 students, and at least 4 teachers available in each school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each SMP/MTs provides at least one teacher for 40 students and a teacher for each group of subjects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>The district ensures each SD/MI has at least two teachers who meet minimum education qualifications of S-1 or D-IV and hold a teaching certificate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum 40% teachers at SMP/MTs hold education qualification of S-1 or D-IV, and at least half of them (20% of total teachers) holds teaching certificate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Each SMP/MTs provides at least one teacher in each of the core subjects of maths, Science and English who meets appropriate minimum qualifications of S-1 or D-IV and holds the teaching certificate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>At least 50% of all SD/MI principals in the district/city have a minimum education qualification of S-1/D-IV and a teaching certificate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All (100%) principal of SMP/MTs in each district/city holds S-1/D-IV degree, and half of them (50%) hold teaching certificate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>At least 50% of all school supervisors in the district/city have a minimum education qualification of S-1/D-IV and hold teaching certificate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>The district develops and implements a human resource management plan to ensure the capacity of education personnel in the district office to implement the MSS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>The district develops and implements a plan to provide support to schools for curriculum development and effective teaching processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Quality control</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>The school supervisor visit; each school once a month, each visit is a minimum 3 hours for the purpose of monitoring school performance and improvement. The supervisor keeps a record of visits to every school under his/her responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities and Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>SD/MI provides a set of textbooks covering at least four subjects at a ratio of one set for every student.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SMP/MTs provides a set of textbooks covering every subject at a ratio of one set for every two students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>SD/MI provides at least one set of science equipment and resource materials comprising at least – model of human skeleton, model of human body, globe, examples of optical equipment, science equipment for basic experiments and posters for natural science.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>SD/MI provides at least 100 items of enrichment materials and 10 reference books.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMP/MTs provides at least 200 items of enrichment materials and 20 reference books.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The school principal ensures that the school environment is clean and orderly.</td>
<td>Observation of supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching and Education personnel</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>All teachers and education personnel participate in professional development training and meetings relevant to their duties for at least 50 hours per year</td>
<td>School record of professional development verified by Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Each school develops and implements a code of conduct for both students and teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The school principal prepares an organizational structure showing the roles and responsibilities and supervision structure for school principal, teachers and other educational personnel.</td>
<td>Copy of Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Each fulltime teacher must be on duty in the school for 37.5 hours per week, to include face to face teaching, preparing materials and teaching plan, reviewing and grading student tests, and providing consultation to students.</td>
<td>Teachers’ schedules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Students receive teaching instruction for at least for at least 34 weeks per year with face to face teaching as follows – Grades I, 18 hours per week Grades II, 18 hours per week Grades III, 24 hours per week Grades IV-VI, 27 hours per week Grades VII – IX, 27 hours per week</td>
<td>School Calendar. Teachers’ Schedules and class timetables.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The school principal implements programs to ensure regular daily attendance of teachers.</td>
<td>Evidence of sign-on book, letters and instructions to staff verified by Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The principal and all teachers implement programs to ensure regular daily attendance of all students.</td>
<td>Attendance records. Evidence of follow-up on poor attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>The school and madrasah develop school level curriculum (KTSP) in accordance with the pertaining regulation.</td>
<td>Copy of KTSP document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Each teacher prepares syllabi for every subject and class taught outlining the content, objectives and a range of motivational strategies, teaching methods and student activities suited to the ability level and interests of students.</td>
<td>Evidence of syllabi – signed by the Principal. Supervisor inspects a sample.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Each teacher develops learning assessment program which includes observation, assignments, short tests and regular feedback and remediation for students to assist them to improve their learning.</td>
<td>Principal signs off. Supervisor inspects sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum/Teaching and Education Personnel</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>The school principal updates school statistics and reports them to the Dinas education at district/city annually.</td>
<td>Copy of the Report received by District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The school principal undertakes classroom observation and maintains a record of his/her observation and provides feedback to each teacher on their performance in accordance with teachers’ competency standards and education process standards, at least twice per semester.</td>
<td>Copy of Principal’s record of visits and copy of advice provided to teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Each teacher reports assessment results for each student in</td>
<td>School Assessment record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The school principal reports the results of midyear and final exams to parents and the Dinas at the end of the semester.</td>
<td>Copy of Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Each school has an elected school committee or PTA which actively functions as a partner in the development of school policies, plans and budget.</td>
<td>Minutes of meetings; other records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Each school has an Annual Plan including the Annual Budget and Maintenance Plan.</td>
<td>Copy of the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The school principal prepares an annual report on teaching and learning in the school and the operational and investment expenditures at the end of the academic year.</td>
<td>Copy of the Annual Report, including Financial Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase Three:

GARNERING SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION
20. CONSULTATION MINUTES

As required by the MSS regulation, the process for MSS formulation should follow the steps shown in exhibit 12. At this point, I and the team members had been able to formulate the first draft of MSS. The next challenging process would be sharing this draft with senior personnel from central government offices (MONE, MOHA, MORA, MOF and BAPPENAS) to gain their support and approval.

This exhibit shows minutes taken from each consultation, and from these minutes themes detailed in chapter 4 (Consulting with Policy Makers) emerged. The emerging themes were then carefully considered to formulate and implement the MSS in education.

Note: For ethics reasons names were hidden.
CONSULTATION MINUTES

As will be noted, the consultation process was comprehensive and time consuming. Most MSS Team members attended all consultation meetings. (I chaired many of these meetings). These consultations took place in Jakarta and covered fifteen senior officials from MONE, MORA, MOHA and BAPPENAS. (For ethics reasons, not all respondents’ names are indicated).

Detail of all meetings have been included in the portfolio to indicate the wide range of responses and the strong support for the concept of MSS. These are my records and often, they are in note form.

CONSULTATION 1

Person: Dr. Hamid Muhammad PNFI (Director General for Non formal and Informal Education)
Place: Building E 3rd Floor Ministry of National Education Office
Date/Time: November 28 2008/13.30
Attended: Malik, Hetty, Kiri, Tarum, Agus, Aly.
Method: Un-structured interview

Points:

1. MMS for formal education first, non formal is formulated later. Would it be better to separated or integrated? If related to Compulsory education, it is better integrated.
2. Authorities in education sector is hold by the three parties;
   a. Government (central-provincial and district)
   b. School
   c. And family or community
3. MSS should be more explicit either for school or for DEO
4. To improve enrollment rates, what is the minimum action a district should do?
5. MSS should cover process and input, not only targets
6. MSS should explicitly states targets for each level of governance; central, provincial and district and what strategy or how to achieve it. What is DEO responsibilities
7. There should be a clear connection between NSE, MSS and Accreditation
8. Define only the basic, general standard. Let the districts do on their own for the rest
   a. Drop out
   b. Transition
   c. Exams
   d. Readiness
   e. Buildings
   f. Basic needs of schools
9. Basic needs for schools must be provided first before testing them
10. Relate to DEO responsibility to achieve targets
11. MSS target for MONE, PEO and DEO are set, define in RENSTRA/RENSTRADA to work out and achieve it
12. When enacted, juklak or guidelines is needed
13. Relate MSS to performance management of units
14. ADA (average daily attendance), whose responsibility is this?
15. Remember only 63% JSE have electricity
16. Check on teacher law, what a DEO should do? Qualification, welfares, training?
17. It is most difficult to change bureaucrats attitude/mind set
CONSULTATION 2

Person: Prof. Dr. Suyanto PhD (Director General for Primary and Secondary Education)

Place: Building E 5th Floor Ministry of National Education Office

Date/Time: November 28 2008/15.30

Attended: Malik, Hetty, Kiri, Tarum, Agus, Aly.

Method: Un-structured interview

Points:

1. MSS enacted once for all or steps by steps based on the real districts conditions
2. MSS concerns:
   a. What should be happening in schools
   b. What should be delivered/given to schools
      In order for schools quality to improve continuously,

   In other word to improve schools and districts MSS continually

3. Don’t forget madrasah in DEPAG’s authority
4. For buildings and facilities, consider PU (Public Works) standards → adopt it
5. MSS should ensure:
   a. The right person in the right place
   b. Personnel change should be limited/avoided to maintain the continuous program
   c. Little things are schools responsibility, big things is DEOs
   d. Ensure healthy and conducive school environments: no smoking, greened with plantation or gardens.
   e. Established the position of accreditation, NSE and MSS
6. Public or communities are over expected to the 20% education budget of all national or regional budget as mandated by education law 20/2003
7. MSS states what to do by DEO and schools; what, why and how
8. Time lines; January National workshop, February financing, March disseminating
9. The DG Strongly committed and supports MSS

Note: is praying facility mandatory? Who does the school planning?
CONSULTATION 3

Person: Prof. Dr. Dody PhD (Secretary General for MONE)
Place: Building E 5th Floor Ministry of National Education Office
Date/Time: November 28 2008/13.30
Attended: Malik, Hetty, Kiri, Tarum, Agus, Aly.
Method: Un-structured interview

Points:
1. MSS is a policy instrument to:
   Push and control NSE efforts equally throughout districts all over Indonesia
2. MSS should be Metamorphosis and changing overtimes
3. MSS to map out how districts serve schools/education to give DEO an incentive or a disincentive
4. Instrument to measure DEO level of performance
5. Select only the basic key indicators to represent the other
6. Insert in the main stream of monitoring system. BPS, SMS, Parasmaya (development awards) → BME (Benefit Monitoring Evaluation)
7. Avoid duplication in questionnaires and reporting
8. Involve the function of PEO and DEO
CONSULTATION 4

Person: [Head of School and Madrasah Accreditation Board/BAN-SM]

Place: Gedung BAN-SM Lantai 2 Cipete Jakarta Selatan

Date/Time: December 3, 2008. 14.00

Attended: Hetty, Kiri, Tarum, Agus.

BAN-SM members (Fakry Gafar, Tita, Lestari)

Method: Un-structured interview

Points:

1. MSS as part of government policy in decentralization and autonomy
2. Education authority at the end is hold by DEO who should implemented. Central government ought/must control it.
3. Accreditation instrument is finish for SMA only, the other are still being developed
4. SPM is alive now after being considered dead because the latest regulation could not be implement effectively
5. NSE (SNP) is considered high/ideal, un-affordable. SPM is then important
6. SPM should accommodate the two laws (UU 32 and UU 20 and its PP)
7. SPM is aimed for school under category C → D and E (not accredited)
8. SIASM = Sistem Informasi Akreditasi Sekolah dan Madrasah
9. SPM also functions as accountability system to see the services given by DEO and later on trigger the resources allocation
10. Who will assess SPM?, When? How? → SPM Mechanism, cycle period?
11. Use Accreditation norm of references
12. Define what is considered Minimum, how do we qualify service?

What is the follow up action after accreditation??!!

Never meant MSS as a lowering factor of motivation in developing school quality!!??

Steps should be time framed

Important, how to get the local government supporting MSS, as an accountability mechanism, planning strategy, and funding formulation?
CONSULTATION 5

Person:  [redacted] (Information system coordinator for BAN-SM)

Place:  Griya Astuti, Lembah Nyiur Cisarua Bogor

Date/Time:  December 4, 2008 900

Attended:  Kiri, Tarum, Agus, BAN-SM members from each province

Method:  Observation in BAN-SM Workshop

Un-structured interview

Points:

1. At this moment there are unique number for schools from different institution PSP, JARDIKNAS, Regions; NSS, NIS, NPSN. This creates difficulty in school Data based management.

2. BAN-SM website: [http://www.ban-sm.or.id](http://www.ban-sm.or.id)

3. The web could only figure the accredited schools in each province but could not provide the detail grades of each schools

4. After the enactment of government regulation 19/2004 the accreditation system and module is changed to 8 instead of 9 standards. This change will take time technically and in implementation. At this moment (2008) only SMA is ready

5. There are schools accredited already but by using the old accreditation system

6. So far the system could not provide the summary of school that have been accredited yet

7. Assessors are province based (BAP-SM) instruments are filled out online and manually by school principles and assessor before being visited (assessed). Minimum S1 degree, 2 days visit,
CONSULTATION 6

Person: Director General for Teaching and non Teaching Personnel Quality Improvement (PMPTK)

Place: Gedung F Depdiknas Lantai 17 Senayan

Date/Time: December 5, 2008

Attended: Hetty, Kiri, Tarum, Agus,

Sumarna Pranata (Director for Training and development), Surya Darma (Dir for Education Personnel), Giri Suryatmana (secretary Directorate General), Maria Widiani (Deputy Dir), Abi Sujak (Dep Dir), Mas Harisanyoto (Dep Dir), Horas Situmorang (Dep Dir),

Method: Discussion

Points:

1. SPM = what should be done or given/delivered by district and school for minimum teaching learning process to happen?
2. The forum checking the MMS items one by one
   a. Teacher/student ratio: 1/32
   b. Teacher work time 37.5 totals, at least 24 face to face and how about student work time? → check ministerial decree
   c. Qualified teacher (S1) and competent, one in each school.
   d. Number of non teaching staff (TU)?
   e. Supervisors/schools 1/15 in cities and 1/5 to 10 in rural areas. Visit schools 2 to 3 times/month at least 1 to 2 hours each
   f. Principals 75% S1 in each district
   g. 1 text book for 2 student at least
   h. 1 supplement book for 5 students
   i. Principal period 4 years, school plan 4 years
3. In each DEO there should be at least an instructor or master teacher trained by LPMP/P4TK
4. 2 years time framed for MSS
5. Consider school cluster
   a. SPM Schools
   b. SSN Schools
   c. RSBI Schools
   d. SBI Schools
6. MSS for both DEO and Schools must be defined as a whole
CONSULTATION 7

Person: Himawan Hariyoga (Director for Autonomy in National Planning Bureau/BAPPENAS)

Place: Jl Suropati Bappenas Lantai 3

Date/Time: December 9 2008, 10.00

Attended: Anton Tarigan (Deputy Director), Hetty, Kiri, Agus, Tarum

Method: Discussion

Points:

1. Team should be well informed with all laws and regulations related to MSS. Regulation is given, no use of opinions
2. If there is any recommendation, it would be taken in the following year / round or action, not this year. (We realize any weaknesses compare to ideal concepts concerning MSS, but for the time being let us just put aside those ideal things because our main concern now is how to get these regulation related to MSS implemented!)
3. How central government handed down authority? There was no grand design or road map, all by trial and error.
4. PP 38 was enacted (9 July 2007) later after PP65 (28 December 2005) → confusing
5. Still unclear how to strengthen (Capacity Building) DEOs, how to control the system?
6. MSS has an important role in supporting National strategic planning for fiscal decentralization. Based on MSS, the costing and fiscal decentralization will be formulated.
7. It is mandated in PP 65 that by the end of 2008, three main sectors had to have MSS enacted (Education, Health and Basic Infra Structure).
8. Ministry of Environment, Social affairs, have enacted their MSS already
9. Considering the districts disparities, MSS standard should be flexible enough to accommodate the poor districts.
10. MSS could be used as the basis for transferring funds/grants either as DAK, DAU or ‘Perimbangan-Balancing Fund’ and MSS is the benchmark
11. Also could be used as an accountability scheme for districts
12. This is what needs to be fulfilled by Districts

13. All Input, process and output need costing and funded. Based on health sector experience, sampling is used → too expensive. If un-affordable then prioritize! Check to Mr. Gunsery for financing SPM

14. Consider all related or relevant laws and regulations UU32 PP65 Permenagri6 Permendagri79 etc.
CONSULTATION 8

Person: Ade Cahyana (Head of Education Statistics Office)
Place: Gedung E Lantai 1 Depdiiknas Senayan
Date/Time: December 15 2008, 10.00
Attended: Kiri, Ahmadi, Astuti, Dian, Hakim, Agus,
Method: Discussion

Points:
1. Consider schools as a BHP (Legal Education institution body)
2. PSP indicators should be in line with the MSS indicator after the instrument is fixed; teacher, facility, equipments
3. Indicators or variables could be inserted into annual census instrument rather than special survey
4. Do a pilot project first before enacted

CONSULTATION 9

Person: Mohammad Ali (Director General for Islamic Education of MORA)
Place: MORA Office, Jl Lapangan Banteng Lantai 7
Date/Time: December 15, 2008. 15.00
Attended: Hetty, Kiri, Ali, Agus
Method: Discussion

Points:
1. MSS is useful for assessing, ensuring and mandating DEO and school minimal services. MSS will position DEO and school/madrasah than put affirmative action to improve
2. MSS should refer to BAN-SM instruments, if a school is not accredited, it should not also achieve MSS
3. MSS instrument applies for both school and madrasah, no differences, all criteria uses for school also used for madrasah
4. How can we measure DEO responsibility in improving education is totally different with MSS and Accreditation
5. Every school and madrasah should achieve MSS within 2 years?
6. Madrasah has its own supervisors
7. Community should claim DEO or Schools for achieving MSS
CONSULTATION 10

Person: Dr. Bahrul Hayat PhD (Secretary General of MORA)

Place: MORA Office, Jl Lapangan Banteng Lantai 2

Date/Time: January 8th, 16.00

Attended: Hetty, Malik, Tarum, Agus, Akhmadi

Method: Discussion

Points:

1. Clarify all definitions, make all understanding clear to avoid misinterpretations. In turn this will simplify the implementation process.
2. MSS functions differently in two different levels; in managerial level as a program monitoring tools, while in schooling level as teaching learning process monitoring process. Be sure that the two functions are different.
3. Synchronize the relationship of MMS, accreditation and NSE. To monitor the MSS fulfillment, involve community (MSS for schools) and higher local government institution(MSS for DEO)
4. Be careful in setting standards, which standards is most important for MSS among the 8 NSE standards? In schooling process is significantly important, what about standards for input and output?
5. SPM or MSS is a kind of invoice for schools and DEOs to be fulfilled and categorized in 8 standards. From system view point, based on MSS, each DEO should fulfill the school’s input and process needs then promote its output quality. The invoice should be charged annually.
CONSULTATION 11

Person: Kartiko Purnomo (Director for Local Government Capacity Building and Performance Evaluation MOHA) Hasudungan (MOHA)

Place: Lapangan Banteng MOHA Office, 9th Floor

Date/Time: January 15, 2009

Attended: Agus, Malik, Tarum, Hetty, Akhmadi, Renani

Method: Discussion

Points:

1. So far, district and municipal authorities were handed down already, but MSS as the how to its implementation is not enacted yet.
2. In line with MSS development, each sector should also develop NSPK (Norm, Standard, Procedure, Criteria)
3. Based on PP65, all ministries should enacted their MSS by the end of 2008, Health, Social, Environment, MOHA, Woman, Housing are almost finished. Public work and Education on the way. Please speed up, with MSS team work.
4. It’s not necessary to confront law 32 and law 20; so far decentralization was only implemented in local election and new local government territories. MSS was not concerned because it has no impact on politic and money. Autonomy should bring prosperity to local people, better services than better local government. The three basic services should has MSS first; education health and basic infrastructure (public work)
5. To build MSS, refer to PP 38, all obligatory functions should be MMSed.
6. In this 2009 all MSS draft should be approved by DPOD (Local autonomy consultative body) headed by MOHA, member: BAPPENAS, MOF and MENPAN,
7. Even though there are good HR, but education sector considered too slow in developing MSS, why?
8. Education MSS should be developed comprehensively covering all level and aspect not only basic education (SD and SMP). Bureau of law and organization should lead this process.
9. Education MSS has been waited to be approved, after its concepts then its guidelines, implementation strategy and its costing analysis, than embedded in the education sector strategic planning.
10. Please MONE coordinated internally to finalize the draft, consult it to DPOD, enact it with ministerial decree and provide all necessary instruments.
11. Differentiate Technical standards and MSS; refer to PP 38 to mediate it, the latest MSS was not too bad, why take so long?
12. Plan immediate actions, statement that MSS is only for basic education is needed

(Secretary General)
CONSULTATION 12

Person: Dr Bambang Indriyanto (Secretary of Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education), SPM Full Teams (MONE)
Place: Building E, 5th Floor
Date/Time: January 16, 2009
Attended: All SPM (MMS) Team
Method: Discussion

Points:

1. MSS is to define whether a school is appropriate or feasible enough to operate or alive, in near future analysis is not component based anymore but based on individual school. How many schools are still under MSS indicators? Schools are categorized; MSS schools, National standard schools and International standard school.
2. MSS should be inserted in education national strategic planning, could be used to group schools becoming MSS target. Its instruments should be approved by NSE Body, National Accreditation Body and MOHA.(DPOD)
3. The MSS draft should be discussed in a team of National Education Workshop (February 23, 2009)
4. Soon draft the Ministerial Decree and its guidelines and instruments.
5. Why MSS is only for basic education. Based on PP 65 MSS could be achieved in steps; take priority and consider local government capacity. Is MSS affordable? Later on MSS is developed based on educational situation

CONSULTATION 13

Person: Made Suwandi (Director for Autonomy of MORA)
Place: MOHA Building, Lapangan Banteng 7th Floor
Date/Time: January, 21, 2009, 14.00
Attended: Hetty, Ali, Agus, Tarum, Malik
Method: Discussion

Points:

1. Referring to Law 32, PP 38 and PP 65 regarding decentralization and refer to Law 20, PP 19 regarding Education → MSS is formulated for both districts and schools level. It is meant to be the most effective way to promote education service quality and not as technical standards (Malik)
2. MSS keeps track on PP 38 where central, province and district government has its own authorities. Always remember whether MSS reflects PP 38 points? MSS is what all citizens should minimally receive from those authorities (obligatory functions). MSS is implemented incrementally and evaluative way.
3. MSS could functions as a(an):
   a. Accountability
   b. Financing SSA, Grant system
   c. Planning → Renstra and Renstrada (National-Regional Planning)
   d. Pembinaan Daerah → Capai minimum dulu, awasi pelaksanaannya
   e. Performance budget system
   f. Pro poor grants
4. MSS as a measuring or scaling system. MSS is the minimum service citizen should receive, and NPSK is the system to achieve it. Incrementally the MSS standard is lifted higher. When MSS is not achieved in a district, special treatment or intervention is needed → DAK, DAU, BOSS, Re-allocation etc.

Notes: School populations could be grouped according to their accreditation status; A, B, C, D and E. Recently, most schools are in D and E status which are below the MSS standards. MSS policy is aimed to lift D and E schools up at least to the C or passing grade standards.

5. Exercise/trial is needed, implement in rich, medium and poor districts to check difficulties, geographical disparities, Java or out Java.

6. MSS should be simple but be improve continually. MODEL BUILDING, measureable and implementable

7. MSS is not only basic education, but this is the education priority for now!

8. There have been many strategic issues related to teacher management, it is possible that the PP38 is revised and teacher administration is recentralized.

2008/9 EXISTING MSS BY DISTRICTS

Notes: School populations could be grouped according to their accreditation status; A, B, C, D and E. Recently, most schools are in D and E status which are below the MSS standards. MSS policy is aimed to lift D and E schools up at least to the C or passing grade standards.
CONSULTATION 14

Person:  Dr. Atho Mahdar (MORA Research and Development Head)
Place:  MORA Taman Mini Office, 2nd Floor
Date/Time:  January, 22, 2009, 14.30
Attended:  Agus, Malik
Method:  Discussion

Points:

2. SNP = standar yang dicita-citakan. SNP-toleransi = SPM x Tahun (NSE is the ideal standards, MSS is NSE minus tolerances)
3. Is the division authority fixed/confirmed already? There is a tendency that MONE does not take part in certain aspects or doubting something in implementing autonomy.
4. How to ensure the standard authority in each level of governance; central, province and districts? What should be done if DEO does not perform well in MSS? Do they really want to implement MSS? How MSS was implemented so far?
5. In many cases, local governments only wants to receive money (budget) but nor the works! This attitude would influence the MSS implementation.
6. Big question, after MSS is enacted, would local government willing to implement it? Why? Why not enacting MSS through joint decree between MONE, MORA, and MOHA. It seems to be more effective based on MORA experience on handling religious issues in local government.

CONSULTATION 15

Person:  Prof. Bambang Suhendro (National Standard of Education)
Place:  NSE Building, Jl Fatmawati Jakarta Selatan
Date/Time:  March 10, 2009
Attended:  Malik, Akhmadi, Tarum, Agus
Method:  Discussion

Points:

1. Clarify terminologies, check it with SNP and curriculum instruments (syllabi/silabus, action plan/RPP)
2. All indicators should be somewhere below SNP, never higher!
3. Clarify and revise some MSS points,
   - School distant, 3 km for elementary, 6 for junior secondary, isn’t it too far? Check to NSP
   - School size, 30 or 40 students? Good school less students, is it necessary to limit student number in a class?
   - Point 8: one teacher for each 32 students, minimum 4 teachers in a school. For SMP check for subject teachers!
   - Point 9: 2 competence and certified teachers in each school, clarify how long would it take? How much fulfilled? Ask PMPTK
   - Point 10: separate SD and SMP
   - Supervisor ratios?
   - Point 15: frequency in a month
   - Point 28: teacher work load 40 hrs/week? 24 hrs teaching, check with teacher law
   - Point 29: teaching workload not specified? For teaching, individual, and structured activities. In a year less or equal to 900 hours.
   - School exams, not included in MSS?
The MSS draft was not only discussed with central government personnel, but also with education stakeholders at provincial, district and school levels. These consultations were undertaken by the MSS team. I was significantly involved in these FGDs and discussions. The FGDs were conducted across Indonesia.

This exhibit is only one example from West Nusatenggara Province at the end of 2008. These minutes were also used to formulate the emerging themes discussed in chapter 4; Gathering broader feedback.

Notes: For ethics reasons, names were hidden.
FGD 1 - NTB/WEST NUSA TENGGARA PROVINCE FGD

Persons: Key personnel in Provincial level

Attended: Kiri, Aly, Agus, Tarum,  
Place: NTB Provincial Education Office,  
Date/Time: December 12, 2008, 10.00  
Method: Discussion

While waiting for the participants, Pak Imhal presented Statistics of education in NTB (see the Data attached). In 2009 NTB focuses on health and education sectors. Average school year of population is still low 6, 7. NTB ranked 32 of 33 provinces in education.

1. In reality in the field, many schools are still below this draft  
2. Achieving SNP or MSS is still hard for regions with limited potency and resources like NTB  
3. Central government role is important to help left or weak regions in catching up education to national average. With 1.2 billion APBD, NTB prioritize education (20%) and health (15%)  
4. UAN is unfair considering the variety of school condition  
5. Check NTB Statistics; is it true that for NTB the draft of SPM is too high?  
6. Point 21; report to Dinas Pendidikan and Kanwil/Kandep Agama  
7. Point 15 not only RAPBS (annual) but also RPS (five year plan)

Treatments, aids, grants for regions should be differentiated based on real condition in the field. PNFI has differentiated grants to local governments

1. How to position SNP, SPM, accreditation, and school categories (SPM, National Standard, International Standard)  
2. Synchronize SPM formulation/systematization to SNP with its 8 standards
1. Refer to 8 standards of SNP.
2. Point 10 refers to Law 14 on Teacher, why only 1?
3. Point 11 75% of principals are master teacher and S1?
4. Point 12 in PP drafts minimum S2?
5. Point 15 school planning and budgeting is called RAPBS
6. Point 19 Teacher’s work load is 42, why only 18?
7. Point 25 State the subject matter (Mata pelajaran)
8. The district and its schools condition vary, why test them with the same standard (UAN)? → Unfair?

1. Point 10 should be all, why only one?
2. Point 11 principal is a teacher with additional tasks, revise the statement
3. Point 12 should be S2 why only S1?
4. Point 19 why only 27?

1. Supervisor is a teacher with additional tasks, for SD should S1 and SMP should S2
2. The draft is Ok for public madrasah(negeri) but difficult for private madrasah
3. Difficult to recruit supervisor due to its low incentives. Becoming ordinary teacher is preferred.

1. Government (central) always wants the best result from schools but forget what the things are needed and what ought to happen in schools in order to facilitate that to happen. Don’t just ask what to do by teacher in schools, fulfills their needs first for schools (facility), teacher and students.
2. Consider poor/emergency school, fulfill their basic need first

1. Clarify the position of SPM to SNP
2. Many times the quality is questioned, but the quality remains the problem
3. Accreditation pictures or illustrate school conditions, but what the follow up action is more important

Note from BAP Office visits:

1. Not all accreditation result/recommendation is followed up by Dinas Pendidikan
2. SPM should explicitly covers the accreditation result/recommendation
3. Schools are reluctant to be accredited (effecting new students enrollment)

SPM is an assessment strongly depend on data availability; student, teacher, facility. Consider carefully how to collect, process, and interpret SPM data
Muslihat:

Consider point 4, the new SATAP (one roof school) should not threaten the surrounding or existing school and madrasah

1. SPM will be coordinated under the Secretary of Dinas, members are Bidang (Sub Dinas/Deputy Head of relevant education; TK/SD, SLP, SMA, SMK) and relevant unit outside MONE (MORA local office, LPMP, BAP, Dewan Pendidikan),
2. SPM should be enacted using Local Govt. Decree as Strategies to Achieve SPM, including guideline and mechanism. Data, Instrument, assessing schools SPM need to be formulated.
3. S2 certificate for SMP Teachers is hard to achieve
22. **FGD 2. LOMBOK TENGAH DISTRICT, WEST NUSA TENGGARA PROVINCE**

This exhibit is similar to exhibit 21, showing minutes drawn from a FGS held at district level in Lombok Tengah in West Nusatenggara Province in late 2008.

For detailed discussion on the emerging themes please see chapter 4; Gathering broader feedback.
FGD 2. WEST NUSA TENGGARA PROVINCE, LOMBOK TENGAH DISTRICT

Persons: Key personnel in Lombok Tengah DEO

Secretary of PEO,
Deputy Deputy for Secondary Ed,
Elementary/SD Section
Deputy for Basic Ed,
junior secondary/SMP section
Deputy for Ed personnel (PMPTK),
MORA PEO,
MORA District office
DPRD,
LPMP,
BoE,
Planning Bureau,

Attended: Kiri, Aly, Agus, Tarum, Hetty, Akhmadi

Place: Lombok Tengah NTB District Education Office,
Date/Time: December 18, 2008. 10.00
Method: Discussion

Secretary for DEO:

1. To reduce DO rate, Retrieval Scholarship is implemented by Dinas (APBD) for DO students and children never been to school. In addition class for special service is given for needy children before they are sent to regular schools. The programs is specially for rural areas; mountainous, beaches, and close to jungle
2. MORa and MONE are integrated as madrasah contribution is significant to education
3. Dewan Pendidikan (Education Board) is having strong contribution such as defining places for new school buildings and classrooms rehabilitations

Dewan Pendidikan:

1. SPM is needed to improve education quality but its implementation is somewhat doubtful because the gaps between public and private
2. In accordance to PP 47 and PP 48, NTB launched free basic education. Assumed that more than 50% of students are from poor families
3. School and madrasah supervisors are not synergic yet
4. Many ratios in the field are not as good as this SPM draft yet. Toilet ratio is still 1:100 not 1 to 50 or 60 especially for madrasah and private schools
5. Not all School Committee functions properly yet, School Committee empowerment so far only covers 3 sub districts consist of 20 schools
6. Many community leaders propose new schools without considering its requirements
BAPPEDA

1. SPM should be enacted in local government using a decree to be covered with appropriate budgeting and in line with district or province planning. SPM is part of and embedded in middle and long term local government strategic planning.
2. Water and electricity is sometimes difficult in rural areas
3. Classroom and student ratio should be differentiated among school levels
4. SPM as part of MONEV system with periodical performance measurement to assure education quality improvement
5. Many bad/poor private schools as a consequence of loose (too easy) new school operational permission should be tighten. In one location a limited number of new students are claimed by two different private schools but both are operated under minimal requirements

Dinas Propinsi:

1. Local government decree on SPM should refer to higher decree on SPM. This is important in order for local policies such as Renstra, Renja, RKPD and its MONEV could accommodate SPM
2. It is hoped that before Local Government Development Planning Workshop (Musrenbangda) hold in 2009 SPM already fixed
3. SPM Dissemination is important to motivate and ask commitment from all related institution within internal and external MONE
4. SPM is coordinated by Secretariat and supported by its education divisions in Dinas Pendidikan
23. SCHOOL FGD and school visits

This exhibit is similar to exhibit 21, showing minutes drawn from a FGS at school level in Lombok Tengah district in West Nusatenggara Province in late 2008.

For detailed discussion on the emerging themes please see chapter 4; Gathering broader feedback.
SCHOOL FGD and School Visits

School Visit 1, SD 1 Ampenan

Person: Mr. Rah (School Principal)
Place: Ampenan 1 Elementary School Mataram Lombok
Date/Time: December 18, 2008. 12.50
Attended: Kiri, Tarum, Agus, Aly, District staff
Method: Observation and discussion

Points:

1. The school is considered as a good school in many ways; the buildings, student achievements, management, etc. showing that the school is above the SPM draft indicators. Part of the success is because the school is supported by Mataram University as a school model.
2. It shows that SPM is only one thing, but principal’s leadership is also very important to improve school quality, many obstacles could be anticipated by their “school team” with strong commitment, transparency and involving various individuals and institutions as the school stakeholders.
3. To be certified, teachers receive scholarship on one condition; back to school after finishing the study, unless graduated teacher would go to other higher school (to SMP or SMA/SMK) and left elementary school teachers remain un certified.

School Visit 2, SMP 4 Mataram

Person: School Principal, vice principal, teachers
Place: Mataram 4 Junior Secondary School Mataram Lombok
Date/Time: December 18, 2008. 12.50
Attended: Kiri, Tarum, Agus, Aly, District staff
Method: Observation and discussion

Points:

1. With 38 PNS teachers and 11 NONPNS teachers, 830 students and 22 classrooms, some classes are double shifted. Only one teacher below S1.
2. How do we define open junior secondary school (SMP Terbuka) SPM?
3. The school accreditation is B, but the building is still being totally renovated. Rehabilitation budget is supported by local government and school committee plus tuition fee from students Rp. 40,000,- each.
4. The old SPM is not well disseminated, but SNP is. The school is proposed to be SSN School, a category different from accreditation system.
5. School’s SPM assessed by district personnel or supervisors and coordinated by District secretary, and relevant divisions through
School Visit 3, SMP 3 East Praya Central Lombok

Person: School Principal, vice principal.
Place: East Praya 3 Junior Secondary School Central Lombok
Date/Time: December 20, 2008, 10.00
Attended: Kiri, Tarum, Agus, Aly, District staff
Method: Observation and interview

Points:
1. The school is sited in a dry area where fresh water is considered difficult
2. Many parts of the building need renovation, the library looks so poor with no evidence of routine circulation and maintenance. Many books are scattered untidily on shelves.
3. Science lab problems with tool maintenance and not enough lab materials
4. The school reports monthly to district but could not show the report when asked
5. Although the accreditation is B, I think it is a B minus

School Visit 4, SD N Bagik Kerongkong East Praya

Person: Principal and teachers
Place: Public Elementary School Bagik Kerongkong Praya Timur
Date/Time: December 20, 2008, 11.00
Attended: Hetty, Kiri, Aly, Achmadi, Agus, Tarum
Method: Observation and interview

Points:
1. This school is considered poor; three of the classrooms are still being renovated after about a year was neglected.
2. This is where district responsiveness is important. How could we put responsiveness as an SPM indicator for district level?
3. On the other hand, school committee members from surrounding community is considered weak (poor) and too difficult to contribute financially. Should we standardize community participation?

School Visit 5, SDN 7 Praya

Person: School Principal, vice principal, teachers
Place: Mataram 4 Junior Secondary School Mataram Lombok
Date/Time: December 18, 2008, 12.50
Attended: Kiri, Tarum, Agus, Aly, District staff
Method: Observation and discussion

Points:
1. This school is considered better, unfortunately there was no-body to meet since it was afternoon already when we arrived. Teachers and students were already gone.
2. It is interesting however that within the school complex, there are some building for teachers to stay (asrama guru), but one of them is totally broken and long been neglected.
3. For some rural areas asrama guru is important, and probably MSS should say something about this - depends on the district itself.
24. **Notes from MSS presentations and discussions at Board of Education Workshops.**

(These notes are a summary of significant responses and should be seen as indicators of local concerns.)

The previous exhibits show some feedback and support from central, local and school levels. But as suggested by many respondents, the role of community or society in general for education development was also considered truly important. It was suggested that:

- First, education is to serve citizens as part of community or society.
- Second, local governments are obliged to serve their people by providing a range of public services mandated by the decentralization laws or regulation.
- And most importantly, local governments are also accountable to their people, not only to the central government.

Fortunately I also had direct access to some national workshops of Boards of Education (BOE) held in Bogor, West Java Province in early 2009. Of the four workshops scheduled, I attended three of them.

This exhibit shows the minutes taken from the BOE workshops. Emerging themes are detailed in chapter 4; Garnering Support.
Notes from MSS Presentation and Discussion in Board of Education Workshops. (These notes are a summary of significant responses and should be seen as indicators of local concerns.)

a. 1st Round, Purnama 2 Hotel, Cipayung, Bogor, West Java
March 11, 2009. South Meeting Room, 13.00 am

Participants: 99 members or Head of District, Municipal and Province Education Boards.

A. Banjar, West Java
1. MMS has been waited for by local governments as an important instrument to implement education sector development
2. How is the spending of 20% budget allocation in relation to MSS for both central and local governments
3. What about province and central government MSS as mandated by PP 65?
4. Concerning free education; is it true that there is no more school fee in all schools?
5. Would it be possible to fulfill and met MSS and NSE for free?
6. Some local governments entitle ‘Zakat/Moslem Charity’ or Corporate Social Responsibility to generate funding from education stakeholders. Would it be OK?

B. Boloang Mangando, North Sulawesi
1. If then a district or municipal could not met MSS, would then its education authorities be recentralized to province or central level? Would there be any sanction or punishment?
2. There is a tendency that local governments implement their educational authorities on their own way. A lot of political and power interventions to education sector after autonomy and decentralization were implemented. Could MSS anticipate this?

C. Jepara, Central Java
1. Why only elementary and secondary education? What about secondary and non formal education?
2. There was Ministerial Decree on MSS (129a/U/2004). Did we learn something from the implementation of this decree? There was local governments decree on this MSS, was there any evaluation?
3. Regarding PP 38/2007 on local government authorities, especially on education facilities, who should fulfill school needs? It’s still being multi interpreted?

D. Aceh Province
1. There are already 20 provincial board of educations, what about the rest of 1 provinces?
2. As mandated by Education Strategic Planning, National Board of Education should be stated in 2009. Is there any special preparation for this venue?

E. Gorontalo, North Sulawesi
1. Any criteria required being a national board member?
2. All candidates should present their vision and mission in a ‘fit and proper test’
3. It seems that MSS is all about standards, where is the services?

F. Central Java Province

1. MSS should cover the 3 tiers of all government levels; central provincial and municipal
2. The intervention of local government is too difficult to be avoided; it is not easy to fulfill required personnel as stated by MSS.
b. 2nd Round, Wisma Bahtera Hotel, Cipayung, Bogor, West Java
March 17, 2009. Grand Meeting Room, 13.00 am

Participants: 112 member or Head of District, Municipal and Province Education Boards.

A. NAD (Nangro Aceh Darussalam)
   1. In each school unit, there should be at least an administrator to help headmaster and teachers
      manage the school

B. South Sulawesi
   1. How is these MMS indicators build in relation to NSE and Accreditation system? Who should
      assess MSS and how?

C. Sidenrappang Sidrap)
   1. Many Bureaucrats and Board members are still having problems understanding the laws,
      regulations or decrees regarding education sectors. Those documents, in any ways should be
      making available especially for education stakeholder.

D. Sukabumi
   1. How is the relationship of MSS with MONE’s NSPK (Norma, Standard, Prosedur dan Kriteria)
   2. Who should be responsible for the funding of MSS, local or central Government? In many ways
      central government still tend to keep the funding mechanism such as BOS and DAK, why not
      directly to district level? Never say that district’s personnel are not ready yet!

E. Wonogiri
   1. There is another Law regarding decentralization → Law 12/2008
   2. How is the essence of education finance according our regulation; MSS, BHP and free education.
   3. Could MSS be used to standardize local government personnel? Education sector is now
      experiencing and intrusion after administered under local government. Not all district education
      head are having proper educational background. This is not good for educational management in
      the long run.

F. East Kalimantan
   1. As education board members for more than 6 years, what have we done so far to help local
      government improving education sector? The development of education is also an indicator of its
      board performance.
   2. It is impossible to provide free education. Some body or some institution somewhere ought to
      fund it. The family, community, government or both somehow has to finance education. Never
      free
c. 3rd Round, Wisma Bahtera Hotel, Cipayung, Bogor, West Java

Participants: 127 member or Head of District, Municipal and Province Education Boards.

A. Pakanbaru, Riau

1. There was Ministerial decree on MSS (129a/U/2004), what’s wrong with it, any evaluation?
2. Many local key personnel ask for school opening approval (many are madrasahs), isn’t this their right after decentralization? They know best what they need, why should we hinder them using MSS? Can’t the standards be lowered just to accommodate them first and later on be improved?

B. Toli-Toli

1. Personnel and teachers recruitment, could it be centralized again? Within the last several years after implementing decentralization personnel issue is chaotic in many local governments. Could it be specified in MSS?
2. How could education management be stabilized if a personnel position could only last for months? And later on substituted only for ‘political reasons’ with somebody ineligible.

C. Palangkaraya, Central Kalimantan Province

1. Many schools are still far below standards. How could we improve it with only limited human resources (knowledge and skill), funding. Has MSS team evaluate the real condition in the field before specifying the standards? Don’t just make standards from central views, check and supervise first!

D. West Nusa Tenggara

1. Regarding to the eight standards in NSE, how could we achieve it if district head always appoint his personnel without professional judgments, merely political or nepotism considerations. Why don’t we make MSS for district personnel, principal and teacher appointment?
2. How can we escort the implementation of MSS if we don’t know for sure whether there is accountability mechanism or not? Even if there is reward or punishment or not?

E. Purworejo, central java

1. There was MSS years ago, why it is not optimally implemented? Is it because the disparity of districts capacity? Or more as no clear division of labor (authority) among government levels?
2. How to avoid political intervention in appointing professional or bureaucrats within education sector? Could MSS intervene this?
3. Why the ‘RPP’ (Rancangan Peraturan Pemerintah/Government Regulation Draft) on educational management (‘pengelolaan’) is not approved yet by the central government.

F. Pasawaran, Lampung Province

1. MONE’s decree is not strong enough for stipulating MSS because MONE’s decree on school principal is not obeyed by the local government.
2. In order for MSS to be really implemented and fulfilled by local government, it should be stipulated by ‘PP’ (Peraturan Pemerintah/ Government Decree) or at least Joint Ministerial Decree with MOHA.
G. Bogor West Java

1. Different local governments manage their local government differently. In Bogor, sub district education office (Kantor kecamatan) was just abolished. This creates uncertainty to schools and supervisors within this area. In some districts supervisors are under provincial level, but in some are under districts level. Could MSS solve this case?
2. In some districts the head of district education offices and their staff are not people from education sector. Why not MSS address this issue?

H. Bengkulu Selatan

1. MSS item number 4, why only 4 teachers in an elementary school? They are class teachers → 6 teachers for 6 classes
2. In cities, there more teachers that what is needed. On the other hand, rural areas need more teachers. How would MSS address this teacher redeployment?
Products

This draft was developed by the MSS team after considering suggestions gathered from its consultations and development processes. This draft has, as yet, not been translated into English, but is included for MONE (and other Indonesian) personnel. It also indicates the progress and contribution made by this research.

When this report was written, the MSS final draft was still waiting for its approval from the Regional Autonomy Consultative Body (DPOD - Dewan Pertimbangan Otonomi Daerah) prior to being signed and stipulated as a MONE decree before being implemented to all districts/cities.

Although the final draft of MSS for the education sector has now been formulated, a more challenging task lies ahead. The decentralization process delegated most education authority to the district level. Accordingly the MSS should cover these entire authorities, not only basic education (elementary and junior secondary education). The decision to formulate MSS only for elementary and junior secondary education was agreed by the MSS team because the main focus of education development in Indonesia nowadays is on improving basic education throughout the country.

Later on, whenever possible, the MSS standards would gradually be set higher and for higher levels of schooling. If education MSS are set for all education levels under the DEOs, education financing would be too expensive and become un-affordable for the average DEO.

This exhibit shows how MSS indicators changed over time: previously there were 35 indicators, but after the National Consultative Meeting, the team and various representatives from central government institution agreed to reduce the indicators to only 27 to make it more simple and affordable for the average DEO.
## Final Draft of MSS Indicators (Version November 2, 2009).

This draft was developed by MSS team after considering suggestions gathered from its development process. This draft has, as yet, not been translated into English, but is included for MONE (and other Indonesian) personnel. It also indicates the progress and contribution made by this research.

### Indikator SPM Bidang Pendidikan Nasional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jenis Pelayanan Dasar</th>
<th>Indikator</th>
<th>Standar Pelayanan Minimal</th>
<th>Nilai</th>
<th>Batas waktu Pencapaian</th>
<th>Keterangan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. SPM Kabupaten/Kota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarana dan Prasarana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tersedia satuan pendidikan dalam jarak yang terjangkau dengan berjalan kaki yaitu maksimal 3 km untuk SD/MI dan 6 km untuk SMP/MTs dari kelompok permukiman permanen.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Dinas Pendidikan Kab/Kota dan Kandepag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jumlah peserta didik dalam setiap rombongan belajar untuk SD/MI tidak melebihi 32 orang, dan untuk SMP/MTs tidak melebihi 36 orang. Untuk setiap rombongan belajar tersedia 1 (satu) ruang kelas.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Dinas Pendidikan Kab/Kota dan Kandepag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Di setiap SMP dan MTs tersedia ruang laboratorium IPA yang dilengkapi dengan meja dan kursi yang cukup untuk 36 peserta didik dan minimal satu set pralatan praktek IPA untuk demonstrasi dan eksperimen peserta didik.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Dinas Pendidikan Kab/Kota dan Kandepag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Di setiap SD dan MI tersedia satu ruang guru yang dilengkapi dengan meja dan kursi untuk setiap orang guru, kepala sekolah dan staf kependidikan lainnya; dan di setiap SMP dan MTs tersedia ruang kepala sekolah yang terpisah dari ruang guru.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Dinas Pendidikan Kab/Kota dan Kandepag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendidik dan Tenaga Pendidikan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Di setiap SD dan MI tersedia 1 (satu) orang guru untuk setiap 32 peserta didik dan 6 (enam) orang guru untuk setiap satuan pendidikan, dan untuk daerah khusus 4 (empat) orang guru setiap satuan pendidikan.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Dinas Pendidikan Kab/Kota dan Kandepag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Di setiap SMP dan MTs tersedia 1 (satu) orang guru untuk setiap mata pelajaran, dan untuk daerah khusus tersedia satu orang guru untuk setiap rumpun mata pelajaran.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Dinas Pendidikan Kab/Kota dan Kandepag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Deskripsi</td>
<td>Persentase</td>
<td>Tahun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Di setiap SD dan MI tersedia 2 (dua) orang guru yang memenuhi kualifikasi akademik S1 atau D-IV dan 2 (dua) orang guru yang telah memiliki sertifikat pendidik.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Di setiap SMP/MTs tersedia guru dengan kualifikasi akademik S-1 atau D-IV sebanyak 70% dan separuh diantaranya (35% dari keseluruhan guru) telah memiliki sertifikat pendidik, untuk daerah khusus masing-masing sebanyak 40% dan 20%.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Di setiap SMP dan MTs tersedia guru dengan kualifikasi akademik S-1 atau D-IV dan telah memiliki sertifikat pendidik masing-masing satu orang untuk mata pelajaran Matematika, IPA, Bahasa Indonesia dan Bahasa Inggris.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Di setiap Kabupaten/Kota semua kepala SD dan MI berkualifikasi akademik S-1 atau D-IV dan telah memiliki sertifikat pendidik.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Di setiap Kabupaten/Kota semua kepala SMP dan MTs berkualifikasi akademik S-1 atau D-IV dan telah memiliki sertifikat pendidik.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Di setiap Kabupaten/Kota semua pengawas sekolah dan madrasah memiliki kualifikasi akademik S-1 atau D-IV dan telah memiliki sertifikat pendidik.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kurikulum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pemerintah Kabupaten/Kota memiliki rencana dan melaksanakan kegiatan untuk membantu satuan pendidikan dalam mengembangkan kurikulum dan proses pembelajaran yang efektif.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kunjungan pengawas ke satuan pendidikan dilakukan satu kali setiap bulan dan setiap kunjungan dilakukan selama 3 jam untuk melakukan supervisi dan pembinaan.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jenis Pelayanan Dasar</th>
<th>Indikator Standar Pelayanan Minimal</th>
<th>Nilai</th>
<th>Batas Waktu Pencapaian</th>
<th>Keterangan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. SPM Satuan Pendidikan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarana dan Prasarana</td>
<td>15 Setiap SD dan MI menyediakan buku teks yang sudah disertifikasi oleh Pemerintah mencakup mata pelajaran Bahasa Indonesia, Matematika, IPA, IPS dengan perbandingan satu set untuk setiap peserta didik.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Setiap SMP dan MTS menyediakan buku teks yang sudah disertifikasi oleh Pemerintah mencakup semua mata pelajaran dengan perbandingan satu set untuk setiap peserta didik.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Setiap SD dan MI menyediakan satu set peraga IPA dan bahan yang terdiri dari kerangka manusia, model tubuh manusia, bola dunia (globe), contoh peralatan optik, kit IPA untuk eksperimen dasar, dan poster IPA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendidik dan Tenaga KePendidikan</td>
<td>18 Setiap SD dan MI memiliki 100 judul buku pengayaan dan 10 buku referensi, dan setiap SMP dan MTS memiliki 200 judul buku pengayaan dan 20 buku referensi.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 Setiap guru tetap bekerja 35 jam per minggu di satuan pendidikan termasuk kegiatan tatap muka di dalam kelas, merencanakan pembelajaran, melaksanakan pembelajaran, menilai hasil pembelajaran, membimbing dan melatih peserta didik, serta melaksanakan tugas tambahan yang melekat pada pelaksanaan kegiatan pokok sesuai dengan beban kerja Guru.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Satuan pendidikan menyelenggarakan proses pembelajaran selama 34 minggu per tahun dengan kegiatan tatap muka sebagai berikut : Kelas I - II : 18 jam per minggu Kelas III : 24 jam per minggu Kelas IV - VI : 27 jam per minggu Kelas VII - IX : 27 jam per minggu</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurikulum</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Satuan pendidikan menerapkan Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) sesuai ketentuan yang berlaku.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penilaian Pendidikan</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Setiap guru menerapkan Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran (RPP) yang disusun berdasarkan silabus untuk setiap mata pelajaran yang diampunya.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penjaminan Mutu Pendidikan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Setiap guru mengembangkan dan menerapkan program penilaian untuk membantu meningkatkan kemampuan belajar peserta didik.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepala sekolah melakukan supervisi kelas dan memberikan umpan balik kepada guru dua kali dalam setiap semester.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penjaminan Mutu Pendidikan</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Setiap guru menyampaikan laporan hasil evaluasi mata pelajaran serta hasil penilaian setiap peserta didik kepada Kepala Sekolah pada akhir semester dalam bentuk laporan hasil prestasi belajar peserta didik.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepala Sekolah atau Madrasah menyampaikan laporan hasil Ulangan Akhir Semester (UAS) dan Ulangan Kenaikan Kelas (UKK) serta Ujian Akhir (US/UN) kepada orang tua peserta didik dan menyampaikan rekapitulasinya kepada Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten/Kota atau Kandepag pada setiap akhir semester.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manajemen Sekolah</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Setiap satuan pendidikan menerapkan prinsip-prinsip Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah (MBS).</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. **Pictures from FGDs, school visits during FGDs, MSS Meetings/discussions/workshops**

Various activities such as FGDs, meetings, discussions, visits, dissemination of MSS information and workshops were undertaken to bring the first draft of MSS to its final stage before being proposed to the DPOD meeting in each relevant ministry.

This exhibit contains pictures of these activities. Most of the MSS team and respondents were aware of my double role (as a manager and researcher), and when I asked about the possibility of their pictures being put in this portfolio, no objections were raised.
Pictures from FGDs, school visits during FGDs, MSS Meetings/discussions/workshops

Other views of Mataram MSS FGD.
A scene of one group discussion (Elementary and JSE schools personnel) in Batam City Sumatera.

FGDs were also held in many different places, such as Batam City in Riau Province.
Researcher with two of MSS Team members observing an elementary school in West Nusa Tenggara Province

JS School visit and observation in Lombok Barat District West Nusatenggara Province
FGD/discussion with school personnel; “What do you think of MSS indicators?”

“A junior secondary school principal is responding on MSS indicators

“Most of our teachers graduated from S1 already. I think MSS standards are too low for us here, but not for many schools in rural areas,” he responded.
MSS information is disseminated at every opportunity, like planning workshop.

Law and Organization Bureau personnel finalizing MSS Ministerial decree in MONE central office
MSS Teamwork from various institutions (MONE, MOHA, MORA, BAPPENAS, MENPAN) finalizing MSS indicators before proposing the draft to the MSS National Consultation Forum (Note; the camera date was not properly set, it should be October 2009).
MSS was also introduced in National MONE Workshop (RAKERNAS), February 2009
Introducing MSS to local government personnel in Surabaya (late 2009).
National Consultative Team finalizing MSS draft prior to proposal to DPOD (National Autonomy Consultative Body). November 2009.
27. **Draft of the proposed MONE Ministerial Decree on MSS.**

(Again, this is not yet available in English. The draft is still awaiting approval. This is included to indicate the progress and the achievements of this research.

Soon after the final draft of MSS is approved by the DPOD, it will be recommended soon to the MONE to be enacted as a ministerial decree. Based on this regulation, all DEOs throughout Indonesia will then be able to legally adopt it as a local government decree. This is the time when the new MSS regulation is implemented to improve school and DEOs service quality as one of decentralization aims.

This exhibit shows the first draft of MSS MONE’s decree as a revision to the latest MONE’s MSS decree 129a/U/2004. These changes in MSS regulation should be seen as an example of changes expected to flow from research by project; a change in practice or body of work, as required by RMIT regulation. (In this case, the change or improvement will occur at the national level and influence teaching and learning in basic education across Indonesia.)
Draft of the proposed MONE Ministerial Decree on MSS.

Again, this is yet not available in English. The draft is still awaiting approval. This is included to indicate the progressing and the achievements of this project.

PERATURAN MENTERI PENDIDIKAN NASIONAL RI
NOMOR .../...../2009

TENTANG
STANDAR PELAYANAN MINIMAL
BIDANG PENDIDIKAN DI KABUPATEN/KOTA

MENTERI PENDIDIKAN NASIONAL REPUBLIK INDONESIA,


b. bahwa untuk menjamin tercapainya mutu pendidikan yang diselenggarakan daerah perlu menetapkan standar pelayanan minimal (SPM) bidang pendidikan;

c. bahwa berdasarkan huruf a dan b tersebut di atas, dipandang perlu menetapkan Standar Pelayanan Minimal Bidang Pendidikan di Kabupaten/Kota;

Mengingat : 1. Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 78 Tahun 2003, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4301);

2. Undang-Undang Nomor 32 tahun 2004 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2004 Nomor 125, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4437) sebagaimana telah diubah terakhir dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2008 tentang Perubahan Kedua Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 32 tahun 2004 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2008 Nomor 59, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4844);

3. Undang-Undang Nomor 33 Tahun 2004 tentang Perimbangan Keuangan Antara Pemerintah Pusat dan Pemerintahan Daerah (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2004 Nomor 126, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4438);
4. Undang-undang Nomor 14 Tahun 2005 tentang Guru dan Dosen (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2005 Nomor xxx, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor xxxx);

5. Undang-undang Nomor 25 Tahun 2009 tentang Pelayanan Publik (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2009 Nomor 112);

6. Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 19 Tahun 2005 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2005 Nomor 41, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4496);

7. Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 79 Tahun 2005 tentang Pembinaan Dan Pengawasan Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Daerah (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2005 Nomor 165 Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4593);

8. Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 65 Tahun 2005 tentang Pedoman Penyusunan dan Penerapan Standar Pelayanan Minimal (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2007 Nomor 82 Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4737);

9. Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 38 Tahun 2007 tentang Pembagian Urusan Pemerintahan Antara Pemerintah, Pemerintahan Daerah Provinsi, Pemerintahan Daerah Kabupaten/Kota (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2007 Nomor 82, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4737);

10. Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 41 Tahun 2007 tentang Organisasi Perangkat Daerah (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2007 Nomor 89, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4741);

11. Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 50 Tahun 2007 tentang Tatacara Pelaksanaan Kerjasama Antar Daerah (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2007 Nomor 112, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4761);


Mengingat : Hasil Rekomendasi Sidang Dewan Pertimbangan Otonomi Daerah tanggal xx Oktober 2009

MEMUTUSKAN:

Menetapkan : PERATURAN MENTERI PENDIDIKAN NASIONAL TENTANG STANDAR PELAYANAN MINIMAL BIDANG PENDIDIKAN DI KABUPATEN/KOTA.

BAB I
KETENTUAN UMUM

Pasal 1

Dalam Peraturan ini yang dimaksud dengan :

1. Standar Pelayanan Minimal bidang Pendidikan selanjutnya disebut SPM Pendidikan adalah tolak ukur kinerja pelayanan pendidikan yang diselenggarakan Daerah Kabupaten/Kota.

2. Standar Pelayanan Minimal sebagaimana diatur dalam Peraturan Menteri ini mencakup pelayanan pendidikan dasar melalui jalur pendidikan formal.


4. Daerah Otonom selanjutnya disebut Daerah adalah kesatuan masyarakat hukum yang mempunyai batas-batas wilayah yang berwenang mengatur dan mengurus urusan pemerintahan dan kepentingan masyarakat setempat menurut prakarsa sendiri berdasarkan aspirasi masyarakat dalam sistem Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia.

5. Pemerintahan Daerah adalah penyelenggaraan urusan pemerintahan oleh pemerintah daerah Kabupaten/Kota dan DPRD menurut asas otonomi dan tugas pembantuan dengan prinsip Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.


7. Pengembangan kapasitas adalah upaya meningkatkan kemampuan sistem atau sarana dan prasarana, kelembagaan, personil, dan keuangan untuk melaksanakan fungsi-fungsi pemerintahan dalam rangka mencapai tujuan

1 Perlu dikonsultasikan ke Biro Hukum utk merumuskan dlm ketentuan peralihan mengenai cakupan SPM yg dilaksanakan oleh satuan pendidikan dgn pendanaan dari APBN
pelayanan dasar dan/atau SPM Pendidikan secara efektif dan efisien dengan menggunakan prinsip-prinsip tata pemerintahan yang baik.

8. Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah yang selanjutnya disingkat APBD adalah rencana keuangan tahunan pemerintahan daerah yang dibahas dan disetujui bersama oleh pemerintah daerah dan DPRD dan ditetapkan dengan Peraturan Daerah.

9. Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara yang selanjutnya disebut APBN adalah....

**BAB II**

**STANDAR PELAYANAN MINIMAL BIDANG PENDIDIKAN**

**Pasal 2**

(1) Kabupaten/Kota menyelenggarakan pelayanan pendidikan dasar sesuai SPM Pendidikan.

(2) SPM Pendidikan sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) berkaitan dengan pelayanan pendidikan yang meliputi jenis pelayanan beserta indikator kinerja dengan target pencapaian 100% pada tahun 2013:

a. Pelayanan Pendidikan Dasar untuk Kabupaten/Kota:

1. Tersedia sekolah/madrasah dalam jarak yang terjangkau dengan berjalan kaki yaitu maksimal 3 km untuk SD/MI dan 6 km untuk SMP/MTs dari kelompok permukiman permanen.

2. Jumlah siswa SD dan MI dalam setiap rombongan belajar tidak melebihi 32 orang, dan bagi siswa SMP dan MTS tidak melebihi 40 orang dan tersedia ruang kelas untuk setiap rombongan belajar.

3. Setiap SMP dan MTs memiliki ruang laboratorium IPA yang dilengkapi dengan meja dan kursi yang cukup untuk 40 siswa dan minimal satu set peralatan praktek IPA untuk demonstrasi dan eksperimen siswa.

4. Untuk setiap SD dan MI tersedia setidaknya seorang guru untuk setiap 32 siswa, dan di setiap sekolah tersedia setidaknya 4 (empat) orang guru.

5. Untuk setiap SMP dan MTs tersedia setidaknya seorang guru untuk setiap 40 siswa dan di setiap sekolah tersedia setidaknya guru sejumlah kelompok mata pelajaran

6. Di setiap SD dan MI tersedia 2 (dua) orang guru yang memenuhi kualifikasi pendidikan S1 atau D-IV dan setidaknya 1 (satu) orang diantaranya telah memiliki sertifikat pendidik

7. Di setiap SMP dan MTs tersedia guru dengan kualifikasi pendidikan S-1 atau D-IV sebanyak 40% dan separuh diantaranya (20% dari keseluruhan guru) telah memiliki sertifikat pendidik

8. Di setiap SMP dan MTs tersedia guru dengan kualifikasi pendidikan S-1 atau D-IV dan telah memiliki sertifikat pendidik masing-masing satu orang untuk mata pelajaran Matematika, IPA, Bahasa Indonesia dan Bahasa Inggris

9. Di setiap Kabupaten/Kota tersedia 50% Kepala Sekolah SD dan MI berkualifikasi pendidikan S-1 atau D-IV dan setengah diantaranya (25% dari keseluruhan kepala SD dan MI) telah memiliki sertifikat pendidik
10. Di setiap Kabupaten/Kota semua kepala sekolah SMP dan MTs berkualifikasi pendidikan S-1 atau D-IV dan setengah di antaranya (50% kepala sekolah SMP dan MTs) telah memiliki sertifikat pendidik
11. Di setiap Kabupaten/Kota 50% pengawas sekolah memiliki kualifikasi S-1/D-IV dan separuh di antaranya (25% dari keseluruhan pengawas) telah memiliki sertifikat pendidik
12. Pemerintah Kab/Kota memiliki rencana dan melaksanakan kegiatan untuk membantu sekolah dalam mengembangkan kurikulum dan proses pembelajaran yang efektif
13. Kunjungan pengawas ke sekolah dilakukan minimal sekali dalam satu bulan dan setiap kunjungan dilakukan setidaknya selama 3 jam untuk melakukan pemantauan dan pembinaan.

b. SPM Untuk Satuan Pendidikan
14. Sekolah Dasar dan Madrasah Ibtidaiyah menyediakan satu set buku teks yang sudah disertifikasi oleh Pemerintah mencakup mata pelajaran Bahasa Indonesia, Matematika, IPA, IPS dengan perbandingan satu set untuk satu siswa
15. Sekolah Menengah Pertama dan Madrasah Tsanawiyah menyediakan satu judul buku teks mencakup mata pelajaran yang sudah disertifikasi oleh Pemerintah, dengan perbandingan satu set untuk setiap satu orang siswa
16. Setiap SD dan MI menyediakan satu set peraga IPA dan bahan yang terdiri dari kerangka manusia, model tubuh manusia, bola dunia (globe), contoh peralatan optik, kit IPA untuk eksperimen dasar dan poster IPA
17. Setiap SD dan MI menyediakan 100 judul buku pengayaan dan 10 buku referensi, dan Setiap SMP dan MTs memiliki 200 judul buku pengayaan dan 20 buku referensi
18. Setiap guru tetap bekerja setidaknya 37.5 jam per minggu di sekolah termasuk mengajar di dalam kelas, menyiapkan satuan acara pembelajaran, memberikan konsultasi individu bagi siswa yang membutuhkan
19. Sekolah dan Madrasah menyelenggarakan proses pembelajaran di sekolah selama 34 minggu per tahun dengan kegiatan tatap muka sebagai berikut:
   1. Kelas I : 18 jam per minggu
   2. Kelas II : 18 jam per minggu
   3. Kelas III : 24 jam per minggu
   4. Kelas IV - VI : 27 jam per minggu
   5. Kelas VII - IX : 27 jam per minggu
20. Sekolah dan Madrasah memiliki KTSP sesuai ketentuan yang berlaku
21. Setiap guru menyusun silabus untuk setiap mata pelajaran/kelas yang diampunya
22. Setiap guru mengembangkan program penilaian untuk membantu meningkatkan kemampuan belajar siswa
23. Kepala sekolah melakukan supervisi kelas dan memberikan umpan balik kepada guru dua kali dalam satu semester
24. Setiap guru menyampaikan laporan hasil evaluasi mata pelajaran serta hasil penilaian setiap siswa kepada Kepala Sekolah pada akhir semester dalam bentuk laporan hasil prestasi belajar;
25. Kepala Sekolah/Madrasah menyampaikan hasil test tengah tahunan dan hasil ujianakhir kepada orang tua siswa dan menyampaikan rekapitulasinya kepada Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten/Kota/Kandepag pada setiap akhir semester;
26. Setiap Sekolah dan Madrasah menerapkan prinsip-prinsip Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah (MBS);

Pasal 3

Di luar jenis pelayanan sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 2 ayat (2), Kabupaten/Kota tertentu wajib menyelenggarakan jenis pelayanan sesuai kebutuhan, karakteristik, dan potensi daerah.

Pasal 4

SPM Pendidikan sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 2 dan Pasal 3 diberlakukan juga bagi Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta.

BAB III

PENGORGANISASIAN

Pasal 5

(1) Bupati/Walikota bertanggungjawab dalam penyelenggaraan pelayanan pendidikan dasar sesuai SPM Pendidikan yang dilaksanakan oleh Perangkat Daerah Kabupaten/Kota dan masyarakat sesuai peraturan perundangan yang berlaku;

(2) Penyelenggaraan pelayanan pendidikan dasar sesuai SPM Pendidikan sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) secara operasional dikoordinasikan oleh Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten/ Kota;

(3) Penyelenggaraan pelayanan pendidikan dasar sesuai SPM Pendidikan dilakukan oleh pendidik dan tenaga kependidikan sesuai dengan kualifikasi dan kompetensi yang dibutuhkan.

BAB IV

PELAKSANAAN

Pasal 6

(1) SPM Pendidikan yang ditetapkan merupakan acuan dalam perencanaan program pencapaian target masing-masing Daerah Kabupaten/Kota.

(2) Standar Pelayanan Minimal sebagaimana dimaksud dalam perencanaan program pada ayat (1) dilaksanakan sesuai dengan
BAB V
PELAPORAN
Pasal 7

(1) Bupati/Walikota menyampaikan laporan teknis tahunan kinerja penerapan dan pencapaian SPM Pendidikan kepada Menteri Pendidikan Nasional.

(2) Berdasarkan laporan teknis tahunan sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) Menteri Pendidikan Nasional melakukan pembinaan dan pengawasan teknis penerapan SPM Pendidikan.

BAB VI
MONITORING DAN EVALUASI
Pasal 8

(1) Menteri Pendidikan Nasional melaksanakan monitoring dan evaluasi atas penerapan SPM Pendidikan oleh Pemerintah Daerah dalam rangka menjamin akses dan mutu pelayanan pendidikan dasar kepada masyarakat.

(2) Monitoring dan evaluasi sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) dilaksanakan sesuai dengan peraturan perundang-undangan.

(3) Monitoring dan evaluasi sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) dilakukan oleh Gubernur sebagai Wakil Pemerintah di Daerah untuk Pemerintahan Daerah Kabupaten/Kota.

Pasal 9

Hasil monitoring dan evaluasi penerapan dan pencapaian SPM Pendidikan sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 8 dipergunakan sebagai:

a. Bahan masukan bagi pengembangan kapasitas pemerintah daerah dalam pencapaian SPM Pendidikan;

b. Bahan pertimbangan dalam pembinaan dan pengawasan penerapan
SPM Pendidikan, termasuk pemberian penghargaan bagi pemerintah daerah yang berprestasi sangat baik; dan
c. Bahan pertimbangan dalam memberikan sanksi kepada Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten/Kota yang tidak berhasil mencapai SPM Pendidikan dengan baik dalam batas waktu yang ditetapkan dengan mempertimbangkan kondisi khusus Daerah yang bersangkutan sesuai peraturan perundang-undangan.

BAB VII
PENGEMBANGAN KAPASITAS

Pasal 10

(1) Menteri Pendidikan Nasional memfasilitasi pengembangan kapasitas melalui peningkatan kemampuan sistem, kelembagaan, personil dan keuangan, baik di tingkat pemerintah, provinsi, dan Kabupaten/Kota.

(2) Fasilitasi pengembangan kapasitas sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) berupa pemberian orientasi umum, petunjuk teknis, bimbingan teknis, pendidikan dan pelatihan, dan/atau bantuan lainnya meliputi:

a. Perhitungan sumber daya dan dana yang dibutuhkan untuk mencapai SPM Pendidikan, termasuk kesenjangan pembiayaan;
b. Penyusunan rencana pencapaian SPM Pendidikan dan penetapan target tahunan pencapaian SPM Pendidikan;
c. Penilaian prestasi kerja pencapaian SPM Pendidikan; dan
d. Pelaporan prestasi kerja pencapaian SPM Pendidikan.

(3) Fasilitasi, pemberian orientasi umum, petunjuk teknis, bimbingan teknis, pendidikan dan pelatihan, dan/atau bantuan lainnya sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (2), mempertimbangkan kemampuan kelembagaan, personil dan keuangan negara serta keuangan daerah.
BAB VIII
PENDANAAN

Pasal 11

(1) Pendanaan yang berkaitan dengan kegiatan penyusunan, penetapan, pelaporan, monitoring dan evaluasi, pembinaan dan pengawasan, pembangunan sistem dan/atau sub sistem informasi manajemen, serta pengembangan kapasitas untuk mendukung penyelenggaraan SPM Pendidikan yang merupakan tugas dan tanggung jawab pemerintah, dibebankan kepada APBN Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

(2) Pendanaan yang berkaitan dengan penerapan, pencapaian kinerja/target, pelaporan, monitoring dan evaluasi, pembinaan dan pengawasan, pembangunan sub sistem informasi manajemen, serta pengembangan kapasitas, yang merupakan tugas dan tanggung jawab pemerintahan daerah dibebankan kepada APBD.

BAB IX
PEMBINAAN DAN PENGAWASAN

Pasal 12

(1) Menteri Pendidikan Nasional melakukan pembinaan teknis atas penerapan dan pencapaian SPM Pendidikan Dasar.

(2) Pembinaan sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) dilaksanakan dengan menyusun Petunjuk Teknis yang ditetapkan dengan Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional.

(3) Menteri Pendidikan Nasional setelah berkoordinasi dengan Menteri Dalam Negeri, dapat mendelegasikan pembinaan teknis sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) kepada Gubernur selaku wakil pemerintah di daerah.

Pasal 13

(1) Menteri Pendidikan Nasional dalam melakukan pengawasan teknis atas penerapan dan pencapaian SPM Pendidikan dibantu oleh Inspektoret
Jenderal Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

(2) Gubernur selaku wakil pemerintah di daerah dalam melakukan pengawasan teknis atas penerapan dan pencapaian SPM Pendidikan dibantu oleh Inspektorat Provinsi berkoordinasi dengan Inspektorat Kabupaten/ Kota.

(4) Bupati/ Walikota melaksanakan pengawasan dalam penyelenggaraan pelayanan Pendidikan sesuai SPM Pendidikan di daerah masing-masing.

BAB X

KETENTUAN PERALIHAN

Pasal 14

(1) Untuk menjamin keberlangsungan pencapaian tujuan pendidikan nasional, dalam pelaksanaan SPM Pendidikan terdapat sebagian urusan yang menjadi kewenangan daerah yang pendanaannya masih bersumber dari APBN.²

BAB XI

KETENTUAN PENUTUP

Pasal 15


Pasal 16

Peraturan ini mulai berlaku pada tanggal ditetapkan.

Ditetapkan di Jakarta
pada tanggal ... Oktober 2009

MENTERI PENDIDIKAN NASIONAL RI,

Bambang Soedibyo

² Perlu dikonsultasikan lebih lanjut dgn Biro Hukum
28. Fact sheets about MSS (What, How and Why MSS?)

Not only MSS indicators and its regulation were produced, but this exhibit also shows another product of this research by project; MSS fact sheets. These documents are useful in workshops and to the discussion and dissemination process.

These documents were developed by the MSS Team, to which (as outlined in the exegesis) I made a significant contribution. They facilitate the implementation of the revised MSS policy and also provide important insights into the approach adopted and an awareness of the importance to communicate the new MSS in order to support and encourage their implementation.
FACTS SHEETS

MINIMUM SERVICE STANDARDS FOR EDUCATION

What, How and Why?

NSE
(Content, Competency, Teacher and Personnel, Facilities and Infrastructure, Management, Evaluation, Process, Financial)

MSS
CONTENTS OF FACTS SHEETS

1. What is meant by MSS in Education?
2. How does MSS support the Government’s targets for Education?
3. Relevant Laws and Regulations for MSS in Education
4. Why do we need a revised set of MSS?
5. How does MSS relate to the National Standards for Education (NSE) and School Accreditation?
6. Diagram: Relationship of MSS to NSE and School Accreditation
7. Process for development of the new MSS
8. Diagram: Responsibilities for implementing MSS
9. How will MSS be used and by whom?
10. How will MSS improve quality of education?
11. Diagram: Role of MSS and NSE in improving the quality of education
12. How will MSS guide education financing?
13. Proposed implementation model for MSS
14. Timeframe for achievement of MSS and SNP
WHAT IS MEANT BY MINIMUM SERVICE STANDARDS (MSS) IN EDUCATION?

- Minimum Service Standards (MSS), referred to in Bahasa Indonesia as Standar *Pelayanan Minimal* (SPM), describe the nature and degree of education services that need to be delivered by district/city government and *Kandepag*\(^3\) both directly and indirectly through schools and madrasah.
- The purpose of MSS is to ensure that in every school/madrasah; at least the minimum conditions are provided for teaching and learning to occur.
- The MSS for education includes services which are:
  - the *direct responsibility* of the district/city government and *Kandepag* (e.g. provision of classrooms, qualified and competent teachers);
  - the *indirect responsibility* of the district/city because the service is delivered by the school staff, supported by the district (e.g. preparation of lesson plans and student assessment take place at schools but are supervised by the district). The district is still accountable for ensuring that these services are provided.
- MSS for education defines the *obligatory functions* of local government and *Kandepag* in providing education services. This means that the Government and *Kandepag* are obliged to deliver the specified facilities and services.
- MSS describes what every school/madrasah must have, and must do, at the minimum level, to ensure that learning can take place.
- MSS makes a clear statement to the public about the minimum level of service that they can expect in their schools/madrasahs.
- MSS does not stand alone – it is the first step towards implementing the National Standards in Education (NSE).

\(^3\) Representative Office of MORA at district level
HOW DOES MSS SUPPORT ACHIEVEMENT OF GOVERNMENT TARGETS IN EDUCATION?

• MSS in Education is a performance management instrument for the development of the education sector. MSS will help the government in strategizing the achievement of education development targets through various stages of planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

• MONE, MORA, and Bappenas are each responsible for establishing policies and targets for national development in the education sector as part of the RENSTRA (MONE and MORA), and the Medium Term Development Plan (Bappenas). Local governments develop their plans and set targets for education in their respective regions based on the national plans.

• It is recognized that there are many challenges to improving quality and equity in education. Reports produced by MONE, MORA and Bappenas reveal not only a low level of achievement but significant variation between regions which is associated with economic, social and cultural background factors as well as institutional capacity and human resource factors.

• Improving education quality is a key priority of government programs as is the imperative to reduce the disparity in performance between regions. MSS is an effective instrument for addressing these disparities by identifying the least performing schools and implementing improvement strategies.

• As part of a broader education quality improvement strategy, MSS helps to identify the inputs and processes that are required for efficient and effective management of education services.
**LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR MSS IN EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT (DECENTRALIZATION &amp; AUTONOMY)</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP 47/2008: Compulsory Basic Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>PP 21/2004: Guidelines for Programming and Budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP 48/2008: Education Financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHY DO WE NEED A REVISED SET OF MSS?

- New legal frameworks for local government (Law 32/2004) and for national education (Law 20/2003) require MONE and MOHA to develop MSS that will guide local government in delivering education services.

- The existing MSS, developed under MONE Decree No. 129a/2004, was based on the old law pertaining to local government (Law 22/1999) which has now been superseded by Law 32/2004. The new law includes revisions to the division of roles and functions between levels of government which are set out in government regulation (PP) 38/2007. As a result, the existing MSS needed to be revised to accommodate the requirements of both Law 32/2004 and PP 38/2007.

- Furthermore, Law 20/2003 and PP 19/2005 were issued to ensure the systematic improvement of education through application of National Standards for Education. A National Board for Education Standards (BSNP) was established in 2006 to be responsible for formulating the standards and monitoring implementation. Currently, 7 out of 8 sets of standards have been issued through ministerial regulations.

- Clearly, the publication of the National Standards (NSE) required that the MSS developed under MONE Decree 129a/2004 be revised in order to be both consistent with the content and intent of the NSE and to reflect the specified roles and responsibilities of each level of government for providing education services in the decentralized era.
HOW DOES MSS FIT WITH THE NATIONAL STANDARDS (NSE) AND SCHOOL ACCREDITATION?

Minimum Service Standards (MSS)

- MSS for Education do not stand alone; they are closely aligned with both the National Standards (NSE) and School/Madrasah Accreditation.
- MSS is an implementation strategy for achieving NSE step-by-step.

National Standards for Education (NSE)

- The NSE were developed under Law 20/2003 and Government Regulation 19/2005 by an independent Board (BSNP) and cover 8 aspects of schooling: (a) standard of content; (b) standard of process; (c) standard of teacher, principal and education personnel; (d) standard of equipment and infrastructure; (e) standard of management; (f) standard of financing; (g) standard of evaluation; and (h) standard of graduate competence.
- The NSE contains comprehensive and detailed standards for each level of schooling – primary, junior secondary, senior secondary and vocational high schools – that are expected to be fulfilled by 2014. Implementing MSS is the first stage towards ensuring achievement of the NSE.

School Accreditation

- The National Board of Accreditation (BAN-SM) developed the accreditation instrument for schools and madrasah based on NSE.
- The accreditation status of a school/madrasah is based on their overall score (A to D) derived from a series of rating scales. (A = highest; D = lowest). Rating of D or below is unsatisfactory.
- Schools who do not meet the lowest level (D) on the accreditation are the target group for MSS, together with schools that have not yet taken part in the accreditation process but are thought to be at risk.
- Accreditation will be undertaken by Provincial Board of Accreditation (BAP-SM) and involving province based assessor from their area.
FACT SHEET 6

RELATIONSHIP OF MSS TO NSE AND SCHOOL ACCREDITATION

EQAIS = Education Quality Assurance and Improvement System.

Objective— to ensure all schools get over the line

BAN ACCREDITATION

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD

NATIONAL STANDARD EDUCATION

MINIMUM SERVICE STANDARD

Non Accredited

Continuous Improvement

EQAIS

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD

NATIONAL STANDARD EDUCATION

MINIMUM SERVICE STANDARD

Non Accredited
PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW MSS

- The *process* for development of MSS is based on Guidelines contained in PP 65/2005 and MOHA Regulation No. 6/2007.

- The *content* of the MSS is guided by the NSE which has been issued by MONE Regulations. Extensive consultations between the MSS team and the BSNP were undertaken to ensure a shared understanding and a common platform for the approach and methodology.

- As MSS is to be an intermediate target towards achievement of NSE, MSS includes elements which are a subset of NSE; MSS also includes particular district responsibilities which foster the achievement of NSE.

- MSS has to take account of the available resources for education and capacity for implementation. Therefore the MSS focuses on elements that will have greatest leverage in improving the quality of education.

- The process of identifying elements to include in MSS also took into account educational theory and international research on factors most commonly associated with quality education and school improvement.

- Consultation workshops on proposed key elements of MSS were conducted with education stakeholders including teachers, principals, supervisors and education officers from Dinas, *Kandepag*, Bappeda, and Members of Local Parliaments in selected districts and provinces.

- The MSS consultation draft was then discussed with relevant officers from MOHA, MOF, MORA, MENPAN, Bappenas, BAN-SM, and BSNP. Based on advice from these key institutions the final MSS draft is being put forward for discussion at a national workshop.

- The revised MSS arising from the national workshop will be submitted to MOHA for review by a Consultative Team, and subsequently forwarded for approval from the Regional Autonomy Advisory Board (DPOD).

- Once approved by DPOD (Regional Autonomy National Consultative Body), the MSS is then issued through a MONE regulation.
RESPONSIBILITIES FOR IMPLEMENTING MSS

(Who is responsible for What?)

Central Government

- Operating Funds Assistance (BOS)

District, City, Government

- Infrastructure and Equipment
- Teacher, Principal, Supervisor
- District education management

Quality Education

- Teaching and learning contents
- Teaching and learning process
- Education Evaluation
- Books, equipments, and media
- School Management
HOW WILL MSS BE USED AND BY WHOM?

- National and Provincials government will be able to use the MSS to evaluate the performance of local governments in fulfilling their obligatory functions in education.

- MONE and MORA will be able to use the MSS to monitor the extent to which schools and madrasah are meeting the minimum conditions for learning.

- MONE will use the MSS to monitor the extent to which national education policies, including the national standards for education (NSE), are being implemented by schools.

- MORA will use the MSS to monitor the extent to which national education policies, including the national standards for education (NSE), are being implemented by Madrasah.

- MOF and BAPPENAS will be able to use the MSS to make efficient resource allocations in the education sector and ensure that education is properly financed.

- Districts and Kandepag will be able to use MSS to assess the basic conditions for learning in every school, to plan for improvement and to guide resource allocation.

- Schools and Madrasah will be able to use MSS to check that they have the basic resources guaranteed by government and that they are fulfilling the minimum mandatory expectation of what every teacher and principal must do.

- Parents will be able to use the MSS to check whether their school or Madrasah has the resources it must have and if it is doing what is expected by law.
HOW WILL MSS RAISE QUALITY OF EDUCATION?

- MSS is focused on *closing the gap* in education services and achievements so that every school is operating at a guaranteed level of service and can realistically begin the process of systematic school improvement towards achievement of the SNP.

- MSS raises awareness of what is required of the main partners in education service delivery – the school and the district/city. This will help to ensure that their efforts are targeted to have the greatest impact on improving education in the most disadvantaged schools.

- MSS strengthens accountability by making explicit what districts and schools must provide.

- MSS enables each level of government to advocate for the resources needed to bring every school up to the minimum standard.

- MSS guides the district/city government in the selection, training and allocation of manpower resources to best support education achievement.

- MSS empowers the community and gives them the facts to advocate for resources and quality teaching and management in schools.

- In 2-3 years every school should be at or above the minimum level of service. This will be a big step in raising education achievements in the poorest and most disadvantaged areas.

- Schools that are at or above the MSS have tools and processes for continuous improvement – for example by striving to improve their accreditation rating and by systematically working on school improvement using the processes of the Education Quality Assurance and Improvement System (EQAIS).
Diagram: Role of MSS and NSE in Improving the Quality of Education

External Factors:
Autonomy, Decentralization, Human Rights, Globalization, MDG’s, EFA, Accountability

Existing Condition:
1. Most of district/cities have not fulfilled their obligatory functions in education
2. No policy instrument for district/cities to implement their obligatory functions in education
3. The earlier MSS (Kepmen 129a/2004) for education has not adequately addressed specification of services and not in line with the new standards contained in NSE

NSE

MSS

Policy Instrument to manage and support the achievement of National Standard Education equitably in all district/cities

1. Std Content
2. Std Process
3. Std Competency
4. Std Teacher and Personnel
5. Std Facilities and Infrastructure
6. Std Management
7. Std Evaluation
8. Std Financing

Expected Condition:
1. District/cities able to provide education services to fulfill minimum condition (quality, accountability, transparency) as a basis for achieving NSE
2. District/cities allocate sufficient resources for education

Legal Framework:

Improving Dignity and Competitiveness of the Nation as reflected in the constitution 1945
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HOW WILL MSS GUIDE EDUCATION FINANCING?

- The MSS provides a clear statement of what each school must have and must do.

- Some standards will be reached through the redistribution of resources within the district. For example, ensuring that all schools have the teachers they need may involve moving some trained teachers from one school to another.

- Some standards will require additional resources. These resources may come from the district, province or national government. For example new or improved infrastructure; training of supervisors.

- Some standards will be achieved by more effective allocation of resources within the school. For example more frequent supervision by the principal of teachers’ lesson plans; increasing the amount of face to face teaching time received by students.

- Costing the implementation of MSS will be based on mapping the current status of schools and unit cost analysis.

- The school supervisors in each districts/city will assess each school’s status against the MSS and identify those below the MSS. This enables the district to formulate the budget to meet the MSS. In this way the district education budget will prioritize meeting the gaps in the areas of highest need.

- Mapping resource allocation to education gaps ensures that every school and district will meet the minimum level in the target time.

- MSS has potential to make district/city resource allocation and budgeting more cost effective and efficient.
PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION MODEL FOR MSS

Preparation and Dissemination

- Dissemination of MSS will target relevant stakeholders at district/city, Kandepag, schools, and madrasahs.
- Training will be provided for district officers, supervisors, and principals who are responsible for implementation of MSS.
- To support MSS implementation in the first year a task force will be established at each district whose members are appointed from Dinas, Bappeda, Kandepag, and Sekda.

Identification of target schools and madrasah by the district and Kandepag

- MSS Task Force should identify the target schools that are not meeting MSS:
  - Use data and information from BANP to identify schools and madrasah rated at or below level D between 2005 - 09.
  - Dinas and Kandepag assign school/madrasah supervisors to identify schools in their district that have not undertaken the accreditation process but are thought to be at risk of not meeting MSS.
- Dinas and Kandepag on the request of MSS Task Force assign supervisors to assess the conditions of the identified schools/madrasahs using MSS criteria and report the results to MSS Task Force. (As mentioned in the proposed MONE decree for MSS)

District planning and action

- The district (dinas/Kandepag) task force will prepare a plan and budget for achieving MSS in target schools based on the results of assessment by supervisors and analysis of district and Kandepag data.
• The district dinas/Kandepag prepares action plan on how to improve both inputs and processes to ensure that all schools will meet MSS within two years.

• Each target school/madrasah will develop a plan for meeting the school level components of MSS. Supervisors will monitor monthly each school’s progress towards the MSS.

**Monitoring and review**

• MONE, MORA and MOHA monitor progress towards implementation of MSS.

• Once MSS has been field tested in a select group of districts, a full-scale national implementation plan will be developed. The plan will include a national steering group to drive implementation.

**Sustainable Education Quality Improvement**

• Schools and madrasah that have fulfilled MSS will be supported to continually improve their services in order to achieve NSE using the systematic approach contained in the Education Quality Assurance and Improvement System (EQAIS).

• MSS will be reviewed regularly and the indicators adjusted upwards in a step by step process towards the goal of all schools and madrasah achieving NSE requirements by 2014.
In 2010 MSS will be implemented, and all DEOs are expected to achieve these basic education MSS by 2013.
29. MSS Indicator Guidelines

Considering the many problems that emerged from the previous MSS implementation, the MSS team finally decided to prepare MSS guidelines accompanying the other MSS documents (Indicators, Decree draft, fact sheets).

The guidelines were formulated throughout a series of meetings (in October-November 2009) and consisting of a series of guidelines: how to implement indicators for DEO and school level, how to measure the MSS gap based on the existing conditions of a DEO or a School MSS compared to its indicator and finally, how to formulate costing in fulfilling DEO or school MSS requirements.

These guidelines are too bulky to be fully included in this portfolio, therefore this exhibit only shows some of the documents, for example, documentation to be completed by the school principal and verified by the district supervisor.
Guidelines for measuring MSS Indicators.

Bagian – 1
Petunjuk Teknis Perhitungan Indikator Standar Pelayanan Minimal Bidang Pendidikan.

1. Jenis pelayanan : SARANA DAN PRASARANA
2. Indikator IP-1 : Tersedia satuan pendidikan dalam jarak yang terjangkau dengan berjalan kaki yaitu maksimal 3 km untuk SD/MI dan 6 km untuk SMP/MTs dari kelompok permukiman permanen.
3. Definisi operasional : Kelompok permukiman permanen adalah kelompok permukiman yang terletak di daerah terpencil dan didiami oleh minimal 1000 orang. Ciri utama daerah terpencil adalah memiliki hambatan geografis dan prasarana transportasi.
4. Target Pencapaian penuh (100%) : 2013
5. Kegiatan : 1) Memeriksa dan mendata kelompok pemukiman permanen di daerah terpencil yang memiliki penduduk minimal 1000 orang. Kelompok pemukiman dengan jumlah penduduk sebesar ini menjadi acuan perhitungan kelompok pemukiman. 2) Memeriksa dan mendata kelompok pemukiman permanen yang memiliki akses pada SD/MI dalam jarak kurang dari 3 km. 3) Memeriksa dan mendata kelompok pemukiman permanen yang memiliki akses pada SMP/MTs dalam jarak kurang dari 6 km.
7. Petugas Pengumpul Data : Pengawas TK/SD, SMP, RA/MI, dan MTs).
8. Penafsiran Data : Kabupaten/Kota disebut memenuhi indikator IP-1 apabila sub indikator IP-1.1 dan IP-1.2 adalah nol, artinya semua pemukiman permanen di daerah terpencil di wilayahnya telah memiliki akses sekolah dalam jarak 3 km untuk SD/MI dan 6 km untuk SMP/MTs.
9. Implikasi : Apabila tingkat pencapaian indikator IP-1 belum mencapai 100% maka Pemerintah Kabupaten/Kota perlu merencanakan program dan menyediakan investasi untuk pemenuhannya secara bertahap.
Guidelines for Costing MSS Indicators.

Bagian – 2
Petunjuk Teknis Perhitungan Biaya Standar Pelayanan Minimal Bidang Pendidikan.

I. Pendahuluan

1.1. Latar Belakang

Keberhasilan pelaksanaan Standar Pelayanan Minimum (SPM) bidang pendidikan oleh pemerintah daerah tergantung dari komitmen pemerintah Kabupaten/Kota. Komitmen ini bisa didapat antara lain jika ada kesepakatan secara politis bahwa anggaran untuk pelaksanaannya masih dalam jangkauan kemampuan penganggaran di masing-masing Kabupaten/Kota.

Selain untuk kepentingan setiap kabupaten kota, beban biaya pelaksanaan SPM juga diperlukan oleh pemerintah. Mengingat sebagian besar pemerintah daerah anggarannya tergantung dari transfer dari pemerintah, dan telah terikat dalam bentuk pembayaran gaji pegawai. Dampaknya, sebagian besar pemerintah daerah kemungkinan perlu perubahan kebijakan dan cara penganggaran yang cukup bermakna untuk memenuhi kewajiban SPM ini. Sehingga pemerintah perlu mengetahui beban anggaran pelaksanaan SPM setiap pemerintah Kabupaten/kota, untuk menentukan besarnya subsidi tambahan yang diperlukan untuk kabupaten/kota tertentu yang walaupun telah melakukan manuver anggaran, masih sulit melaksanakan SPM tanpa tambahan dana.

Sebagai konsekwensi dari kedua hal diatas, diperlukan sebuah metode estimasi yang setara antar kabupaten/kota. Dalam upaya itulah maka disusun “Petunjuk Teknis Perhitungan Biaya Pelaksanaan Standar Pelayanan Minimum Bidang Pendidikan”

1.2. Maksud dan Tujuan

Tujuan utama perhitungan biaya standar pelayanan (SPM) adalah untuk melakukan estimasi beban biaya pelaksanaan SPM baik di pemerintah kabupaten/kota maupun di sekolah sebagai pelaksana fungsi pendidikan di kabupaten/kota. Ada beberapa elemen biaya yang penting dan berdampak besar terhadap anggaran pemerintah kabupaten/kota sebagai konsekwensi pelaksanaan SPM:

1. Biaya Investasi Prasarana
2. Biaya Investasi Sarana
3. Biaya Investasi Sumber daya manusia
4. Biaya Operasional
5. Biaya Lain-lain

Walaupun SPM meliputi biaya untuk sekolah, dalam petunjuk teknis ini cakupan perhitungan dalam petunjuk teknis ini hanya meliputi dampak anggaran pada pemerintah kabupaten/kota. Sejauh biaya pelaksanaan operasional sekolah telah didesain memenuhi SPM ini maka tidak ada tambahan biaya lain untuk pelaksanaan SPM di sekolah.

Tujuan penyusunan petunjuk teknis perhitungan biaya ini adalah sebagai pedoman dalam perhitungan beban biaya pelaksanaan SPM di Kabupaten/kota. Sesuai aturan SPM harus
dimasukkan dalam Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah (RPJMD) dan selanjutnya kedalam Rencana Kerja Pemerintah Daerah (RKPD). Oleh karena itu perhitungan biaya ini akan membantu pemerintah Kabupaten/Kota dalam perencanaan alokasi anggaran tahunan, agar target SPM dapat tercapai sesuai dengan waktu yang dispakati.

Biaya operasional sebagai akibat pemilikan aset tambahan untuk pemenuhan SPM yang perlu dipelihara tidak dimasukkan dalam petunjuk teknis ini. Pemerintah daerah diharapkan mengalokasikan anggaran secara wajar atas seluruh asset yang dimiliki agar umur asset sesuai dengan desainnya.

Biaya-lain-lain sebagai akibat pelaksanaan SPM juga tidak masuk dalam petunjuk teknis perhitungan biaya SPM ini.

1.3. Ruang Lingkup


1.4. Pengertian

1. SPM bidang pendidikan ini mencakup pelayanan pendidikan dasar yang menjadi target wajib belajar. Sesuai dengan program pemerintah wajib belajar adalah pendidikan selama 9 tahun mencakup 6 tahun sekolah dasar dan 3 tahun sekolah lanjutan pertama.


II. Penyiapan Data dan Pembagian Wewenang

2.1. Waktu Pelaksanaan

Perhitungan biaya standar pelayanan minimal bidang pendidikan ini dilakukan setiap tahun sebelum Musrenbangda tingkat kabupaten/Kota dilakukan. Hasil perhitungan biaya standard pelayanan minimal bidang pendidikan ini menjadi bahan pertimbangan dalam Musrenbangda.

2.2. Penangungjawab

Penangungjawab dari perhitungan biaya standard pelayanan minimal bidang pendidikan dilakukan oleh Dinas Pendidikan masing-masing Kabupaten/Kota.

Dalam melaksanakan perhitungan biaya standar pelayanan minimal bidang pendidikan ini diperlukan data-data yang relevan dari butir-butir SPM. Data-data tersebut diperoleh dari:

1. Pengisian formulir data yang dilakukan oleh kepala sekolah/madrasah
2. Pengumpulan data yang dilakukan Pengawas Sekolah/madrasah
3. Pengumpulan data yang dilakukan oleh Dinas Pendidikan/Kandepag.
Karena banyak indikator dalam butir-butir SPM memerlukan informasi tentang pencapaian secara terdistribusi sekolah, maka penyajian dan pendataan di tingkat sekolah dilakukan oleh kepala sekolah. Langkah selanjutnya adalah pengumpulan data di tiap sekolah yang terbaru akan lebih akurat, cepat dan efisien dilakukan oleh Pengawas Sekolah. Sewaktu pengumpulan data dari kepala sekolah, Pengawas Sekolah melakukan uji petik atas data yang disampaikan oleh kepala sekolah. Kunjungan rutin Pengawas Sekolah ke setiap sekolah yang menjadi tanggung-jawabnya juga merupakan kegiatan yang masuk dalam SPM pendidikan ini. Oleh karenanya informasi dari Pengawas Sekolah menjadi sumber data utama dalam perhitungan standar biaya SPM ini.

Sebagian data pengumpulannya lebih baik dan akurat dilakukan oleh Dinas Pendidikan. Dalam situasi ini maka data tersebut menjadi pelengkap data dari Pengawas Sekolah.

2.3. Pembagian Tugas

1. Kepala Sekolah/Madrasah
   a. Menyiapkan data sesuai format formulir/lembar survey yang telah disiapkan untuk setiap butir SPM;
   b. Memberikan hasil pengisian formulir/lembar survey kepada Pengawas sekolah atau Petugas dari Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten/Kota;

2. Pengawas Sekolah/Madrasah
   a. Mengumpulkan data formulir/lembar survey yang disiapkan oleh kepala sekolah yang menjadi binaannya;
   b. Melakukan pemeriksaan ulang dengan uji petik secara random terhadap data yang diberikan oleh kepala sekolah;
   c. Mengolah dan menyajikan data tiap sekolah untuk setiap butir SPM dimana petunjuk teknisnya menyatakan demikian;
   d. Membuat rekapitulasi data-data butir-butir SPM untuk seluruh sekolah yang menjadi tanggungjawabnya;
   e. Menyampaikan hasil rekapitulasi data sekolah ke Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten/Kota atau Kandepag

3. Dinas Pendidikan/Kandepag
   a. Mengumpulkan data posisi sekolah terhadap pencapaian SPM;
   b. Membuat rekapitulasi data butir-butir SPM dari pengawas sekolah untuk mendapatkan data terkini untuk prasarana, sarana, sumberdaya manusia dan sumberdaya lainnya yang terkait dengan butir-butir SPM
   c. Membuat rekapitulasi data butir-butir SPM seperti pada (c) sesuai dengan rencana tahunan pencapaian SPM yang merupakan turunan dari pencapaian SPM pendidikan yang terdapat pada RPJMD.
   d. Menghitung kebutuhan investasi, operasional dan biaya lainnya untuk pencapaian SPM pada setiap tahun anggaran
   e. Merekomendasikan dan mendiskusikan hasil perhitungan biaya untuk pencapaian SPM tahun anggaran dalam forum Musrenbang Kabupaten/Kota
   f. Memasukkan hasil perhitungan biaya SPM pada (d dan e) dalam penyelipan Rencana Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja (RAPBD) daerah. Untuk madrasah masuk dalam Rencana Anggaran Kandepag.
III. Tata Cara Perhitungan Biaya Standar Pelayanan Minimum

3.1. Prinsip Dasar

Perhitungan biaya standar pelayanan minimum bidang pendidikan menggunakan konsep *incremental*. Hal ini dilakukan karena tanpa SPM pun, pelayanan pendidikan sudah dilaksanakan oleh Pemerintah kabupaten/Kota. Pelayanan pendidikan yang masuk dalam butir-butir SPM merupakan sebagian dari keseluruhan pelayanan pendidikan. Dengan demikian SPM haruslah dimaknai sebagai bagian dari pelayanan pendidikan yang penyediaannya tidak boleh lebih rendah dari yang diatur dalam SPM.

Sebagai konsekwensi logisnya adalah bahwa setiap Pemerintah Kabupaten/Kota harus mengetahui posisi pelayanan pendidikan yang diatur dalam SPM. Kalau ada pelayanan pendidikan yang lebih rendah dari standar yang diatur dalam SPM maka pemerintah perlu mengalokasikan anggaran untuk meningkatkan pelayanan pendidikan agar setidaknya mencapai standar minimal tersebut.

Bukan maksud SPM ini untuk menurunkan standar pendidikan yang sudah tinggi di sekolah-sekolah dalam kabupaten/Kota. Walaupun redistribusi sumber-daya, terutama sumber-daya manusia, memungkinkan untuk dilakukan, pelaksanaannya harus dilakukan dengan cara seksama agar kualitas pendidikan tidak turun ke tingkat SPM. Kebijakan demikian memang pada akhirnya bisa dilakukan sekedar untuk mencapai SPM tetapi dengan mengorbankan pelayanan pendidikan di sekolah-sekolah yang kualitasnya sudah tinggi. Dimana perlu dapat dilakukan alokasi anggaran dari kegiatan pada dinas pendidikan yang kurang esensial dalam pencapaian SPM ke pelayanan pendidikan yang masih rendah pencapaiannya menurut standar SPM.

3.2. Langkah-langkah Penyusunan Biaya Standar Pelayanan Minimum

Langkah-langkah Penyusunan Biaya Standar Pelayanan Minimum adalah sebagai berikut:
1. Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten/Kota membuat perhitungan kesenjangan butir-butir dari sisi Investasi Prasarana, Sarana
2. Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten/Kota membuat perhitungan kesenjangan butir-butir dari sisi Investasi Sumberdaya Manusia
3. Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten/Kota membuat perhitungan kesenjangan butir-butir dari sisi Biaya lain-lain
4. Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten/Kota membuat perhitungan biaya pelaksanaan SPM
30. DEO MSS Survey Form

Since the final MSS indicators were formulated, a series of dissemination processes took place at the end of 2009 by inviting relevant stakeholders from provinces, districts and schools. In each dissemination process, practical exercises were completed for the participants to be able to use MSS indicators. This form therefore is becoming an important part not only in the dissemination process, but later on will be used in real DEO or school MSS assessments.

This exhibit shows the form used by DEO personnel to assess its MSS indicators.
### DEO MSS Survey Form

#### Pendataan Dinas Pendidikan untuk Standar Pelayanan Minimal

**Kabupaten/Kota:**

**Dinas:**

1. Berapa banyak jumlah pemukiman permanen di Kabupaten/Kota?
   - Penduduk lebih dari 1000 orang
   - Penduduk kurang dari 1000 orang

2. Berapa banyak pemukiman permanen dengan lebih dari 1000 penduduk yang tidak ada akses ke satuan pendidikan?
   - SD dalam radius 3 KM
   - SMP dalam radius 6 KM
   - Apakah Kabupaten/Kota perlu menambah sekolah? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
   - Berikan alasannya:

4. Berapa banyak jumlah pengawas di Kabupaten Kota?
   - Jumlah Pengawas TK/SD
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik D-III
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik dibawah D-III
   - Jumlah pengawas TK/SD yang memiliki sertifikasi pendidik
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik D-III
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik dibawah D-III
   - Jumlah Pengawas SMP
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik D-III
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik dibawah D-III
   - Jumlah pengawas SMP yang memiliki sertifikasi pendidik
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik D-III
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik dibawah D-III
- Jumlah Pengawas RA/MI
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik D-III
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik dibawah D-III
- Jumlah pengawas RA/MI yang memiliki sertifikasi pendidik
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik D-III
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik dibawah D-III

- Jumlah Pengawas MTs
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik D-III
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik dibawah D-III
- Jumlah pengawas MTs yang memiliki sertifikasi pendidik
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik D-III
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik dibawah D-III

5. Apakah Kabupaten/Kota memiliki rencana membantu satuan pendidikan untuk pengembangan kurikulum?
   - Memiliki rencana? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
   - Memiliki rencana dan telah dilaksanakan? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
31. Elementary School (SD) MSS Survey Form

This exhibit shows the form used by elementary school personnel or supervisors to assess elementary school MSS indicators and is similar to exhibit 30.
Pendataan Sekolah untuk Standar Pelayanan Minimal: Sekolah Dasar/Madrasah Ibtidaiyah

| Kabupaten/Kota: |  
| Dinas: |  
| Sekolah/Madrasah – No ID: |  

I: Group 1

1. Berapa jumlah siswa di sekolah/madrasah ini? *(Kalau jumlah rombel setiap kelas lebih dari 1, isikan formulir 1)*
   - Laki-laki
   - Wanita
   - Total
     - Kelas 1
     - Kelas 2
     - Kelas 3
     - Kelas 4
     - Kelas 5
     - Kelas 6

2. Berapa banyak rombel di sekolah/madrasah ini?
   - Jumlah total rombel
   - Jumlah rombel dengan peserta didik lebih dari 32 orang
     - Apakah sekolah ini perlu menambah rombel? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
       - Berikan alasannya:

3. Berapa banyak ruang kelas di sekolah ini?
   - Jumlah ruang kelas total
   - Jumlah ruang kelas yang baik
   - Jumlah ruang kelas yang rusak

4. Berapa banyak jumlah tenaga kependidikan?
   - Jumlah seluruh tenaga kependidikan
   - Jumlah seluruh guru
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik D-III
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik dibawah D-III
- Jumlah guru yang memiliki sertifikasi pendidik
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik D-III
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik dibawah D-III
- Pendidikan kepala sekolah
  - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
  - Telah memiliki sertifikasi pendidik? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)

5 Ruang guru?
  - Adakah ruang khusus guru? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
  - Adakah mejaa+kursi cukup untuk guru? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
    - Jumlah mejaa guru
    - Jumlah kursi guru
  - Adakah mejaa+kursi cukup untuk tenaga kependidikan lain? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
    - Jumlah mejaa tenaga kependidikan lainnya
    - Jumlah kursi tenaga kependidikan lainnya

II. Group 2

6 Berapa banyak buku teks yang dimiliki sekolah ini?
  - Bahasa Inggris
  - Matematika
  - Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam
  - Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial

7 Berapa banyak judul buku pengayaan dan referensi yang dimiliki?
  - Buku Pengayaan
  - Buku referensi

8 Berapa banyak alat peraga IPA yang dimiliki? (Kalau alat peraga yang dimiliki lebih dari list ini isikan formulir 2)
  - Kerangka manusia
  - Model tubuh manusia
  - Bola dunia
  - Contoh peralatan optik
  - Kit IPA untuk eksperimen dasar
  - Poster IPA

8 Berapa lama rata-rata guru tetap berada di sekolah selama seminggu, tahun lalu?
  - Guru 1
  - Guru 2
  - Guru 3
  - Guru 4
  - Guru 5
  - Guru 6
  - Guru 7
  - Tambahkan di kertas terpisah bilamana perlu
32. Junior Secondary Secondary (SMP) MSS Survey Form

Similar to exhibits 30 and 31, this exhibit shows the form used by junior secondary school personnel or supervisors to assess JSS MSS indicators.
Junior Secondary High (SMP) MSS Survey Form

Pendataan Sekolah untuk Standar Pelayanan Minimal: Sekolah Menengah Pertama/Madrasah Tsanawiyah

Kabupaten/Kota: 

Dinas: 

Sekolah/Madrasah – No ID: 

I: Group 1

1. Berapa jumlah siswa di sekolah/madrasah ini? (Kalau jumlah rombel setiap kelas lebih dari 1, isikan formulir 1)  
   - Laki-laki 
   - Wanita 
   - Total 
     - Kelas 1 
     - Kelas 2 
     - Kelas 3

2. Berapa banyak rombel di sekolah/madrasah ini?  
   - Jumlah total rombel 
   - Jumlah rombel dengan peserta didik lebih dari 32 orang 
     - Apakah sekolah ini perlu menambah rombel? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0) 
       - Berikan alasannya:

3. Berapa banyak ruang kelas di sekolah ini?  
   - Jumlah ruang kelas total 
   - Jumlah ruang kelas yang baik 
   - Jumlah ruang kelas yang rusak

4. Ruang Laboratorium IPA?  
   - Adakah ruang laboratorium IPA? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0) 
   - Adakah meja+kursi cukup untuk peserta didik? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0) 
     - Jumlah meja peserta didik (kalau meja besar, berikan kapasitas tiap meja untuk menampung peserta didik) 
       - Kapasitas peserta didik tiap meja besar: 
     - Jumlah kursi peserta didik
5. Berapa banyak peralatan praktek IPA yang dimiliki? (dalam set) 

6. Berapa banyak jumlah tenaga kependidikan?
   - Jumlah seluruh tenaga kependidikan
   - Jumlah seluruh guru
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik D-III
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik dibawah D-III
   - Jumlah guru yang memiliki sertifikasi pendidik
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik D-III
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik dibawah D-III
   - Pendidikan kepala sekolah
     - Dengan kualifikasi akademik S1/D-IV atau lebih? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
     - Telah memiliki sertifikasi pendidik? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)

7. Apakah tersedia 1 orang guru untuk setiap mata pelajaran? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0) – (Lengkapi formulir 2)

8. Ruang guru?
   - Adakah ruang khusus guru? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
   - Adakah meja+kursi cukup untuk guru? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
     - Jumlah meja guru
     - Jumlah kursi guru
   - Adakah meja+kursi cukup untuk tenaga kependidikan lain? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
     - Jumlah meja tenaga kependidikan lainnya
     - Jumlah kursi tenaga kependidikan lainnya

9. Ruang Kepala Sekolah
   - Adakah ruang khusus kepala sekolah? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
   - Apakah ruang kepala sekolah terpisah dari ruang guru? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
   - Adakah meja+kursi cukup untuk kepala sekolah? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)

II. Group 2

10. Apakah buku teks tersedia untuk peserta didik di sekolah ini? (Lampirkan formulir 3)
    - Tersedia untuk setiap mata pelajaran? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)
    - Satu set untuk setiap peserta didik? (Ya = 1, Tidak = 0)

11. Berapa banyak judul buku pengayaan dan referensi yang dimiliki?
    - Buku Pengayaan
    - Buku referensi
Additional Products (Papers and Presentations)

33. MSS Presentation for Disseminations

To facilitate the MSS development activities, a number of presentations were prepared. This exhibit is only one example of various presentations used by me or team members.

This presentation was used in Bandung, November 2009 in a meeting involving local government planning bureau members.
Standar Pelayanan Minimal Pendidikan Dasar

Tim SPM/MSS Team
Bandung, 10-11 November 2009

Kerangka Perundangan

- UU 32/2004: Pemerintahan Daerah
- UU 20/2003: Sistem Pendidikan Nasional
- UU 33/2004: Perimbangan Keuangan
- PP 19/2005: Standar Nasional Pendidikan
- PP 38/2007: Pembagian Kewenangan Pusat-Daerah
- PP 65/2005: Pedoman Penyusunan SPM
- PP 55/2005: Pengelolaan Perimbangan Keuangan
- Permendiknas mengenai SNP
- Permendagri 6/2008: Juknis Penyusunan & Penerapan SPM
- Permendagri 79/2007: Juknis Strategi pencapaian SPM
Standar Nasional Pendidikan dan Kualitas Pendidikan …(1)

- Guru, kepala sekolah dan pengawas;
- Kurikulum;
- Buku dan media;
- Infrastruktur dan peralatan;
- Proses
- Manajemen
- Teknologi
- Evaluasi pendidikan
- Kompetensi lulusan;
- Efisiensi internal;
- Relevansi (efisiensi eksternal);

Standar Nasional Pendidikan (SNP) menetapkan spesifikasi input, proses, output, dan outcome;

- Input dan proses dipakai sebagai pendekatan untuk memperkirakan output;
- Output: kualitas pendidikan, efisiensi internal, relevansi (efisiensi eksternal);

Standar Nasional Pendidikan dan Kualitas Pendidikan …(2)

- Cita-cita UU 20/2003 dan PP 19/2005;
- proksi (penduga) indikator kualitas dalam bentuk:
  - Input
  - Prosess

Keadaan saat ini; proksi (penduga) indikator kualitas dalam bentuk:
- Input
- Prosess
Strategi Implementasi SNP

- SNP dicita-citakan sebagai tingkat minimal layanan pendidikan;
- SNP berisi ketentuan tentang input, proses, dan output yang jauh lebih baik dibanding kondisi saat ini;
- Implementasi SNP akan membutuhkan sumberdaya yang sangat besar, kapasitas SDM serta kapasitas kelembagaan yang sangat tinggi → perlu strategi dan pentahapan dalam pelaksanaannya;
- SPM dapat digunakan sebagai instrumen untuk mengendalikan implementasi SNP secara bertahap dan terprogram → instrumen pengelolaan kinerja.

Peningkatan SPM Menuju SNP

SPM 2009 → SPM 2012 → SPM 2014 = Standar Nasional Pendidikan (SNP)

Kondisi Saat Ini

SPM meningkat dari waktu ke waktu menuju SNP
Ilustrasi Peningkatan SPM SD/MI

Kondisi Saat Ini:
- Guru S1/D4: 16%
- Banyak sekolah tanpa guru dg sertifikasi
- Blm semua sekolah menyediakan buku utk siswa

SPM 2009-2011:
- Guru S-1/D-IV: 2 orang/ sekolah 6 rombel
- Guru bersertifikat: 2 orang
- Buku 4 matapelajaran 1 set/siswa
- Kit IPA, tanpa ruang Lab

Stndr Nasional Pendidikan:
- Semua guru sudah S-1/D-IV
- Semua guru sudah sertifikasi
- Buku lengkap 1 set/siswa
- Memiliki Lab & Alat IPA
- Memiliki Lab Bahasa & Komptr
- Memiliki tenaga administratif

Hubungan SPM, SNP, Akreditasi dan Penjaminan Mutu

*EQAS *) Educational Quality Assurance and System
34. Collaborative Paper on Decentralization

To broaden our perspectives on decentralization in Indonesia and its impact to education sector, in December 2006 we conduct a seminar inviting different donors from foreign institutions.

Based on the discussion and suggestions from the participants, finally we decided to focus on three different aspects related to decentralization (planning, service quality and participation) as the main topic of our dissertation.
Decentralization:
Implementation in the Indonesian Context and some Relevant Literature

Didik Suharti
Agus Haryanto
Mochammad Abduh

Collaborative Paper
Prepared for Indonesian Decentralization Presentation to Education Donors

Ministry of National Education
December 2006.
Introduction

Research By Project has three objectives: first the development of a more skilled practitioner; second, the development of professional and academic knowledge; and third the fostering of change in practice or a body of work. The social distribution of knowledge is an important value of Research by Project. Throughout our research projects we worked with our colleagues in the Ministry of National Education, in provincial and district offices and with the broader education community.

Decentralization was a new experience for the education community. We all faced the challenge of implementing this new policy direction. At the same time we faced the challenge of improving educational access, quality and participation. This challenge took place at a time of dramatic change in the Indonesia nation.

The sharing of knowledge and collaboration to improve Indonesian education was an ongoing commitment. In December 2006 this commitment to the distribution of knowledge took the form of a workshop in the Ministry of National Education in Jakarta. The workshop was attended by key officials from MONE, representatives from multilateral funding agencies such as the World Bank, AusAID, USAID and the Asian Development Bank, representatives from nongovernment organizations, academics and our supervisors.

This paper was prepared for the workshop. It complemented the Presentation (see attached PowerPoint slides) that formed the first part of the workshop. There was real interest and support from all present for our work. This encouraged us to continue our research.

Didik Suhardi
Agus Haryanto
Mohammad Abduh
Decentralization:
Implementation in the Indonesian Context and some Relevant Literature
Didik Suhardi, Agus Haryanto and Mochammad Abduh

Decentralization is an increasingly common reform theme of governments around the world (Hanson, 1998, p.1). Unfortunately its implementation faces challenging problems. One probable cause of this situation is the lack of understanding if the decentralization concept itself is unclear among key actors in the decentralization process. Without proper understanding about the concept, it is not easy to understand why its implementation could not bring about the positive decentralization promises such as improved service quality, better participation and better planning. Before proposing any solution to overcoming implementation problems, it is necessary to provide some appropriate understanding of how decentralization was implemented in Indonesia and discuss some relevant decentralization concepts.

It is also important to understand the reasons behind this reform, how it takes form in governance and how it occurs in different part of the world. This paper complements the attached PowerPoint Presentation. It has been divided into two parts: The first part of explores the concept of decentralization, the reasons cited for this form of governance, the different forms of decentralization and the experience of decentralization. The second part looks explicitly at the Indonesian experience – some observations and reflections and considerations for the future of Indonesian decentralization. In this paper insights are drawn from a range of scholars and countries. This information is then formulated into a matrix that provides a framework to better analyze and understand the situation in Indonesia. The matrix also provides a useful tool for understanding the problems facing managers in MONE and of the challenges of improving education quality.
Concepts of Decentralization

Since this research is mainly studying education quality in the context of decentralization in Indonesia, understanding key concepts like decentralization is a necessity and will be discussed first. Various concepts of decentralization can be found in the literature discussing public management reform either from individual experts or institutional observations in a range of countries. The following are some relevant examples of decentralization definitions that could be used.

Apreku (2003, p. 9), Rondinelli and Cheema (1983) define decentralization quite broadly to mean the transfer of planning, decision making or administrative authority from central government to its field organizations, local administrative units, semi autonomous organizations, local government or nongovernmental organizations (p.13). According to McGinn and Welsh (1999), decentralization is about a shift in location of those who govern, about the transfer of authority from those in one location or level vis-à-vis education organization, to those in another level. The location of authority is expressed in terms of the location of the position or the governing bodies; municipal, county or district governments; and schools (p. 17).

Centralization-decentralization can also be viewed as a spectrum ranging from a unitary governmental system where the central government has most power or decision making authority to a governmental system where local governments and community organizations exercise large amounts of power. The ultimate centralized system is one in which all decisions are made in the nation’s capital, and the ultimate decentralized system is one where all decision are made by individuals, community organizations, and small local governments (Winkler, 1999). In other words, in a centralized system the authority to make important decisions is retained by managers at the top of the hierarchy. On the contrary, a decentralized system is an organizational set up whereby the authority to make important decisions about organizational resources and to initiate new projects is delegated to managers at all levels in the hierarchy (Jones, 2003).
From the definitions above, it can be concluded that centralization-decentralization is a spectrum along which the positioning of the decision making process is held; between the central and peripheral units of organization. Using the diagram below, based on several definitions mentioned above, it is suggested that authority transfer could be seen as a vertical or horizontal process. People usually perceive that a unit with more authority (for example central office) is placed higher in the diagram (vertical), but in reality this is not always the case. Central government is just as high as district offices (horizontal). The difference is not in their position, but in the power and authority they hold. We have attempted to show these relationships in the figure below.

**Figure:**

*Spectrum of Centralization-Decentralization*

In this case, Indonesia is not fully centralized nor fully decentralized, because after decentralization most decisions making process were handed down to local government, but some (for example, foreign affairs, economic matters, religious affairs, defense, national security and judicial) are retained by the central government. Indonesia therefore, falls within a continuous spectrum between centralized and decentralized poles of governance. And this causes some confusion and complexity for donors and those charged with managing education.
Reasons for Decentralization

Not only the concept of decentralization should be investigated, but the why - the reasons behind decentralization should also be understood, especially by key actors of the implementing organizations, otherwise decentralization would be unsuccessful. In the following paragraphs, the background of and some reasons for decentralization initiatives are discussed.

According to McGinn and Welsh (1999) there are three reasons to account for the upsurge of interest in decentralization in the world, beginning around 1970. First, the political-economic debates resulting a reformulation and reduction of the role of central government and an increasing role for the market. Economic and financial globalization weakened central government, and, on the other hand, a shift toward market-based decision making has strengthened local groups. Supporters of decentralization advocated roles for privatization and encouragement of non-government organizations (NGOs). Finally, the emergence of new information and communication technologies has made it possible to achieve high levels of control over systems, with decentralized management. A new paradigm of management emphasizing attention to output rather than inputs gave increased importance to strengthening local capacity for decision making.

In addition, Alm and Bahl (1999) state that countries with a large population and large land areas tend to be more decentralized. It is too difficult and too costly to govern effectively from the center when the population and land area are very large. Large countries are likely to have variation among regions in climate, geography, and economic base, so that centrally mandated uniformity in the provision of government services can be quite inefficient.

Moreover, according to Alm and Bahl (1999) if the population of a country is diverse or if the regional economies are diverse enough so that there are distinct regional preferences for government services, then there is a strong case for decentralized governance. “Diversity” might mean different things; examples of the kinds of diversity that typically lead to cries for decentralization are variations in ethnic, religious, and cultural backgrounds, isolation from the governing centers, and
distinctive economic bases. Duncan (2004) made an important observation on this issue in his study: *Mixed Outcomes: the Impact of Regional Autonomy and Decentralization on Indigenous Ethnic Minorities in Indonesia*. His finding on advantages or disadvantages of decentralization to ethnic minorities will be discussed later in this paper.

Countries may have adopted decentralization policies for a variety of reasons, some explicitly revealed through administrative actions. According to Winkler (1999), the rationale for educational decentralization can be grouped into three broad categories: educational finance, efficiency and effectiveness, and redistribution of political power. While Hanson (1998) suggests that many different, but interrelated goals such as: increased economic development through institutional modernization; increased management efficiency; redistribution of financial responsibility; democratization; the neutralization of competing powers; and improved quality of education drive decentralization initiatives and consequently shape their strategies. Goals such as these fit within the political, economic, organizational and educational categories that contribute to directing the course of decentralization reform.

Bjorg (2003) also stated that recently international funding organizations (including the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank) have thrown their weight behind the decentralization of education systems around the globe, often making decentralization a precondition for financial assistance. These international funding organizations claim that decentralization will lead to one or more of the following outcomes: a distribution of power, increased efficiency, or greater sensitivity to local culture.

It might be assumed that because Indonesia is a big and diverse country; decentralization is reasonable and preferable. Unfortunately, the decentralization initiative was forced more by external factors rather than reasons inspired by an internal assessment and motivation. It was implemented to fulfill international donor’s financial assistance conditions in responding to a monetary crisis, to answer demands from regional government to gain power in managing their own resources, and to overcome political crisis as a result of over-centralized governance. At that time, the central government was given very little choice but to decentralize,
regardless of the lack of proper preparation and planning. For many, Indonesian decentralization is the product of a crisis rather than a smooth, well-planned reform. Our experience supports this contention.

**Forms of Decentralization**

After discussing the concepts of and reasons for decentralization, it is also important to discuss how decentralization is implemented, how and to what degree authority is transferred. As mentioned above, decentralization may be defined as the transfer of decision-making authority, responsibility and tasks from higher to lower organizational levels or between organizations. According to Hanson (1998) there are three major forms of decentralization:

- **Deconcentration** typically involves the transfer of tasks and work, but not authority, to other units in the organization. The schools rehabilitation program in Indonesia for example, is deconcentrated to local government with central government guidelines, regulations, and funding. The responsibility for all works needed to carry out the school rehabilitation is handed down to DEO level;

- **Delegation** involves the transfer of decision-making authority from higher to lower hierarchical units, but that authority can be withdrawn at the discretion of the delegating unit. For example, teachers and school personnel recruitment is now delegated to DEO level;

- **Devolution** refers to the transfer of authority to an autonomous unit that can act independently, or a unit that can act without first asking permission. At this time, the authority of opening or closing schools for example, is at DEOs level. DEOs need no permission at all from the province, ministry or central government.

According to Rondinelli, privatization is also a form of devolution as responsibility and resources are transferred from public to private sector institutions (as cited in McGinn and Welsh, 1999). In relation to privatization, many Indonesian public services are becoming private institutions already, for example water treatment, telecommunication and transportation. In the long run, according to Hanson (1998), devolution is the more effective method because it provides for continuity in the change process. According to Hanson (1998), delegation often brings with it the so-called "yo-yo decision-making pattern" as newly-appointed (and frequently changing) leaders delegate or retract authority depending on their motivations of the moment. For most of us, understanding the above concepts is relatively easy, but
how do we know which is applicable? This is why learning from the decentralization experiences of the different countries is very important.

The Challenge of Implementation: Promises and reality

Decentralization has become a fashionable option internationally as a strategy to achieve institutional and governmental reforms, especially in developing and newly industrializing countries. Typically the advocates of decentralization present it as a panacea for institutional and governance shortcomings and often as a means to improve service delivery and outcomes. Multilateral agencies such as the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) have been two of the more powerful advocates of these strategies. The image of the then IMF President, Michel Camdessus, standing over the then Indonesian President, Suharto, as he signed the IMF agreement is one of the most striking images of the power of international agencies to impose institutional ‘reform’ on a member country.

The problem is that the glowing picture painted by decentralization advocates rarely lives up to the initial claims. Even when the implementation is successful the time taken for the benefits to materialize is far longer than expected. It is hardly surprising that those with vested interests, the political, economic or social elites or those with other forms of social advantage (for example solid patronage networks) quickly develop new ways of working in the new environment. This is not to suggest that all those who do benefit are unethical or engage in questionable practices though of course some do. For example; Fritzen (2006) notes that there is a danger of expanding patronage politics and decentralizing corruption.

Conversely it is not surprising that those individuals and groups who are socially disadvantaged struggle in the decentralized system. As noted earlier, decentralization is justified on a number of grounds, including increasing local participation and democracy, improving accountability and improving responsiveness and service delivery. This latter objective rests on the assumption that services will improve if decision-making is shifted from the national to the sub-national level. However the evidence for improved service delivery as a consequence of decentralization is
mixed. A key factor is the capacity of sub-national authorities (Galiani 2001, 2008). The poor and disadvantaged are particularly vulnerable:

“…we find a trade-off between efficiency and equity. Although ‘bringing decisions closer to the people’ may be generally optimal, decentralization can help the good get better, but make the already disadvantaged worse off” (Galiani, 2008 p2118). The Indonesian version of decentralization needs to be analysed in the context of broad international experience. International experiences outlined below provide a more comprehensive picture about the problems faced in implementation. This is a useful tool for discussing and analyzing decentralization in Indonesia.

For example, Gershberg and Winkler (2003) in *Education Decentralization in Africa: a Review of Recent Policy and Practice* outline their observations on international decentralization experiences in Africa. Because of some similarities in the level of authority transfers, their observation is important to the Indonesian context. It focuses in particular, on the decentralization of basic education functions and responsibilities from central government ministries to sub-national governments, to communities, and to the schools themselves; a similar process to that being undertaken by education decentralization in Indonesia. Their observations on experiences from African countries can be summarized as follows:

- Efficiency and effectiveness are most likely to improve under decentralization when service providers—schools, local governments, or regional governments—are held accountable for results;
- Accountability requires clear delineation of authority and responsibility and transparent and understandable information on results (both educational and financial);
- Decentralization of real decision-making power to schools or school councils is a means of increasing the voice of education’s clients and can significantly increase parental participation in the school; alternatively, school councils which are only advisory in nature cannot sustain parental participation;
- Decentralization of education to sub-national governments does not empower parents and improve school performance -- Further decentralization to schools (school councils or school boards) or local communities—a policy which is often initiated within the education sector itself—does empower parents and can improve school performance, especially when changing the organization of education is simultaneously accompanied by attempts to improve teaching and learning;
- For decentralization to schools to be successful, principals must acquire new skills in leadership and management—financial, of teachers, and with the community.
- Most decentralization includes the transfer of financial resources to sub national governments or schools.
- Decentralization requires that national and/or regional ministries of education be restructured to provide the new functions which they should provide to sub-national governments and schools;
- The single largest obstacle to education decentralization is often the teachers’ union, which fears a loss of negotiating power;
• Teachers are the most important factor in delivering instruction to children. Thus, if the
teacher management—recruitment, evaluation, transfer, and salary supplements—is not
decimalized along with other responsibilities, the potential benefits of decentralization are
highly constrained.
• The single largest fear expressed by national education ministries is that sub national
governments, communities, and/or schools lack the capacity to manage education;
• Decentralization is a long, evolutionary process. While legislative and constitutional changes
may radically change responsibilities over night, real changes in governance, accountability,
and impact in the classroom take much longer. (Winkler, & Gershberg, 2003. p. 5-7)

From the African experiences above, it could be concluded that for decentralization
to be successful, several important strategies need to be implemented. First of all,
there needs to be a clear division of authority or function between government levels.
Secondly, in order for each level of government to be able to carry out its functions,
adequate resources such as buildings, facilities, equipment and funding need to be
provided. Thirdly, a sufficient number of personnel with appropriate leadership and
management skills are needed to manage available resources. Fourthly, empowering
local communities to build participation and to strengthen accountability mechanisms
is necessary. Last but not least, focus on school quality improvement needs to be
addressed as this is the most significant determinant of the effectiveness of education
decentralization.

The ‘Big Bang’ process of decentralization in Indonesia has meant that most
education managers still lack the necessary experience, skills and understanding to
implement decentralization effectively. Learning from the experiences of other
countries in implementing decentralization (such as the African countries above) is
important and much less expensive and less risky than the rapid, trial and error
strategy of Indonesian decentralization.

On the other hand, Paqueo and Lammert in Decentralization in Education (World
Bank Governance Reform Question and Answer, 2000) describe the most important
lessons that can be learned from international decentralization experiences. They
suggest educational reform should be a local process. The school is the centre of
change, not the ministry or the district administration. Schools determine the degree
of success; they can block implementation, enfeeble it or bring it to effective life. For
schools to improve the quality of their programs effectively, they need to play an
active and creative role. They also argue:

• Central support is vital. The issue for the central ministry is learning to support local schools
in their efforts. In other words, how to make demands on support, encourage, empower,
enable and build a strong local school. Giving more responsibilities to the individual school presupposes a strong support structure from the system at large, one that must be built around the real needs of schools in development. For the central level it implies that a system of reform and a division of labor is needed to effectively support the local level;

- Effective system linkages are essential. The strategy in complex systems is to identify effective linkages, non-bureaucratic in nature, between the national, district and local levels. For communication within the system to be effective, local empowerment is needed, usually as a consequence of more decentralization. A clear administrative role that combines pressure and support and secures the delivery of needed resources is also required;
- The reform process is a learning process. The process is evolutionary and developmental in nature. It cannot be blueprinted ahead of time. The key to success is to get good data from all parts of the system on a continuous basis, studied and worked on at the school district level, and subsequently at the central level. This implies a competent supervision and monitoring system;
- There is a need to think systematically and big. A vision of reform that affects school life substantially will have more effect than a cautious, incremental approach. Any major reforms in complex systems need to build structures and capabilities at all levels. Ad hoc solutions will not work in the long run, only institution-building based on sustained commitment works;
- It is important to focus on classroom practice. The clue is to focus on the dynamics of the classroom and the individual school, since this dynamic to a large extent determines implementation success. It is essential that the supporting materials be of good quality, whether nationally developed and locally adapted, or locally built from the start;
- Treat and see teachers as learners. Good materials and facilities are a necessary but insufficient condition. Teacher mastery is crucial for impact on students, and that can best be developed through a systematic local learning process that includes in-service training, supervision and coaching in a collegial atmosphere;
- Strong commitment is essential at all levels. It is crucial at the central level for sustained effort and the maintenance of needed support structures. It is also essential at the district and school level; however, it cannot be transmitted directly to schools. Commitment at the school level results from empowered successful action, personal mastery that starts with good assistance and develops from practice. In effect, local empowerment builds emotional as well as administrative and problem-solving capacity;
- Both local and central initiatives work. An innovative idea that starts locally, nationally or with external donors can succeed, if programs meet the criteria of national commitment, local capacity building and linkage, in a configuration that makes sense for the particular country;
- Parent and community participation contribute to success. Parent and community participation lead to commitment and contribute to outcomes, and are essential for the development and maintenance of primary schools in rural areas. Effective participation includes a real role for parents in school decision-making;

We realize that we have included a lot of data from this World Bank report. We have done this because the information contained is relevant to the Indonesian experience and our research. The World Bank has been responsible for encouraging, and providing loans to support education decentralization in many countries. From our research it is becoming increasingly apparent that the Indonesian government should also have learnt from the World Bank experience and implemented decentralization more carefully in Indonesia.

It is obvious that finally it is at the school level where the effectiveness of education decentralization success can be determined. As a consequence, all governance levels beyond the school level should contribute to the building of system wide strategies
for supporting and empowering schools. Class rooms, as the front line of educational services where the teaching and learning process take place should be the focus and empowered accordingly. The teacher’s role is crucial. Teachers should be treated as learners and their learning process should include in-service training plus strong supervision and coaching. In the Indonesian case, most public schools are dependent on DEO services. Therefore, it is almost impossible to empower schools and improve school quality without building stronger capacity within DEOs. Needless to say, building local government capacity, especially its DEO, developing effective system linkages among government tiers, and installing effective communication across the system are among the most basic requirements for DEOs to be able to empower each individual school. In addition, it is essential to develop competent supervision and monitoring procedures, to obtain good data from all parts of the system on a continuous basis, collated, for analysis, studied and worked on at the school district level. Measuring and assuring DEO performance is vital and MSS are an appropriate way to do this. As one of the measures of decentralized service delivery effectiveness, community participation through school boards or school committees also needs to be improved. Community commitment as part of a commitment at all levels is needed and stakeholder participation, will in turn contribute to the success of decentralization.

In addition, Hanson (1998, p. 12-13) suggests some propositions that are relevant to our research. His propositions are based on extensive research in five Hispanic countries: Colombia, Argentina, Nicaragua and Spain. Many positive and negative aspects of these countries’ experiences are very important for both the academic community seeking greater insight into educational change as well as decision makers seeking guidelines on effective educational policy. For Indonesian education managers, the following of Hanson’s propositions are significant:

- The more the decentralization initiative involves the centre transferring positive opportunities to the regions (win-win) rather than simply unloading problems and burdens (win-lose), the greater the chances for successful change;
- The greater the accepted vision of decentralization between the distinct centres of power (e.g. political parties, unions, bureaucrats, religious institution), the greater the chance for successful change;
- Devolution rather than delegation of authority and responsibility has a greater chance for long-term success;
- It is easier to initiate a decentralization initiative during times of political, economic and social stress or turbulence, than it is during times of relative stability;
• When decentralization initiatives die, it is usually for political rather than administrative/technical reasons;
• The stronger the management infrastructure at the regional levels, the greater the opportunity for success;
• It is better to transfer authority to individual regions only when they meet specific tests of readiness, rather than to all the regions at once, regardless of readiness;
• Decentralizing in incremental stages has a greater chance for success than an "out-with-the-old and in-with-the-new" approach;
• Understanding the motivation behind a decentralization initiative is the key to understanding the specifics of the strategy;
• The people who have been part of an organizational culture that has managed a centralized system are not very effective in managing a decentralized system; (Old habits and a taste for power are difficult to cast off.)
• A decentralized organization should function as parts of a whole rather than simply independent parts;
• Once decentralization has taken place, the central ministry still must have the tools to safeguard that the regions follow national educational policy.
• Educational policy on decentralization should be set through debate rather than disguised manipulations of the national budget.

Hanson provides some important points that the Indonesian government and the MONE still need to consider if decentralization of education is to succeed. First of all, strengthening DEO capacity is critical to success. Secondly, since the capacity of DEOs varies from place to place, it is better to transfer authority to individual regions only when they meet a specific test of readiness rather than to all DEOs at once. Third, considering that not many of Indonesian bureaucrats are familiar with or have enough experience in decentralization implementation - only some scholars in universities and a limited number of key personnel at central level do - building decentralized vision and organizational culture is needed, because according to Hanson the people who have managed a centralized system are not very effective in managing a decentralized system. Finally, Hanson suggests, once decentralization has taken place, the central ministry must have tools to ensure that the regions follow national educational policy, and one tool for doing this is the implementation of relevant MSS.

The literature explored above provides useful guidelines for Indonesian educational managers. It also provides some very useful signposts for our research. Many of those experiences are relevant to the Indonesian setting. Based on the expert findings above, on the next page a matrix or a table for decentralization implementation was constructed for discussion and as a possible tool to analyze Indonesian decentralization.
### Analysis of International Decentralization Experiences and Its Implementation in Indonesia

*Based on FGD about Alec Ian Gershberg and Donald R. Winkler, Vic Paqueo and Jill Lammert, and E. Mark Hanson experiences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Experiences from a range of different countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Implementation incomplete</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accountability Mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Only implemented to upward level, not to wider stakeholder/customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stake holder Participation Schools/principals</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>School Based Management introduced, but with limited authority. Community participation through School Committee and Board of Education introduced with many obstacles faced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stake holder Participation Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stake holder Participation Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Restructure governance to provide new function</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandated on law 22/1999 revised to 32/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Transfer teacher management to local government</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>All central office personnel and facilities transferred to district level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Capacity building to manage education; Sub national governments, communities, and/or schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Capacity building mostly only dissemination of the regulations to limited of personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Real changes in governance, accountability,</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Same as no. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Schools to determine the degree of success of education decentralization</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schools/classrooms are not used as barometer of education decentralization. Limited to management in district level using MSS (still in process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Impact in the classroom/teaching learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Legislative and constitutional changes, change responsibilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Numerous regulations still needed to facilitate the main law on decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Central support is vital; demand, encourage, empower</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>More capacity building needed but decentralization supervision is also needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Effective linkages, between the national, district/local and school levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Many districts perceive decentralization as freedom from central influences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Competent supervision and monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Mixed administration of MONE and MOHA complicates monitoring and evaluation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Build structures and capabilities at all levels, institution-building based on sustained commitment works.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Restructuring happened, but building capabilities still far to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed Experiences from different country</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Implementati on incomplete</td>
<td>Explanations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Focus on classroom practice, supporting materials should be of good quality.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>In many cases supporting materials such as books, equipments, lab materials are very poor or even inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Commitment at all levels.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only to limited personnel, still far to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Effective participation includes a real role for parents in school decision-making.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Being introduced with many obstacles in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Transferring positive opportunities to the regions.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most technical and operational authorities are handed down to local government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Accepted vision of decentralization between the distinct centres of power.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Still need to build a strong vision of decentralization across and within governance level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is easier to initiate a decentralization initiative during times of political, economic and social stress or turbulence, than it is during times of relative stability.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decentralization was initiated at once after forced by critical situations; funding crisis, foreign aids, regional demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Strong management infrastructure at the regional levels.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing personnel lack necessary skills, knowledge, and motivation, little or limited capacity building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Transfer authority only when meet specific tests of readiness.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>No such tests were administered, not even the tool was constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Decentralizing in incremental stages.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>1998 initiated, 1999 the law was enacted, 2001 was implemented. A “Big Bang” process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Appropriate number of experienced personnel in managing a decentralized system.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only limited personnel experienced in decentralization. Never been implemented before. Limited research and capacity building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. A decentralized organization should function as parts of whole rather than simply independent parts.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is a learning process, most districts perceive it as independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The central ministry still must have the tools to safeguard that the regions follow national educational policy.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Law 23/2003 (National Education System) safeguards education unity, but frameworks dissemination is incomplete and guidelines are unavailable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Educational policy on decentralization should be set through debate</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only limited debate in government offices with People’s Representative. This research is a substantial contribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Experiences from different country implemented/not implemented | 8 | 21 |
The matrix or table compares international experiences in education decentralization (Best Practices) to education decentralization in Indonesia. From 29 suggested best practices, only 8 best practices have been adopted. This suggests that the Indonesian education decentralization process still has far to go. In addition, the matrix is a useful assessment tool to determine whether each district is prepared for and capable of implementing decentralization.

It is very useful to know how Indonesian decentralization was measured against the international experiences outlined by the experts above. Only a small number of those strategies were actually implemented. Take, for example, accountability processes which tended to be only implemented to superiors (upwardly), but not to wider stakeholders, mainly citizens as customers. The accountability process is only reported to the upper level to superiors within an organization, but not to the public in general. As a consequence, usually collective public complaint is not seriously considered in public service quality development, except if it occurs via a massive (usually destructive) demonstration.

Many of those international experiences, for example; capacity building, supervision and monitoring systems, community participation, district readiness test for decentralization, and policy debate are among those experiences from different countries that need to be considered carefully and adopted in Indonesia. The matrix is based on international experiences outlined in relevant literature quoted above and observations on Indonesian decentralization. It provides a useful summary of some of the crucial factors that affect and inform this research. It also points up the importance of relevant literature and informed contextual analysis in assessing and improving education quality. It seems that the effective implementation of decentralization will continue to be a long and challenging process. This notion indicates that education quality is also strongly influenced by the decentralization process.

Based on international experiences above, the following important points need to be considered carefully to improve decentralization implementation in Indonesia:

1. Only about one third of the above best practices or experiences have been implemented in Indonesia, probably because in the last years, legal aspects of authority distribution have not been established yet and are still a work in progress. The latest government regulation, Government Regulation 38/2007 on Authority Distribution among Central Provincial and Local (district/municipal) was just enacted on
July 2007. More work needs to be done to make the distribution of authority among the three tiers clear;

2. What have been implemented mostly related only to bureaucratic issues such as regulation, organization restructuring, and fiscal transfer. Service quality as a result of better planning and community participation as the promises of decentralization, has not yet been the focus or a main target of the decentralization process. As a consequence, school facilities and students - the major clients in the education sector are not used as barometer to measure the success of decentralization. The focus on service quality, planning and participation need to be raised otherwise education quality will remain unchanged;

3. Decentralization still has far to go. Tool kits to assess decentralization implementation at district level are needed. Education quality at the district level should be the focus of education decentralization; the latest regulations regarding service standard, planning and participation need to be revised soon and communicated to all those responsible for providing services to schools.

One would expect from the action learning or action research approach as suggested by the RMIT that some objectives of Research By Project might changed during the research, and reflection and writing processes. For example at the outset decentralization was the only concern. However as the result of this literature review and suggestions raised during discussions; education planning, minimum educational service quality and community participation emerged and became the focus of our projects.

Some Observations and Reflections on Decentralization in Indonesia.

Using some of the concepts and experiences of the experts mentioned above the Indonesian decentralization background and processes will now be discussed in more detail.

Decentralization in Indonesia is not dichotomous or a fait accompli. Authority in Indonesia is neither fully centralized nor fully decentralized, but located on a continuous spectrum, since not all authorities (defense, national security, monetary and fiscal, religion, justice, foreign affairs are all still held nationally or centrally) are handed down to district level. In addition, not all authority in each sector decentralized to local government is handed down, because the central government still holds the responsibility for macro planning, standardization, and monitoring-evaluation in all those sectors decentralized. In other word,
using Winkler’s terminology, Indonesian decentralization can be viewed as being located at some point along a spectrum where most decision making responsibility and authority are delegated to local government.

Concerning the reasons behind decentralization, Mc Ginn’s (1999, p. 27) statement suggesting that the political-economic situation reduces and reformulates the role of central government, is more appropriate for Indonesia because originally the monetary or economic crisis was the triggering factor, doubled by donors’ influence and local government demands.

Alm and Bahl suggest that a country with a diverse population living in large geographic area tends to be more suited to decentralization. Indonesia is probably one of the countries with such criteria. They suggest that centralization tends to overlook differences and, most policy is usually implemented once and for all, regardless of the nature and the needs of local government.

Related to the forms of decentralization as mentioned by Hanson, Indonesia, at the same time, is implementing deconcentration, delegation, devolution or even privatization. For example, the national examination activities are delegated to provincial level, while the authority for opening new schools is devolved to district level. Many government-owned companies in telecommunication, transportation and water treatment have been privatized which removes their control from the central government.

In addition, to understand more about the background, process, and implementation of Indonesian decentralization, some of the most important views of experts and international institutions observing Indonesian decentralization are described below.

The World Bank notes that Indonesia began experimenting with a new form of decentralization at the end of the twentieth century, with the passage of new legislation that shifted political and fiscal authority from the national government in Jakarta to sub-provincial level governments throughout the country. This transfer of authority transformed one of the most centralized governments in the world into one of the most decentralized (World Bank, 2003, p. 1).
However as Duncan argues, ‘The Indonesian government’s plan for decentralization, despite being rather vague and not well thought out, has been very ambitious’ (Duncan, 2007, p. 717). This has had implications for the management of education decentralization and has lead to some tentative steps back to recentralization. For example, SMA and SMK (General Senior High and Vocational Senior High Schools) were originally placed under the authority of DEOs, but under Law Number 32/2004 (replacing Law 22/1999) these schools were placed under provincial authority.

To many observers, the first two decentralization laws, Laws 22 and 25/1999, opened up a unique window of opportunity to forge new power structures in Indonesia based on democratic multi-party elections, accountability, local participation and a fairer distribution of public revenue. They are regarded as one of the most radical and massive approaches ever seen to the devolution of decision-making power to sub-national authorities (the so-called "Big-Bang Approach"). Consequently, decentralization then was seen as offering a wide range of opportunities and potential benefits, but also as encompassing large risks (World Bank, 2000a, p. 13). Even now, years after the respective laws have been passed and after they came into effect, decentralization remains a work in progress, needing adjustment and improvement of the regulatory frameworks and guidelines and capacity building at local level to ensure its effective implementation.

More than that, it is argued by the World Bank (2006) that the two laws on regional autonomy, have caused several challenges, for example: (1) loose-coupling and lack of coordination among the three-tier unitary government structures, (2) simultaneous political, administrative, and fiscal decentralization is not easy to manage, (3) lack of clarity among the three-tier unitary government structures in the assignment of functions, and (4) lack of clarity in governance and management, particularly in education.

Furthermore, Indonesian education decentralization is more complex than other countries where education is only under one institution or ministry. In Indonesia at least three major ministries are involved: the MOHA, MONE and MORA. After decentralization, two major actors; Home Affairs and Education were merged into one institution at province and district levels. Handing down authority to one single administration is much easier than to a ‘mixed’ administration which previously had different capacity, cultures, and perceptions. Originally there were two education offices in each province and district. One was under the MONE called Kandep (district offices) and Kanwil (provincial offices); on the other hand there were
Dinas (under district authority itself) and also Dinas (under province authority). Both Kandep and Kanwil were under MONE, while both Dinas in district and Dinas in Province were under MOHA through their local government Offices. When decentralization occurred these two organizations were merged. Two offices with all their facilities and personnel were merged, becoming new organizations called Dinas Pendidikan (Education Offices) either at district or province level. This is why to most observers there continues to be confusion about the roles and responsibilities of the new Dinas.

The two offices were amalgamated, including all their assets. Their ‘spirit’ of good decentralization (if there was such thing), was dissolved into a traditional or “business as usual” situation. Unless the new emerging organization (Dinas) is enlightened and energized by the true spirit of decentralization, the administration will remain inefficient and ineffectual. Our experience indicates that dissemination of decentralization concepts and its implementation processes are inadequate to drive the spirit of decentralization among personnel in the new institutions.

The two groups of people from two different organizational cultures were merged to energize the new ‘decentralization’, something that is not in their ‘dictionary’ (Jalal, and Setiadi in Reformasi Pendidikan dalam Konteks Otonomi Daerah (2006), p. 136). Decentralization is probably understood only by a limited number of people in the centers (key persons in MOHA, MONE, provinces or district), but to the rest of administrators in provinces and districts, decentralization only means business as usual.

Returning to Hanson (1998) who suggests that the stronger the infrastructure of local government, the greater the opportunity for success in decentralization. Ideally, transfer of authority should only be done to mature or ready regions; regions that are independent and can stand on their own feet in facing problems. Unfortunately Indonesian education decentralization was implemented without a readiness test; authority was handed down regardless of readiness.

It is predictable that only rich and ready regions could benefit from decentralization, the rest would struggle. Consequently, one possible negative side of decentralization is that it may widen the gap between students in wealthy and poor areas. Local areas with plentiful financial and human resources are in a better position to make use of decentralized power compared to poorer areas. This is not an argument against decentralization, but rather a
warning that inequalities such as income, regional, gender and service quality gaps should be monitored and actions taken to correct inequities. Central governments have policy tools, such as special grants to low-performing schools, to prevent inequity from increasing. In relation to that, local government should also be given relevant training and resources and be equipped with service quality measurement tools to avoid disparities in service provision among regions. This is why the latest regulations on MSS need to be revised and disseminated soon.

Another important aspect that should be considered is the problem of teacher retention, competency and development. Jalal (2006) has identified eleven challenges confronting education, including uneven distribution, lack of appropriately qualified staff, inadequate salaries and ‘ineffective teacher management’. In Central Lombok District for example, there is an oversupply of religious teachers and insufficient mathematics teachers and, as a consequence, religious teachers are also required to teach mathematics (Personal communication with the head of DEO in Central Lombok, August 2005).

Despite the impression that the 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 reiterating that the MONE’s role is rendered even more complex by the fact that education in Indonesia falls under three ministries (three ministers and three bureaucracies): MONE, MOHA and MORA. While MONE has the responsibility for coordinating education, each ministry has its own political and administrative agenda and processes, complicating an already complex situation.

How complex decentralization is as perceived by DEO and school personnel is shown by the following data drawn from interviews and discussion recorded from field trips. In the first year of its implementation, decentralization already faced problems. In one district in Sumatra, teachers were striking. They were demanding their salary be paid after several months of waiting. In the centralized era, teachers’ salary was delivered to each school, but now in the decentralized era the salary is delivered through the local government office. The transfer of salary mechanism took time to work out, and teachers were disadvantaged at that time.
Personnel in one school in Mataram complained to us when we visited the school. The school operational fund was transferred directly to school accounts during the centralized era, but now it flows through the local government office. The problem is that the funding is not only smaller in amount, but it also takes a longer time to arrive. One administrator stated,

Although the central office was far away in Jakarta, funds were delivered straight to schools. Now that local government is closer to schools, it is harder to gain funds and takes a longer time for schools to get their operational funds. It seems that the government has transferred the centralized system from Jakarta to local government level (Mataram field notes, 2005).

Teachers and school personnel administration who were originally under the central office were also transferred to district level. The experience of the operational fund was repeated. One Junior High School teacher in Mataram commented,

Teacher administration also takes a longer time. It goes from desk to desk within district personnel office. Although the office location is closer to school compare to central office in Jakarta, but it needs more time to finish teacher administration. Jakarta is farther, but needed less time to finish their administration in the centralized era (Mataram interviews, 2005).

In addition, a member of a district education board in the Bogor Workshop asked:

Why don’t you send this education authority back to Jakarta, because most of us know that the capacity of personnel in district office is inadequate to manage their newly handed authority? (Bogor workshop, 2005)

These relevant and important questions must be considered and answered if decentralization is to be implemented effectively. Later on, our research will contribute to answering these questions and resolving the issues.

Some Considerations for the Future of Indonesian Decentralization with a Focus on Education.

Based on the above discussion, it is obvious that if the decentralization is to succeed the following important considerations should be taken into account. Decentralization is not one shot and quick fix. It takes time. And it must be understood that despite decentralization strategies, there are constants that cannot be changed. These include the geographic and ethnic diversity of the nation. However, at least two important things need to be done by the government. First, greater clarity of management and governance among the three-tiers of
government (central, provinces, and districts) is required. Up until now, efforts to do this have been undertaken, but more attention is needed. Formulation for clear obligatory functions, authority and responsibility among the three-tiers of government may be done through seminars, focus group discussions among them, and other means as deemed appropriate (as has been started by MONE). Second, decentralization is not only a technical matter but it is also a social-cultural matter. The approach being used at the present time is mostly technical. I believe that a social-cultural approach should also be used based on the beliefs and values derived from and related to each ethnic and religious group. Ethnic and religious leaders should be involved in any formulation and discussion regarding the implementation of decentralization. Duncan (2007) argues there is a need for equal inclusion of local people and minorities in decision making. This is likely to be a long term process.

In addition, acceleration of the capacity of the local government is necessary to make sure that autonomy can be achieved by improving the quality of public service for the people and improving all economic aspects. According to the United Nation Development Programmed (UNDP, 2000. p. 15), there are three levels of capacity building interventions: (1) the system level, dealing with the regulatory framework and policies that support or hamper the achievement of certain policy objectives, (2) the institutional or entity level, concerning management instruments and the relationships and networks between organizations, and (3) the individual level, meaning individual skills and qualifications, knowledge, attitudes, work ethics and motivations of the people working in organizations.

Capacity building for managing the transition to decentralization can be done through the following three steps: (1) conduct an assessment of the current decentralized management profile, (2) formulate the desired future of decentralized management, and (3) select appropriate strategies to build the decentralized management capacity. Approaches to develop capacity in managing the transition to decentralization may be done through demand-driven training, focus group discussions, workshops, tutoring, mentoring, etc. and other means as deemed relevant to the needs of local government.

Moreover, the World Bank experiences of decentralization in Latin American and Caribbean countries (Fiszbein, 2005), suggest the three major actors: citizens; policy makers and service providers all need to play major roles in the decentralization process. So far, Indonesia has produced many laws and regulations as if to prove that policy makers have a sufficiently
strong political will to implement decentralization but, on the other hand, regional officers as service providers and communities of citizens/customers in general still have to learn more about what decentralization is and how to implement it effectively. As a consequence, capacity building should be implemented in a wider context; strengthening community participation through district councils and school committees is needed.

One important observation related to capacity building is mentioned by Bjorg (2003) in his study of *Local Responses to Decentralization Policy in Indonesia*. The study uncovers the unseen factors which are very important to the success of any educational reform. Socio-political and cultural background are in fact more important than merely policy formulation and implementation planning. These factors strongly shape the actor’s knowledge, skill, and attitude in implementing reform at the grass root level. Bjorg concludes that Indonesian civil service culture heavily emphasizes obedience and loyalty. These values tend to contradict the essence of decentralization; creativity and initiative. This is why the implementation of Local Content Curricula in Junior Secondary Schools is facing more obstacles in its practice than its policy formulation. This study proves that educational decentralization forced teachers and administrators to conceptualize and support a system of school management that was entirely unfamiliar to them. This situation should be anticipated and considered in every capacity building effort.

Information about the purpose and meaning of laws and regulations still requires massive dissemination to civil society and political actors in the regions. And it still necessitates a major adjustment to the working procedures and the organizational structures of national and regional governments. Efforts to harmonize existing sectoral laws with the new distribution of authorities between the levels of government as regulated by Law 32/2004 have only just started, and the multitude of conflicts between regions and the centre and between the Government and the private sector because of unclear and contradictory legal regulations are bound to continue for some years to come. However, decentralization has already changed the structure of political power in Indonesia and has made the regions stronger - and at times successful- political players.

Finally, as suggested by Fizbein (2005), we would agree that, if decentralization is to be successful and have a positive impact on the quality of education, it must be based on a broad consensus among the various actors and interest groups affected by the change, including
policymakers, regional and local government officials, MONE employees, teachers, parents, university professors, professional associations, and outside groups such as NGOs, religious organizations and donors (Fiske, 1996. p. 75).

To end this discussion, it is increasingly apparent that Indonesia is moving along a path towards decentralization/deconcentration and that effective planning at the centre and the performance of districts are critical to the success of this process. DEO capacity building, coupled with regular DEO service assessments are two important strategies for improving local service quality. This paper has provided the historical context for the forces driving decentralization in Indonesia. It has outlined the on-going debates about the merits of decentralization. It is clear that the successful decentralization of education is a challenging task. In fact, as suggested in this paper, decentralization and democratization have made a daunting task even more difficult. Is not decentralization meant for the betterment of service provision? How can education quality in district offices be ensured in a dynamic decentralizing system? Our research project will make some contribution to answering these questions. Based on this literature reviews and suggestions from various discussions, we finally decided to focus on three different issues related to education quality improvement in this fluid decentralization process; education planning, education service quality and education participation. Our dissertations were also finally entitled based on these three different issues.

We welcome your contributions to our ongoing effort to improve teaching and learning across Indonesia. We also look forward to your comments on our work and our research. Finally, we thank you and your organisations for your continuing support for education in Indonesia.
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35. Presentation to Donors

This power point slides were used to present the collaborative paper on decentralization in Indonesia to the donors at the end of December 2006. The workshop was attended by different donor agencies such as the World Bank, AUSAID, ADB etc. The presentation is devided into two section; decentralization and service quality.
Education in the context of Decentralization in Indonesia

Agus, Abduh, and Didik
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Education in the Context of Decentralization in Indonesia

• Collaborative: Decentralization in Indonesia
  – Agus Centralization (before 1999)
  – Didik Decentralization II (2004 - present)

• Specific Topic:
  – Abduh Participation - District Board
  – Didik Planning - Central Level
  – Agus Service Quality - District Office
Centralization in Indonesia

- Colonial Era (1630s – 1945),
- Post Independence/Old Order (1945-1965),
- New Order (1966-1998),
  - All sector including education are centralized
  - There were several attempts to pilot decentralize
- Problems
  - Complex bureaucracy (33 provinces, 470 districts)
  - Diversity of local needs are not accommodated
  - Slow respond and service
  - Authoritarian leadership → crisis
Decentralization in Indonesia (First Period 1999-2003)

- Based on Law 22/1999 on Local Governance
- All sectors including education are decentralized except defense, fiscal, security, religion, foreign affairs, and judicial
- The focus of decentralization in Indonesia was at the district level
- President was elected by General assembly, Governor and district chief were selected by local parliament members
- Weaknesses of Law 22/1999: unclear division of functions between central, provincial, and district levels; not relevant to the (current development, governance expectation, and demand for the delivery of autonomy)
Decentralization in Indonesia (Second Period 2004-present)

• Based on the aforementioned weaknesses, the Law 22/1999 was replaced by Law 32/2004 on Local Government, characterized by:
  – Clear division of functions between central, provincial, and district/municipal
  – Province has more power
  – Direct general election (president, governor, and district chief or major)

CONCLUSIONS

• Decentralization in Indonesia is very difficult, complex, confusing, challenging, and constant changes (very fluid)
• So what?
• Research is needed in order to improve the current decentralization in Indonesia, particularly in education
• Our research contributes to the improvement of decentralization of education in Indonesia

Legend:
- Command
- Coordination
- R & D: Research and Development

INCREASING NUMBER OF PROVINCES AFTER DECENTRALIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Province Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Provinces Prior to Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Timor-Timur</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>disintegrated 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Maluku Utara</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Banten</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bangka Belitung</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Gorontalo</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Keplauan Riau</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sulawesi Barat</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Papua Barat</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPROVING DISTRICT OFFICE SERVICE QUALITY IN INDONESIA DECENTRALIZED EDUCATION SYSTEM

Agus Haryanto
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MINIMUM SERVICE STANDARD

LEGAL
- Public service authorities transferred to local governments except: foreign affairs, national security, finance, fiscal matters, religion and judiciary.
  - Govt. Reg. 25/2000 → ....
- Government Reg. 65/2005
- Minist. Dec. 129a/2004 → ....
  (Minimum Service Standard)

CENTRAL

PROVINCE

DISTRICT/ MUNICIPAL

STAKEHOLDER

SERVICE

COMMUNITY

SCHOOLS
MAIN QUESTIONS

1. How is Education District Office Service Quality to schools within your area?
2. What factors influencing the service quality?
3. How to improve the service quality?

1. How to raise district service quality?
2. How do MONE do this?
3. How do I work with the districts

DATA ANALYSIS
(Board of Education Perception)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE CONDITIONS</th>
<th>FACTORS INFLUENCING</th>
<th>HOW TO IMPROVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negtive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally Good</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Supervision-Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good enough</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other questions:
- Mental attitude: 5
- Teacher: 6
- Relationship: 7
- Transparency and accountability: 8
- Commitment: 9
- Personnel: 10
- Leadership: 11
- Coordination: 12
- Facilities: 13
- Human Resources: 14
- Finance: 15
- Community Involvement: 16
- Training rotating: 17
- Supervision: 18
- Supervision-Evaluation: 19
- Personnel prosperity: 20
- Capacity Building: 21
- Supervision: 22
- Commitment: 23
- Professionalism: 24
- Transparency: 25
- Accountability: 26
- Finance: 27
- Human Resources: 28
- Facilities: 29
- Coordination: 30

Overall:
- Very Good: 9
- Good: 13
- Good enough: 16
- Some positive feedback
- Some concerns and suggestions
Findings on Service Quality Delivery at District Level

• Effective MSS implementation is quite limited
• Local Government unrespectness to Ministerial Decrees due to no sanction for irregularity
• limited understanding of the importance of MSS and multiple interpretations to MSS within units and levels of government

• 30% relatively good, 40 % fair, and the rest of 30% are unsatisfactory or even worse as compared to the centralized era. This is a very serious message to education managers at all levels

• Challenges identified: human resources capacity at district education offices, varied support facilities at the schools and district levels, high disparity financial supports at the school and district levels, and weak coordination among education stakeholders
Factors influencing the performance of decentralized service provision:

- Political Framework,
- Fiscal Dimension,
- Transparency,
- Citizen Participation,
- Civil Society And Social Structure,
- Capacity Of Sub National Government

Based on Latin American Countries public service main actors:

- Citizen,
- Policy Makers,
- Service Providers
Parasuraman, Zeithmal, and Berry (1988) on Service Quality (SERVQUAL) based on their Gap Model.

- Their early investigations revealed that the primary criteria used by customers in assessing service quality can be described by ten separate dimensions: Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Communication, Credibility, Security, Competence, Courtesy, Understanding / knowing the customers and Access.

- Later, they refined and condensed the ten dimensions to five: Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy.

- The 22 expectation / perception items which form the main questions of the SERVQUAL instrument were derived from the five service dimensions. In the survey, respondents are asked to rate their expectation and perception of these items.
### MINIMUM SERVICE STANDARD (MSS)
#### Ministerial Decree 129a/2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-15 age</td>
<td>&gt;= 90%</td>
<td>Junior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DO rate</td>
<td>&lt;= 1%</td>
<td>Drop Out Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>&gt;= 90%</td>
<td>Comply with National Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>&gt;= 80%</td>
<td>Non Teaching Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>&gt;= 90%</td>
<td>Number of Teachers needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comply with National Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>&gt;= 100%</td>
<td>Subject matter books fulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>&lt;= 30 - 40</td>
<td>Number of students each class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory achievement test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>&gt;= 70%</td>
<td>Graduates to Senior High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UU Pemerintah

PP Pembagian Kewenangan → Kewenangan Wajib → SPM

Perda Dinas Pendidikan

Kewenangan Pendidikan Kabupaten/Kota

SPM Bidang Pendidikan
SERVICE QUALITY

INPUT

PROCESS

OUTPUT

FACTORS

Mental attitude
Teacher relationship
Transparency
Accountability
Commitment
Personnel leadership
Coordination facilities
Human resources
Finance

SERVQUAL

Tangibles
Reliability
Responsiveness
Assurance
Empathy

INDICATORS

Teachers
Students
School

QUALITY EDUCATION

MEASURING (EFQM/MSS)

IMPROVING

CAPACITY

DELIVERY

PRODUCT

SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Regulating
Service
Empowering

CAPACITY

PROCESS

OUTPUT
District Offices are supposed to give to schools:

- **Policies:**
  Vision, mission, planning management etc.
- **Guidance**
  Handbook, instructions, and manual, training
- **Monitoring and Evaluation**
  Auditory, supervision,
- **Regulations**
  Legislation, regulation, qualification, specification, certification, accreditation
- **Support of funding and facilities**
- **Facilitate school and community relationship**

**Improving Service Quality in District Education Office:**

1. Improving Input (District Capacity)
2. Improving Process (Delivery Process)
3. Improving Output (Performance Indicator)
To broaden our knowledge and experiences in international events, in the early stage of this research by project (December 2006), I and my two other colleagues were invited to the ESD (Education for Sustainable Development) seminar in Bangkok. After proposing an abstract for this paper, finally the seminar committee approved our paper and invited us to present.

This exhibit shows the whole paper composed collaboratively with my colleagues (Mr. Didik Suhardi and Mr. Moch Abduh).
ESD Paper 1 in Bangkok
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IN THE INDONESIAN DECENTRALIZED EDUCATION SYSTEM

By
Didik Suhardi, Agus Haryanto and Mohammad Abduh

Presented at APEID International Conference
Bangkok, December 2006

A. Introduction
First of all, I would like to express my appreciation for having been invited to present some information about the Indonesian decentralized education system in general and improvements in planning, quality service, and education boards in particular. I am honored to be here at this valuable conference and I think it is fair to say that the efforts of APEID International Conference will contribute enormously to considering education as an important element in bringing nations together. In Indonesia, and we believe elsewhere, education is considered as the most important factor to develop the capacity of human beings. In turn, well educated human beings will contribute to overall Indonesian development. This is in line with the UNESCO millennium goals where basic education for all is one of the key factors to nation development.

Our topic for this conference is “Improving Planning, Service Quality, and Community Participation in Indonesian Decentralized Education System”. Obviously, there are many other interesting topics to discuss here, but we are not going to discuss them here explicitly due to limited time. Our topic is much related to the theme of this conference, in that, good planning, high quality education services and active community participation through boards of education will contribute to education development deemed to be important for sustainable development. Perhaps we all agree that well educated people will contribute to sustainable development because they are the only active resource while others such as natural resources, financial resources and manmade resources are all passive.

As you may all know, Indonesia is undergoing education decentralization caused by simultaneous changes in political, administrative, and fiscal decentralization. One may argue that it is not an easy task to manage and govern this process, but one must realize that we cannot escape from this complex reality.

Consequently, education in Indonesia has been devolved to field units of the Ministry of National Education since the enactment of Decentralization Law 22/1999 which was effectively implemented in January 2001. According to this Law (which was replaced by the new Decentralization Law 32/2004) and coupled with Education Law 20/2003, the education sector must be managed and governed in accordance with current trends towards greater decentralization of authority and responsibility to provinces, districts, and schools.
The aims of this paper are four fold: (1) to explore the impacts of education decentralization on planning, service quality, and community participation through boards of education, (2) articulate the challenges to a decentralized education system, (3) to improve planning, service quality delivery and the capacity of education boards, and (4) to produce guidelines on planning, service quality delivery, and education boards.

This paper is based on preliminary data that was gathered as part of three larger research projects that are exploring planning, service quality, and community participation in Indonesian education in the context of decentralization. The authors work in the central office of the Indonesian Ministry of National Education (MONE). They are also enrolled in the Doctor of Philosophy – *By Project* in the School of Education at RMIT University. Research *by Project* has three aims: a more knowledgeable and skilled practitioner; a contribution to professional and scholarly knowledge; and a body of work or change in practice. The Program explicitly links postgraduate study with the workplace of the research practitioners, in this case the MONE. Although the three projects share common elements, for example each project is motivated by a desire to improve educational outcomes at the local level in the context of decentralization; the particular focus of each one differs.

The design for each of the larger research projects is based on an action research methodology (see for example, Schmuch 1998 – the full reference is Schmuch, R. A. (1998) *Practical Action Research* Cheltenham, Vic: Hawker Brownlow Education). The data upon which this paper is based was collected during a series of workshops and meetings in the districts of Yogyakarta, Denpasar, Mataram, Central Lombok, West Lombok, Tangerang, Bekasi, and central office in Jakarta in 2005 and early 2006. The number of participants at each workshop and meeting varied from approximately 10 to approximately 100. The aim of the workshops was to collect views, ideas, and data. Although there were minor variations, each workshop and meeting were divided into three parts: e.g. introduction, address by the District Education Heads, and interaction with Researchers. During each workshop and meeting, in depth interviews were done. In some workshops, an anonymous questionnaire was distributed to each participant.

**B. The Context**

The Indonesian monetary crisis of 1997 and ensuing economic, political and social crisis marked a turning point in Indonesian history. President Suharto was pressured to step down from the presidency. He was replaced by Vice President, Habibie who was subsequently formally appointed by the People’s Consultative Assembly/MPR as a President of Indonesia. Following Habibie’s presidential appointment there was increasing pressure on the Government of Indonesia from a range of sources for fundamental reform of government systems. Several provinces, particularly those regions with rich natural resources, such as Irian Jaya, South Sulawesi, Riau, East Kalimantan and Aceh, pushed for the decentralization of government decision making and for greater financial autonomy. They felt that, their natural resources were taken to central government (Jakarta) but only a small part came back to their provinces. If the central government did not respond to their pressures and demands, they indicated that they would move to be independent from Indonesia.

As a consequence of both internal, especially the resource rich regions, and external pressure decentralization was mandated by the People’s Consultative Assembly (MPR) in 1998. This ‘decentralization’ decision was reflected in two laws: Law 22/1999 on Local Government and Law 25/1999 on Financial Balance between Local Government and Central Government in May 1999. By law, Indonesia has been a decentralized country.
since the enactment of those two laws. Under these laws authority was transferred from the central to local governments in all areas of public service except in the fields of foreign affairs, national security, finance, fiscal matters, religion and a few minor specified areas.

The laws signaled a fundamental change in direction in Indonesian governance and required significant changes in the Indonesian regulatory regime in order to give effect to the decision of the MPR. These regulatory changes included: Government Regulations 25/2000 (Authorities of Central Government and Provincial Government), 104/2000 (equilibrium Funds), 105/2000 (The Regions Financial Management and Accountability), 106/2000 (Financial Management and Accountability in Implementation of Deconcentration and Assistance), 11/2001 (Information on Regional Finances), 20/2001 (Fostering and Supervision of Local Governance), 65/2001 (regional Tax), 88/2001 (regional Levies). Developing this new regulatory regime created challenges for the three levels of government – central, provincial and district. In addition to the challenge of creating and communicating a large number of new of new regulations the decentralization process was confronted by different understanding about the nature and impact of the laws and regulations. Each province and district implemented decentralization on the basis of their own perceptions. Consequently, the fidelity of decentralization implementation varied from region to region (Slamet PH, 2005).

The focus of decentralization Law 22/1999 was at the district level, not at the provincial level. This is due to the belief at that time (1998), that if decentralization was implemented only at the provincial level, there was a possibility of national disintegration. Thus, the decision of putting decentralization at the provincial level was for political reason, not technical reasons (Sarundayang, 2005). However, after five years of experience, decentralization of authority and responsibility at the district level has created problems. The district local government machines did not function well and there were lack of coordination among the districts and provinces, and among the districts and central government, just to mention just a few of the problems.

Let us now briefly describe the development of Indonesian decentralized education as of today. Efforts to implement decentralization of education in Indonesia have been tried seriously since 1999. From a positive point of view, perhaps we may say that in a very short time (1999 – 2006) Indonesia has been very successful in implementing decentralized education. The creativity and initiative of local government and community in developing education has been very surprising. Democracy in education is developing very fast. However, on the negative side, as cited by the Indonesian Ministry of Home Affairs (2002), there are numerous weaknesses at both local and central governments including: poor articulation of necessary and achievable tasks; inefficiently constituted organizational structures; inefficiently manned in terms of overstaffing or understaffing; inefficiently manned in terms of required skills to meet mandated tasks, lack of effective measurement criteria to gauge performance and efficiency, lack of effective monitoring systems, lack of operational transparency and some lack of honesty and integrity. But we think it is also affair to say that building decentralized education is not a one shot and quick fix. It is a long process and will take time. Decentralized education is actually empowering the people. Our research will contribute to this process.

Understanding that implementing a decentralized education system will take a time, numerous efforts and initiatives have been tried seriously. For example, efforts have been initiated to strengthen education decentralization management and governance capacity at all levels, from school, district, province to central governments. However, our research based on lessons learned from the field tells us that local education managers are still inadequately prepared and therefore, decentralized capacity building at all levels is needed but it should be based on demand driven both at local and central levels. This requires accurate needs assessment and appropriate development ideas and activities.
Serious efforts are also being undertaken to transit from centralized to decentralized system. During the centralized era, the system of education planning, management, governance, finance, administration, delivery and control, were all directed and guided by the central government. While in this emerging era of decentralization systems are being devolved to local governments at provincial and district levels. Obviously, the transition requires preconditions for decentralization to be successful. For example, clearly established legal frameworks, clear policies, increased institutional capacity (at central, provinces, and districts), capable human resources, active community participation, and good management and governance at central and local levels are necessary conditions required for decentralization to be successful.

According to Slamet (2005), the ultimate goals of Indonesian decentralized education system are to: (1) improve education performances (accessible education for all, increased quality, productivity, effectiveness, efficiency, and innovation), (2) improve quality service delivery, (3) reduced regional disparities, (4) improve resource allocation and development, and (5) enhance good governance e.g. democracy, participation, transparency, accountability, law enforcement, predictability and professionalism, to mention just a few.

C. Three Challenges of Decentralized Education System in Indonesia

There are numerous challenges related to Indonesian decentralized education efforts, but the following three focal points will be the main challenges to discuss in this conference: (1) planning, (2) service delivery, and (3) education boards.

1. Decentralized Education Planning

There are at least seven challenges faced by Indonesian decentralized education planning: (1) planning design, (2) education management information system, (3) planning guidelines, (4) planning coordination, (5) enforcement of planning implementation, (6) monitoring and evaluation, and (7) professional planners. However at this conference we do not have time to deal with all of these issues. We will focus on those that most closely relate to our research. Detail description of each is written in our dissertation draft currently in progress.

2. Quality Service Delivery

The challenges faced by quality service delivery in Indonesian decentralized education system are numerous, but five of them need to be addressed quickly: (1) the meaning of Minimum Service Standard, (2) formula for Minimum Service Standard (MSS) i.e. indicators and target values, (3) guidelines to implement MSS, (4) strong coordination is required across sectors and among units within the Department of National Education, both vertically and horizontally, and (5) an overall system for enforcement should be developed in order to avoid violating MSS.
3. Education Boards

The major challenges facing education boards in Indonesia are two folds: (1) selection mechanisms, and (2) strengthening their roles and functions in order to contribute optimally to education development. (How to strengthen them in order to have local voices to develop education.) Decentralization of education, in actuality, is not only devolving education authority to local governments, but also to local communities. New partnerships between education institutions and local community at large should be built and consequently “community based education” should be the umbrella for developing this partnership. Direction of education is not only the monopoly of education bureaucracy, but the community at large must be given a voice. Therefore, strengthening the roles and functions of education boards should be one of the highest priorities for education activities at the present time.

D. Research Findings (based on temporary data collection)

The followings are research findings based on temporary data collection analyzed by qualitative data analysis. This data analysis was done during data collection (within-site analysis) and therefore it may be subject to change after all data collection will have been completed (data analysis after data collection). Our early research findings said that effective planning, excellent service quality, and intensive community involvement in education process through boards of education, will support the success of sustainable Indonesian decentralized education.

1. Planning for Decentralized Junior Secondary Education

The findings are based on respondent views collected from: (1) several time in-depth interviews with 4 Deputies and 8 Heads of Section at Directorate of Junior Secondary Education Office at the Ministry of National Education in 2005, (2) several meetings and in depth interviews with 30 Provincial Education Offices administrators dealing with education planning in 2005 and 2006, and (3) several time in depth interviews with District Education Offices administrators dealing with planning, Education Boards, school principals, school committees, and school supervisors. It was proposed by them that the ideal education planning in decentralized education system for junior secondary education in Indonesia should cover the followings: (a) planning design, (b) education management information system, (c) planning guidelines, (d) planning coordination, (e) enforcement of planning implementation, (f) monitoring and evaluation, and (g) professional planners. The degree of importance for each of planning dimensions may be seen from Table 1.
Table 1: Summary of Respondents’ Perceptions about the Degree of Importance of Planning Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dimensions of Planning</th>
<th>Respondent Perceptions about the Degree of Importance of Planning Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Design</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education Management Information System (EMIS)</td>
<td>Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Planning Guidelines</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Planning Coordination</td>
<td>Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Enforcement of Planning Implementation</td>
<td>Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Professional Planners</td>
<td>Very important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 1, it can be concluded that planning dimensions are considered as important to very important by respondents. Very important means that certain planning dimensions are very needed, while important means that certain planning dimensions are needed.

a. Planning Design

The first step in the planning design is to define the scope and quality of good planning. The scope of planning design consists of equity, quality and relevancy, and governance of education. The quality of planning can be justified by planning criteria.

Equity, reflecting the fairness of distribution of educational resources, opportunities and/or outcomes across relevant categories such as province, district, income class, social class, ethnic group, sex, minority, etc. Quality or improvement is the educational value that is added by the education system, i.e. gains in achievement as a result of education process or put in another way of getting acquisition of knowledge, skill, and dispositions. Relevancy, reflecting the extent to which education system contributes to the national development process. Governance of education is an arrangement of formal and informal power in education. It is hoped that formal power will be implemented consistently. Therefore, all programs must be undertaken according to the principles of good governance, including: participation, transparency, accountability, law enforcement, professional, predictability, democracy. Good governance is built in the design plan.

Quality of planning is justified by planning criteria developed by researcher together with research subjects. At least 14 criteria for good education planning were identified including: context analysis, profile of current education situation, future ideal education situation, gap analysis, policy and program development to reduce the gaps, demand driven, feasibility of implementation strategy, feasibility of monitoring and evaluation, adequacy-updated-data relevance, feasibility of budget (education plan, financial plan, and financial resources), levels of participation and inclusiveness of stakeholders in education, sustainability (human resources, funding, etc.), system (procedure, mechanism of developing a plan), link and match between planning levels, and completeness of planning elements.
b. Education Management Information System (EMIS)

Education planning should be based on accurate, updated, complete, and relevant data. For this to happen, the second step of planning is to develop EMIS in order to get the needed data. In this step, we must first make all stakeholders aware of the importance of EMIS for education planning, developing software and hardware, training human resources, and making sure the financial supports are available from both national and local offices.

c. Planning Guidelines for Junior Secondary Education

To make sure that planning design is to be implemented with a high degree of consistency it is important in this step to develop implementation guidelines for each program. This will include: the important issues of equity, quality, and governance of education. Each guideline consists of objective for each program to be achieved, activities, inputs, how to do it, etc. including action plans. The implementation guidelines are developed together between researcher and research subjects, both at the central and local government levels.

d. Planning Coordination

To get system wide coordination and consistency, and to avoid unnecessary duplication and conflicts of plans between central and local education plans, it is important to have coordination between central and local education plans through meetings, consultations, trainings, and other mechanisms as deemed relevant to both national and local education offices. This step is very important in the planning process as decentralization of education in Indonesia tends to produce “loose coupling” between central and local education offices. Coordination is done interactively between central and local education offices. Basically, the role of researcher is as facilitator in the coordination and the decisions is based on mutually acceptable decisions agreed during coordination meetings.

e. Enforcement of Planning Implementation

Good planning is only one part of quality assurance. The ultimate results still depend on conformity of implementation to planning design. For this reason, it is important to conduct monitoring, supervision, and control during implementation. Our research found that, decentralized education has caused ‘loose-coupling’ connections between central and local education systems. Therefore, it is important to enforce conformance of implementation to planning design by providing appropriate incentives.

f. Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring should be done to provide early warnings of emerging problems. Evaluation must be done to see whether the real outputs are congruent with the expected outputs. Both monitoring and evaluation are important
to make sure and control the effectiveness and efficiency of the programs. It was found that both national and local education offices agreed on tight monitoring and evaluation undertaken collaboratively in accordance with existing regulations e.g. Government Regulation on Divisions of Labor (tasks and functions) between central and local education offices. (Note: at the present time, the regulation is in the process of being finalized.)

g. Professional Planners

Good planning also depends on good planners. For this to happen, it was agreed by researcher and research subjects to develop good planners through capacity building including: formal education, training, workshops, focus group discussions and other means as deemed appropriate. It was also agreed that both national and local education offices develop the capacity of professional education planners through shared funding.

2. Service Quality Delivery

Based on documentary analysis, meeting observations, questionnaires and intensive interviews with school principals, school committee, education boards, and district education office staff, the following preliminary research findings are presented.

As noted, soon after the Law 22/1999 on Regional Government was enacted, other government regulations derived from this law were also enacted including Government regulation 25/2000 on Regional Government Authorities and Ministerial Decree 129a/U/2004 on Minimum Service Standard. Unlike law 22/1999 that covers more general aspects of regional government, government regulation 25/2000 details how authority is distributed across government levels. To ensure that regional and district levels government carry out their obligatory functions as stated on government regulation 25/2000, each sectoral ministry should provide MSS (minimum service standards) for what is expected to be achieved by each regional government level; Without such standards, there is no evaluation on how those decisions handed down to provinces and districts really affect regional government service quality. In the education sector this minimum service standard is regulated by National Education Ministerial Decree 129a/U/2004. The Education Minimum Service Standard is a set of indicators on formal, non formal, Youth, and Sport Education to be achieved by all district education offices as a consequence of their new obligatory functions after decentralization was enacted.

Even though the education MSS have been enacted for many years, effective implementation is quite limited. The Ministerial decree is not listed in the hierarchy of government regulations which local government usually refers in formulating policies, consequently most local government institutions overlook the importance of measuring their service measurement using MSS. On the other hand, there was a limited understanding of the importance of MSS and a range of interpretations exist both within and across levels of government. This situation raises questions on not only how service quality measurement in district education offices should be formulated, and implemented, but also what factors influence efforts to improve it.

This is why evaluating and measuring service delivery is critically important. The purpose of measuring the quality of service is to see if the quality is better or worse than it was, or is better or worse compared to another service providers These service quality indicators should not only be measured by audits from within the
internal organization of district offices, but should also be measured by external customers including schools, principals, teachers, parents and other community members.

Based on questionnaires distributed to 140 respondents consisting of school principals and teachers in the workshops held in the Department of National Education, 30% participants perceived that the service quality delivery was relatively good, 40% fair, and the rest of 30% are unsatisfactory or even worse as compared to the centralized era. This is a significant message for education managers and a real worry.

Factors influencing this service quality delivery, according to respondents include the capacity of human resources at district education offices, supporting facilities at the school, district office levels, financial support at school and district levels, and coordination among education stakeholders in planning, programming and budgeting, just to mention just a few.

International experience (Ariel Fizbein, 2005) clearly indicates the importance of an appropriate political framework, careful fiscal planning and management, transparency, citizen participation, civil society and the enhanced capacity of sub-national governments to effective public sector decentralization. Based on public service delivery, reform should also consider its three main actors: citizens, policy makers, and service providers (Omar Azwar, 1999). Our research also indicates that the capacity of sub-national government at the district education office level plays an important role in promoting effective education decentralization. This is why capacity building for district education offices is a vital component in improving service quality delivery.

3. Education Boards

The following preliminary research findings based on data collected from a representative sample of 5 districts comprising boards of education, school committee, district education office staff, and school principals including teachers are summarized as follows.

The main issue of Indonesian education at the present time is the transition from centralized to decentralized system. In decentralized system, the authority and responsibility are devolved to local government and community. Right now, the community has been involved more intensively in education matters. In organizing the community involvement, Minister of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia has issued a Ministerial Decree 044/2002 on Education Board and School Committee to support the capacity of districts and schools respectively on how to plan, manage, finance and delivery of education.

According to the Ministerial Decree 44/2002, Education Board has several roles in the field as follows: (1) advising in formulation and implementation of education policy; (2) supporting in finance
and opinion; (3) **controlling** in transparent and accountable management and output of education; and (4) **mediating** between local government, parliament, and community.

To implement these roles, the Education Board has a function to support the growing attention and commitment of communities toward a quality education implementation (*Handbook of Education Board*, 2005). The Board also works cooperatively with communities, either individually or collectively, commerce and industry, government, and parliament, in connection with the quality education implementation. The other function is to accomodate and analyse aspiration, view, claim, and needs proposed by the community.

The function of Education Board is also to give inputs, considerations and recommendations to local government/parliament and to the education unit concerning policy and program of education, local education performance criteria, education personnel criteria, especially teacher/tutor and head of school, education facility criteria, and other bussiness related to education (*Handbook of Education Board*, 2005).

Lastly, the function of Education Board is to support parents and community in order to participate in education and raise funds in term of budgetting the implementation of education at school level.

In general, the establishment of Education Boards has encouraged active community participation in education intelectually, morally, financially, and materially although it varies from districts to districts due to selection and capacity of the Education Boards. For example, it was found that when the Education Boards members were rightly selected, the Education Boards entity tends to be strong which, in turn, the Education Boards tends to do the jobs better. Second, the higher the capacity of the Education Boards members to do the jobs, the better performance of the Education Boards as collective entity.

**E. Conclusions**

In general, the research found that support for decentralization has encouraged greater local/community participation in education intellectually, morally, financially, and materially which, in turn, contributes to a more relevant and valued system which, in turn, will promote sustainability. More specifically, effective planning, excellent service quality, and intensive community involvement in education process through boards of education, will support the success of sustainable Indonesian decentralized education in particular which, in turn, will promote sustainable national development in general. Capacity building in planning, service quality, and boards of education is required if sustainable Indonesian decentralized education is to be achieved.
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Beside the paper showed on previous exhibit (exhibit 34) I and my two other colleagues were also involved in composing another paper. This time we were asked to explore our experiences in doing research by project dissertation together with our supervisors; David Hodges and Bill Vistarini of RMIT University in Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
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ESD Paper 2 in Bangkok

Facilitating Educational Development:
The RMIT Research by Project Program

David Hodges, Bill Vistarini, Agus Haryanto, Didik Suhardi, Moch Abduh

Abstract

One of the greatest challenges for sustainable development is the forging of learning partnerships and creating practical, contextual knowledge. RMIT University’s Research by Project is an innovative post graduate research program that is based on notions of practical knowledge (Gibbons et al., 1994; Jarvis, 1999; Polanyi, 1958) and the application of this knowledge in a particular context. By Project has three aims: a more knowledgeable and skilled practitioner; a contribution to professional and scholarly knowledge; and a change in practice or body of work. The knowledge objectives of Research by Project in RMIT School of Education are practical and transdisciplinary.

This conference paper explores the challenges of undertaking workplace based post graduate research in the context of educational decentralization and capacity building. Three of the authors work in the Indonesian Ministry of National Education and are undertaking doctoral studies By Project. The fourth author is a research supervisor in the Bay Project Program. This paper also looks at issues associated with managing research within the context of a complex and dynamic workplace environment - a world that is characterized by change and shifting priorities. Managing these disruptions requires flexibility and creativity from both students and supervisors.

Collaborating for Learning

Help us to take best practice at the school level and use it to create healthy models of systemic change at a global level so that all students regardless of geographic location have equity and access to an excellent education.

(G100 Principals’ Communiqué, 2006)

The quote above forms part of the official communiqué from the recent Transformation and Innovation: International Workshop for School Principals in Beijing. This is one of six statements that called on policy makers and the business community to support educational transformation. The Communiqué is also relevant to other stakeholders including universities. Elsewhere, the Communiqué recognized that “Education systems and schools in different cultures have developed effective practices and policies. These practices and policies may be unique to their own contexts but are invaluable sources of inspiration for others.” It also recognized the importance of networking and collaboration in educational reform.

One of the key challenges for educational transformation for an equitable and sustainable future is the forging of collaborative learning partnerships that are aimed at the creation of practical contextual knowledge. These collaborative learning partnerships are founded on the recognition that effective educational practices must be responsive to local customs, priorities and decision making while being open to the experiences and knowledge of practitioners who are outside this local context. The RMIT Research by Project Program represents one attempt at educational collaboration.

This paper is a collaborative effort between the authors. Three of the authors are senior officials in the Directorate of Junior Secondary Education within the Indonesian Ministry of National Education. They are currently completing their Doctor of Philosophy by Project. Although the objectives of each project differ, the decentralization of education in Indonesia lies at the heart of each project. More importantly, each project is explicitly aimed at improving educational outcomes especially in basic education, either through better planning
and co-ordination, improved service delivery or increased community participation. The authors are totally immersed in the daily reality of educational reform in Indonesia. Along with their colleagues, they face the challenge of enacting policy and attempting to ensure positive educational outcomes.

The other two authors of this paper are from the School of Education at RMIT University. They supervise masters and doctoral students who are completing postgraduate research By Project. Both supervisors have worked on educational projects in South-East Asia and one has worked in a Ministry of Education and has been involved in major aid project that had decentralization as a major outcome. The research students in the School of Education By Project Program are located in a diverse range of educational settings including schools, vocational education and training institutes, government departments and industrial and community based organizations. Unlike some more traditional supervisory practices which are encapsulated in a master-novice type relationship, (see for example Hodges, Malfroy, & Vaughan, 2006; Malfroy, 2004), supervision in the Bay Project mode tends to be collaborative, with the postgraduate student and the supervisor bringing different skills, knowledge and expertise to the relationship. The role of the supervisor is more aligned to that of a coach or consultant.

Therefore this paper draws on two separate but related sets of experiences – studying in the Bay Project mode on the one hand and supervising in this mode on the other. It is based on a case study methodology (Stake, 2003) and builds on an impact and process evaluation that was informed by Owen (1993). The students in this particular instance were asked to reflect on their experience in the program and to relate these experiences to the objectives of the program and to the challenges that they faced as a practitioner researcher. The remainder of this paper is divided into two parts. The first section provides an overview of the By Project program, articulating the program’s objectives and the action research/action learning methodology that underpins so many of the research projects undertaken in the program. The experiences of the three Indonesian authors are explored in the second section.

The By Project Program
Research by Project was first offered as a mode of post-graduate research in the School of Education in 2000. Therefore it has a relatively short history in this field although it has a longer lineage in areas such as art, design and architecture where the inadequacies of the traditional dissertation were felt to be inappropriate. Research by Project has three aims: a more knowledgeable and skilled practitioner; a contribution to professional and scholarly knowledge; and a body of work or change in practice. This mode of 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 or community. This grounding of research in the reality of the local context is a critical component of the program.

Despite possible appearances of simplicity and convenience, Research By Project and the research candidates who inhabit this space, face a number of challenges including: the changing nature of knowledge, managing the university, the workplace and their inter-relationships, ethical complexities, the development of appropriate methodologies and the challenge of organizing, writing-up and presenting data and findings (Bain, Brown, Hodges, Meyer, & Vaughan, 2004). The practitioner researcher needs to mediate a way through these challenges and fashion an appropriate response.

The first objective of the By Project Program is a more knowledgeable and skilled practitioner – whether that practitioner is a teacher, administrator, school principal or indeed from an entirely different discipline such as architecture. The practitioner’s field of endeavour is not important. What is critical is the explicit acknowledgement that an increase in the knowledge and skill of the practitioner is founded on systematic research and the analysis of practice. This process can be viewed as three challenges. First, it is expected that the practitioner will become more informed about their own practices and the values that inform that practice. Systematic reflection is an integral component of the process of becoming a more informed and knowledgeable practitioner. The term ‘reflection’ is used in the sense of critical or forensic analysis. The second challenge requires the practitioner to become more informed about the context, the stakeholders that inhabit this space and
time that and the issues that animate the context. Schon (1987) used the image of the swamp to convey the work of the practitioner. The third challenge requires the practitioner to rise above the swamp and to become critically informed about the knowledge and practices of other contexts and systems. It is here that the practitioner engages with disciplinary knowledge, evaluating how this can inform the action of the practitioner and the context inhabitants.

In addition to a more knowledgeable and skilled practitioner, Research By Project aims to contribute to professional and scholarly knowledge. This is a laudable but problematic objective because the nature of knowledge itself is contested. Gibbons (1994) differentiated between Mode 1 and Mode 2 knowledge. Mode 1 or traditional knowledge is “generated within a disciplinary, primarily cognitive, context [whereas Mode 2] is created in broader, transdisciplinary social and economic contexts” (p1). Mode 1 is propositional and has a position of dominance in western universities. Mode 2, on the other hand is concerned with application and it holds sway in the typical workplace. Jarvis (1999) refers to the concept of practical knowledge but applying his insights to a doctoral research program is difficult because of conflicting views of knowledge.

More recently, Scott (2004) has modified and extended Gibbons’s typology. While Mode 1 is largely unchanged, technical rationality becomes the focus of Mode 2. In this world of technical rationality, there is, according to Scott, a tendency to view the working knowledge of the practitioner as inferior or at least incomplete because it cannot be generalized or transferred to new practice settings. In other words outside knowledge has the ascendancy even if it does not work in the local practice setting. This is likely to become problematic in an era of decentralization of education and the school based transformations that are encapsulated in the G100 Communiqué.

Mode 3 is concerned with dispositional and transdisciplinary knowledge. Scott anticipates that two quite different approaches could be adopted in this mode. In the more conventional approach the practitioner adapts outside theories to fit the local situation or adopts a more active role in the knowledge stakes, seeing the practice setting as the source of new theory. A more radical position questions the role of theory itself and of outside theorists. Mode 4 adopts an explicitly political position, examining the exercise of power and the interests and values that energise this force. Mode 4 is change orientated and has similarities with the critical action learning/action research movements typified by exponents such as Kemmis and McTaggart’s (2000).

The third objective of the Research By Project Program is to produce a body of work or a change in practice. In the areas of art, design, architecture and music this criteria could be addressed through the production of a portfolio. The portfolio might include drawings, models or pieces of music that were produced during the course of the project. In the area of education, the portfolio could include policy and curriculum documents, teaching materials and the like. However, in a world that can be so easily seduced by the glossy report or glib set of recommendations, the temptation for post graduate students in the areas of education and social development is to privilege a concrete outcome, such as a curriculum document, over the real but fraught area of a change in practice. Typically, changes in practice are slow, incremental and often unglamorous. They can also be contentious and associated with conflict. Therefore, demonstrating a change in practice poses a more complex challenge for the Research By Project practitioner. One way of addressing this challenge is to capture artifacts or exhibits that either represent the change or the action taken by the practitioner researcher in their attempt to facilitate change.

A common feature of Research By Project in education is the use of an action research/action learning methodology. The linking of research and learning is important because it explicitly connects research and learning. (Zuber-Skerritt, 2001). There is a reflexive relationship between the two. Being critical and a commitment to action are the touchstones of action research strategies. It has a number of attractive advantages in that it has the capacity to be overtly critical, and at its core there is the commitment to action. Another attractive feature is the commitment to participation. Without participation, the action research would lose its raison d’etre. The action is linked to the community or workplace and their needs and aspirations.
Action research/action learning approaches can be difficult to manage because of the dynamic nature of the context and the need for the researcher to be responsive to the stakeholders. It is here that the notion of first, second and third person action research can provide a useful framework for the researcher (Reason, 2001; Torbet, 1999). First person inquiry focuses on the researcher, their values, attitudes, motivation and behaviour. Second person inquiry commences when the inquirer engages with the other. An essential feature of second person inquiry is the development of a trusting relationship. This becomes even more critical when the inquirer does not ‘come from’ within the group but is instead an outsider. The development of this relationship should itself be the subject of an explicit inquiry. Torbet speaks of the need to create mini communities of inquiry. While both Torbet and Reason approach first and second person inquiry in a similar fashion, they diverge in their presentation of third person inquiry/practice. Common to both though is the challenge of moving beyond the immediate group and engaging with the ‘other’. Reason argues that third person inquiry is at the cutting edge of action research for “it presents us with the challenge of creating large scale participatory democracy and of dealing with some of the major issues which confront our societies – issues of scale, of co-ordination between different stakeholders and interests groups, of ‘joined-up government’” This is one of the greatest challenges of the phenomenon of globalisation. How is it possible to co-ordinate, let alone ensure participatory democracy? The sheer magnitude of increasing economic interdependence, of multinational companies and global industries means that it is extremely difficult for participants to engage in dialogue. It raises questions of language, culture and concepts of self. Given these difficulties, difficulties that could be loosely termed, ‘the difficulties of identity’, it is even more difficult to devise action.

The following framework and associated questions have been used by many By Project researchers to explore their own actions and the actions and aspirations of the participants with whom they work.

**First person action research**

What are the values that underpin my work?

What are my personal objectives?

What is the impact of these values?

How can I/have I acted as a catalyst?

What kind of relationship will I/have I established with the stakeholders?

What action do I take?

**Second person action research**

• How have the participants engaged with the researcher?
• What are the characteristics of this engagement?
• What are the issues that the participants confront?
• What are their objectives? Their motivation?
• How might the role of the participants be enhanced?
• What is preventing the participants from addressing their concerns?

**Third person action research**

• What are the key issues that impact on the community of organization?
• What are the concerns or aims of the community?
• What does the community expect?
• What resources does the community have?
• How do outside stakeholders shape power within the community?
LINKING POSTGRADUATE STUDY AND THE WORKPLACE

The attempt by RMIT University to link postgraduate study and the workplace is not unique. Coursework degrees, especially at a masters level, typically draw on professional and/or workplace experiences. At the doctoral level, professional doctorates, such as the Doctor of Education and the Doctor of Business Administration also claim to link the expertise and rigor of the university with the workplace and the practitioners that inhabit them. Lee, Green and Brennan (2000) argue that the professional doctorate is fostering a ‘hybrid curriculum’ that exists in the intersections 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 relationships among participants and new kinds of research writing. (p127)

The authors use three intersecting circles to demonstrate the place where the interests 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 6.1 The hybrid curriculum of the professional doctorate](image)

Figure 6.1 captures the intersecting spaces envisaged by Lee and her colleagues. However, these intersecting spaces are presented as being largely unproblematic with the university, the profession and the workplace in happy co-existence, if not collaboration. Central to the hybrid curriculum is the student who must mediate the conflicts in the space and forge new relationships, knowledge and research writing.

The hybrid curriculum model typified by Lee has been criticised. Malfroy (2004) in a study of a professional doctorate in the area of nursing, acknowledges the dominance of the university but challenges the conceptualisation of the other two spheres of the model. For example, it was envisaged that there would be engagement by professional bodies and that the workplace would assume a central role in the doctoral program. However, in Malfroy’s view ‘profession’ is inaccurately conceptualised and in her studies, she found no evidence that the professions were “providing strong guidance or involvement in the planning and teaching of the [nursing] program” (Malfroy, 2004 p68). The workplace lacked influence except as a site for the student’s research and does not have a “deep investment in the process” (p70).
Malfroy offers an alternative to the initial conceptualisation of the hybrid curriculum. Profession has been replaced by ‘professional practice’. The improvement of their own professional practice and the practice of their community were key motivating factors for the students undertaking the doctoral program. The workplace has been replaced by change as it was a characteristic that was evident in the objectives of the doctoral program and in “the intentions and identities of the students” (p74). Figure 6.2 captures the alternative conceptualisation. More important than the conceptualisation is Malfroy’s acknowledgement that workplace relationships will continue to be problematic given the dialectical nature of workplace based doctoral programs.

![Figure 6.2: Conceptual model of the professional doctorate in nursing](Source: (Malfroy, 2004 p71))

The By Project mode of postgraduate research creates challenges for universities and workplaces and the inter-relationship between these institutions and the act of knowledge production. Barnett (2000) has explored the notion of working knowledge. This form of knowledge is appealing because of its pragmatism, but he argues, there are dangers in relying solely on this characteristic as a means of justification. The risk of basing knowledge claims on pragmatism alone is that the longer term moral implications of knowledge and its production may be forgotten.

Research By Project, claims to offer an alternative to the ‘traditional thesis’. Tradition is a device to define truth (Giddens, 2002) and, in the context of postgraduate education, especially in the social sciences, there may be a temptation to view the ‘traditionally’ structured and styled thesis as a device to judge the outputs of all postgraduate programs. Malfroy, in her study of professional doctorates, refers to the dominance exerted by the university and the temptation, of course, is to allow this dominance to unduly shape the representation of all workplace projects.

Research by Project in Indonesia

In July 2004 three officials from the Junior Secondary Directorate of the Indonesian Ministry of National Education (MONE) enrolled as doctoral students in the School of Education at RMIT University. They opted to pursue their doctoral work in the By Project mode rather than with the more traditional thesis. Two reasons were advanced for this decision. First, the program linked the workplace and doctoral studies. As a result, the students were able to explicitly link their organizational and personal work objectives with their doctoral work. Second, the By Project mode enabled the students to continue living and working in Indonesia. They saw that this option had clear advantages not only for their work in the Ministry but also for their families. All three members of the group had primary school aged children and one had children in secondary education and another child in tertiary education.
Prior to formally enrolling a number of preliminary consultations were held to formalise a contract between MONE and RMIT and more importantly to establish the working arrangements for the period of the doctoral project. The working arrangements were intended to provide some structure whilst allowing for flexibility because of the dynamic nature of the working environment and the demands on the doctoral students. An essential feature of the supervisory arrangements was the two visits per year to Indonesia by the supervisory team. These visits were in addition to the one-two visits each year to the Melbourne campus of RMIT by the doctoral students. Typically, these visits last approximately one week. The visits to Melbourne enable the postgraduate research students to remove themselves from the frenetic activity of the workplace in order to make time and space available for formal reflection.

Van Manen (1991) identifies three different types of reflection: anticipatory, interactive and recollective. Anticipatory reflection is the process of deliberating about alternatives, possible courses of action or the planning of particular experiences. There are two types of anticipatory reflection. The first is instrumental and for a project aimed at improving planning and co-ordination in the context of decentralization it would include the planning of a meeting with provincial and district education offices. The second type of anticipatory reflection is the thinking involved in preparation for a particular meeting. How will the officials from the district office react? What concerns will they raise? And so on?

Van Manen refers to reflection in action or reflection in the midst of action. Reflection in action is difficult to achieve in the context of the hectic workload in the MONE. All three doctoral students report that balancing work and the research project is challenging. This is not unique to practitioner researchers in Indonesia or Australia, a point that Van Manen himself makes clear, “while we are interacting we usually do not have time to or opportunity to reflect on our experience as it is happening” (1991 p101).

The third type of reflection is recollective. This activity assists the practitioner researcher make sense of their experiences and the data that they have collected. The visits to Melbourne enable the students to engage in anticipatory reflection and more critically in terms of knowledge production and legitimation, recollective reflection. The visits also enable the students to join in other learning experiences associated with university life such as research seminars, presentation of research findings and reviews of progress.

As stated earlier the relationship between the supervisor and the typical student in the By Project Program is more aligned to that of a consultant or coach then to the master-novice relationship of a more traditional program of study. Working in this learning environment places additional demands and complications on the postgraduate student - such as having to deal with change, conflict and a dynamic environment. It also places additional demands on the supervisor who must develop an understanding of the dimensions of the research project and an appreciation of the dynamic context in which the project unfolds. Using Schon’s image of the swamp once again, the supervisor must enter the swamp in order to appreciate this particular environment. It is only by understanding this environment that the supervisor can fully grasp the scope of the projects’ objectives and be in a position to assist the practitioner researcher engage in the anticipatory and recollective reflection that is so critical for its success.

It is particularly important that the supervisors have some detailed knowledge of the social and political milieu, the organizational culture and the student researchers’ role in the workplace. Accordingly, the supervisors visit Indonesia approximately every six months. These visits include consultations with the students and their local mentors as well as journeys to the field. These journeys have included visits to schools, sub-district, district and provincial education offices in Bali, Lombok, Yogyakarta and Jakarta and its environs.

Conclusion

The Research By Project Program in the School of Education is attempting to forge new ways of producing knowledge. In particular, it is concerned with how apprentice researchers and their local communities or
organizations can use cycles of (critical) reflection that may make use of propositional knowledge as well as locally developed insights, and action. Like so many other educational innovations, the Research By Project also aims to develop individual practitioners and the organizations in which they work. More importantly through this process it is attempting to improve educational outcomes in local communities. To this extent then the program has the potential to facilitate capacity building. It is through a myriad of committed local, interventions that the Millennium Goals will be achieved and the spirit of the G100 Communiqué will be enacted.

One of the real positives of Research By Project is that the researcher remains in his or her workplace and that the research is focussed on this work. Despite this advantage, the continuing responsibilities shouldered by senior ministry officials in their day-to-day workload and for managing a demanding and dynamic decentralisation program add to the challenges of completing the postgraduate program. In other words, the By Project student may confront the dilemma of choosing between conflicting priorities – facilitating change or successfully completing a degree. In the case of the students in the Indonesian Ministry of National Education, the normal demands have been increased by continuing modifications to the decentralisation process and the unexpected challenges of responding to tsunamis and earthquakes.
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38. Letter of Exceptance from Bangkok ESD Seminar Committee

As formal evidence that our paper was formally accepted by the seminar committee, this email was sent by the committee member of Bangkok ESD seminar.

Our papers were scheduled for session 5C on 7\textsuperscript{th} December 2006.
Dear Agus Haryanto, Mochamad Abduh, and Didik Suhardi,

Regarding your abstract which you have submitted to present at the APEID Conference in December 2006. By now, you should have received a message notifying you that your paper has been accepted. I will be the contact person for your sessions. Your papers are scheduled for session 5C on 7th Dec. Attached are the details of the programme and concurrent sessions. Please note that full paper will have to be submitted by 1 November 2006 through the conference webpage: www.unescobkk.org/education/apeid/conference.

In order to facilitate conference planning, I would appreciate your earliest confirmation by Friday 13 October 2006 by e-mail to s.tinsiri@unescobkk.org, indicating whether you will be able to present the paper at the conference.

If you have any questions about the conference, please feel free to contact me.

Looking forward to meeting you in December.

Best regards,
To facilitate our presentation, these power point slides were used in the ESD seminar Bangkok, December 2006. In line with our research by project topic, this presentation also stressing on the importance of management, service delivery and participation as the important elements in developing ESD in Indonesian decentralized education system.
IMPROVING
PLANNING, SERVICES, AND PARTICIPATION
IN INDONESIAN DECENTRALIZED
EDUCATION SYSTEM

By
Didik Suhardi, Agus Haryanto and Mohammad Abduh

Presented at APEID International Conference
UNESCO Bangkok, December 2006

Introduction

• APEID International contributes in bringing nations together
• UNESCO MDG: EFA is one of the key factors to nations development
• Well educated human beings contribute to overall nation’s development
• Good planning, services, and participation is important in nations development
Topics to discuss in Indonesian Decentralized Education System:
Good planning, high quality services and active community participation important for sustainable development

**Aims:**
1. To explore the impacts of education decentralization on planning, service quality, and community participation;
2. Articulate the challenges to a decentralized education system,
3. To improve planning, service quality delivery and the capacity of education boards.

• The authors work in Indonesian Ministry of National Education (MONE), also enrolled in the Doctor of Philosophy – By Project RMIT University

• The data upon which this paper is based was collected during a series of workshops and meetings
The Context

Crisis, pressure for fundamental reform. Internal: Several provinces, decentralization of government decision making and financial autonomy. External: Foreign and or donors countries.


Now, all public service authorities transferred to local governments except; foreign affairs, national security, finance, fiscal matters, religion and judiciary.

Different understanding about the nature and impact of the laws and regulations. Each province and district implemented decentralization on the basis of their own perceptions. Consequently, the fidelity of decentralization implementation varied from region to region.

The district local government machines did not function well and there were lack of coordination among the districts and provinces, and among the districts and central government, just to mention just a few of the problems.
From a positive point of view, efforts to implement decentralization of education in Indonesia have been tried seriously since 1999, the negative side that local education managers are still inadequately prepared and therefore, decentralized capacity building at all levels is needed.

The transition requires preconditions for decentralization to be successful. For example, clearly established legal frameworks, clear policies, increased institutional capacity (at central, provinces, and districts), capable human resources, active community participation, and good management and governance at central and local levels.

Three Challenges of Decentralized Education System in Indonesia

There are numerous challenges related to Indonesian decentralized education efforts, but the following three focal points will be the main challenges to be discussed:

(1) planning,
(2) service delivery,
(3) education boards.
Research Findings  
(based on temporary data collection)

1. Planning for Decentralized Junior Secondary Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Dimensions of Planning</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning Design</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education Management Information System (EMIS)</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Planning Guidelines</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Planning Coordination</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Enforcement of Planning Implementation</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Professional Planners</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Service Quality Delivery

- Minimum Service Standard (MSS) effective implementation is quite limited
- not listed in the hierarchy of government regulations
- limited understanding of the importance of MSS and a range of interpretations exist both within and across levels of government
• 30% relatively good, 40% fair, and the rest of 30% are unsatisfactory or even worse as compared to the centralized era. This is a significant message for education managers and a real worry,

• capacity of human resources at district education offices, supporting facilities at the school, district office levels, financial support at school and district levels, and coordination among education stakeholders

3. Education Boards

• the community has been involved more intensively in education matters
• Education Board has a function to support the growing attention and commitment of communities toward a quality of education implementation
• Education Board is also to give inputs, considerations and recommendations to local government/parliament and to the education unit concerning policy and program of education, local education performance criteria, education personnel criteria, especially teacher/tutor and head of school, education facility criteria, and other business related to education
Conclusions

• In general, the research found that support for decentralization has encouraged greater local/community participation in education intellectually, morally, financially, and materially which, in turn, contributes to a more relevant and valued system which, in turn, will promote sustainability.

• More specifically, effective planning, excellent service quality, and intensive community involvement in education, will support the success of sustainable Indonesian decentralized education in particular which, in turn, will promote sustainable national development in general.

• Capacity building in planning, service quality, and boards of education is required if sustainable Indonesian decentralized education is to be achieved.
40. Most influential people in this research

Research by project has brought me a range of experiences and insight in developing MSS for education. Without the support and understanding of these important people, finishing this project and wrapping it up as a final report and portfolio would have been almost impossible.

Not only support these people, but also the support and contributions from the MSS team members actually made this research and report happen.

Thank you very much!
People who contributed to this research

A review was held in front of prominent people from RMIT University
Colleagues, supervisors/reviewer and my family who helped me complete this research.
### 41. Schools Rehabilitation Program under my unit
After Earthquake In Yogya City and Bantul District 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Rehabilitated School Name</th>
<th>Sub District</th>
<th>City or Municipality</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Funding (in Rupiah)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SD Becari</td>
<td>Pundong</td>
<td>Kab, Bantul</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.455.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SD Tunjunan</td>
<td>Pandak</td>
<td>Kab, Bantul</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.455.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SDN Giriwungu</td>
<td>Imogiri</td>
<td>Kab, Bantul</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.325.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SDN 2 Imogiri</td>
<td>Imogiri</td>
<td>Kab, Bantul</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.325.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SD Mangir Lor</td>
<td>Pajangan</td>
<td>Kab, Bantul</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.455.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SD Banyakan</td>
<td>Piyungan</td>
<td>Kab, Bantul</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.325.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SDN Sanansari</td>
<td>Piyungan</td>
<td>Kab, Bantul</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.455.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SD 1 Petir</td>
<td>Piyungan</td>
<td>Kab, Bantul</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.455.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SD Jetis</td>
<td>Sewon</td>
<td>Kab, Bantul</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.325.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TK ABA Karangkajen</td>
<td>Mergansan</td>
<td>Kota Yogyakarta</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.130.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TK Sedyo Utomo</td>
<td>Umbulharjo</td>
<td>Kota Yogyakarta</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.65.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SDN Golo</td>
<td>Umbulharjo</td>
<td>Kota Yogyakarta</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.520.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SD Muhammadiyah Kleco 1</td>
<td>Kotagede</td>
<td>Kota Yogyakarta</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.195.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SD Muhammadiyah Kleco 3</td>
<td>Kotagede</td>
<td>Kota Yogyakarta</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.195.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SD Muhammadiyah Karangkajen 1</td>
<td>Mergansan</td>
<td>Kota Yogyakarta</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.130.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SD Muhammadiyah Karangkajen 2</td>
<td>Mergansan</td>
<td>Kota Yogyakarta</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.130.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SD Muhammadiyah Bausasran 1</td>
<td>Danurejan</td>
<td>Kota Yogyakarta</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.130.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SD Muhammadiyah Bausasran 2</td>
<td>Danurejan</td>
<td>Kota Yogyakarta</td>
<td>D.I. Yogyakarta</td>
<td>Rp.130.000.000,-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jumlah Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rp.5.200.000.000,-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>