



EDUCATION

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

EDUCATION AND THE ARTS

ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

HEALTH AND HEALTH CARE

INFRASTRUCTURE AND
TRANSPORTATION

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

LAW AND BUSINESS

NATIONAL SECURITY

POPULATION AND AGING

PUBLIC SAFETY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

TERRORISM AND
HOMELAND SECURITY

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit institution that helps improve policy and decisionmaking through research and analysis.

This electronic document was made available from www.rand.org as a public service of the RAND Corporation.

Skip all front matter: [Jump to Page 1](#) ▼

Support RAND

[Purchase this document](#)

[Browse Reports & Bookstore](#)

[Make a charitable contribution](#)

For More Information

Visit RAND at www.rand.org

Explore [RAND Education](#)

View [document details](#)

Limited Electronic Distribution Rights

This document and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law as indicated in a notice appearing later in this work. This electronic representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for non-commercial use only. Unauthorized posting of RAND electronic documents to a non-RAND website is prohibited. RAND electronic documents are protected under copyright law. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of our research documents for commercial use. For information on reprint and linking permissions, please see [RAND Permissions](#).

This product is part of the RAND Corporation monograph series. RAND monographs present major research findings that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors. All RAND monographs undergo rigorous peer review to ensure high standards for research quality and objectivity.

Implementation of School-Based Management in Indonesia

Georges Vernez, Rita Karam, Jeffery H. Marshall

Sponsored by the World Bank



RAND

EDUCATION

This work was sponsored by the World Bank. The research was conducted in RAND Education, a unit of the RAND Corporation.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Vernez, Georges.

Implementation of school-based management in Indonesia / Georges Vernez, Rita Karam, Jeffery H. Marshall.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-0-8330-7618-2 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. School management and organization—Indonesia. 2. School management and organization—Indonesia—Statistics. 3. Educational planning—Indonesia. I. Karam, Rita. II. Marshall, Jeffery H. III. Title.

LB2953.V47 2012

371.209598—dc23

2012020643

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit institution that helps improve policy and decisionmaking through research and analysis. RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

RAND® is a registered trademark.

© Copyright 2012 RAND Corporation

Permission is given to duplicate this document for personal use only, as long as it is unaltered and complete. Copies may not be duplicated for commercial purposes. Unauthorized posting of RAND documents to a non-RAND website is prohibited. RAND documents are protected under copyright law. For information on reprint and linking permissions, please visit the RAND permissions page (<http://www.rand.org/publications/permissions.html>).

Published 2012 by the RAND Corporation

1776 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138

1200 South Hayes Street, Arlington, VA 22202-5050

4570 Fifth Avenue, Suite 600, Pittsburgh, PA 15213-2665

RAND URL: <http://www.rand.org>

To order RAND documents or to obtain additional information, contact

Distribution Services: Telephone: (310) 451-7002;

Fax: (310) 451-6915; Email: order@rand.org

Summary

In 2003, the Indonesian government began to decentralize the governance of its primary and secondary education system as part of its decentralization of responsibilities to district governments (regencies) initiated to strengthen the country's democratic processes. Schools were given authority to manage their operations independently according to student needs and were asked to engage the local community to improve the quality of education. This decentralized form of school management, often called school-based management, required a major shift in how people think about schooling and a significant improvement in the capacity of principals, teachers, and the community to provide leadership, develop programmatic alternatives to meet local educational needs, and engage parents and the community in the governance of schools.

Nationwide implementation of SBM in Indonesia received monetary and technical assistance from various international organizations including the World Bank; the United Nations Children's Fund; the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); the Asian Development Bank; the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID); the Australian Agency for International Development; the Japan International Cooperation Agency; and the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. In spite of this high level of support and attention, little is known about the status of implementation of SBM eight years after it was first implemented. For this reason, the World Bank asked RAND to conduct the first nationwide

comprehensive assessment of SBM implementation and, as needed, to develop recommendations for its improvement.

The Indonesian SBM Program

SBM programs have been implemented in many developed and developing countries and have taken many forms, although they have rarely been implemented nationwide as in Indonesia. SBM programs typically differ along the continuum of two main dimensions: the scope of responsibilities and the authority delegated to the school and who this authority is devolved to—e.g., the school, an outside board, or another independent institution.

The Indonesian version of SBM was intended to give schools broad authority to design, implement, and manage their educational programs and classroom instruction in accordance with local social norms and culture. However, the hiring and assignment of civil service teachers (*pegawai negeri sipil* [PNS]) remain the responsibility of the central government. Although authority was devolved to schools, schools were also mandated to establish an advisory school committee (SC) whose functions include giving input on school educational policy and programs, budget plans, and teacher training; increasing society's attention and commitment to quality education; motivating parents to participate in their children's education; collecting money in support of education; and supervising educational policy and program implementation. To promote transparency, SC members were to be elected and broadly representative of the community.

Schools were directed to formulate a school vision, mission, and goals on “the basis of inputs from all stakeholders including the SC and decided by a teaching board meeting chaired by the principal” and to develop a four-year and an annual plan, the latter to be approved by the teaching board and subject to the input of the SC. Monitoring of school management was to be exercised by the SC on a regular and continuous basis, and supervision over academic management was to be exercised by the principal and the district. Schools were also required to assign a member of the teaching staff to respond to com-

plaints and to requests for information from the public. The education district's role was limited to *validating* the plans and *coordinating* and *supervising* the development of their schools' curriculum.

In 2005, a block grant, the *Bantuan Operasional Sekolah* program, was established to further support the autonomy of schools by providing them with resources that they could flexibly disburse according to school priorities. Another objective of this program was to improve access to education by freeing poor students from school fees. The block grant amount is based on student enrollment, providing a fixed amount per student, about U.S. \$43 in 2010, to all elementary schools. Before this, school operational costs other than teacher salaries were covered by parental fees.

Objectives and Methods

The study had four main objectives:

- conduct a formative assessment of the implementation of SBM
- associate “intermediate” SBM outcomes (authority, participation, transparency) with features of the district, schools, teachers, and communities
- analyze the effects of SBM and other school factors on student achievement
- provide recommendations for policy interventions and future research.

To address these questions, we surveyed principals, teachers, SC members, and parents in a random sample of 54 out of 470 districts, drawn from all seven regions of Indonesia. Within selected districts, a 2 percent random sample of schools was selected. The sample was weighted to represent the universe of elementary schools for the whole of Indonesia. In each selected school, we surveyed the principal, six teachers (randomly selected, one per grade), the SC chair and one member (randomly selected), and six parents (randomly selected, one per grade). In addition, in each of the 54 districts, we surveyed the head

of the district, the head of one randomly selected subdistrict, the chair of the district's education board, and the head of the district's supervisors. Respondents were surveyed face-to-face in April and May 2010. We also developed and administered Bahasa language and mathematics tests to one fifth-grade class in each surveyed school.

The surveys were complemented with an in-depth case study of a stratified randomly selected subsample of 40 schools. For logistical reasons, sampling of the case study schools was limited to the three regions of Java, Sulawesi, and Sumatera. In each school, we interviewed the principal and conducted focus groups with up to four teachers and four parents (randomly selected), SC members (the chair plus three randomly selected members), and BOS team members.

Two study limitations need to be highlighted. First, our findings are based on self-reports from the various respondents and are subject to imprecision and, most importantly, social desirability biases. The latter may have been somewhat mitigated by the confidentiality of the survey. In addition and where possible, we sought to identify such biases by asking similar questions of providers of input or services (such as training) and of recipients of these services. We expected that the first might be more positively biased than the second. Also, when there was disagreement between survey and case study responses, we gave more weight to the case study responses. In the case study, respondents could be probed to clarify their answers and, hence, were less likely to be biased by social desirability. A second limitation is that data were collected at only one point in time so that changes over time could not be described.

Findings

Current Status of SBM Implementation

We found that most principals perceived that they had autonomy over their school's operational, budgetary, programmatic, and instructional decisions consistent with the intent of the central government's decentralization of governance. Principals said that they even had autonomy in hiring and assigning teachers, even though these functions remained

under the authority of the central government, at least for PNS teachers. One potential reason for this perception is that schools have been hiring non-PNS teachers with BOS funds, the latter accounting for nearly one-third of the country's teacher force. Most teachers also said that they had full autonomy in their classrooms including over their choice of instructional methods, groupings of students, and sequence in which they teach the curriculum.

Although they reported having autonomy over their school decisions, principals also reported that they did not take advantage of it by making significant programmatic or instructional changes. And when they did, they typically sought the approval of their district supervisor or other appropriate district staff. One indicator of the reluctance of schools to make independent decisions was the almost complete uniformity in schools' stated goals and priorities and actions taken to improve student performance. This finding is consistent with the reported high level of influence that many districts continued to have in all areas of school managerial and programmatic decisions, including the choice of textbooks and curriculum.

Although most principals consulted with teachers, district staff, and other school principals before making decisions, community and, more broadly, parental participation in school decisionmaking and school affairs remains to be achieved. SC members rarely met and were rarely actively involved in school decisionmaking processes, including the setting of the school's mission, the allocation of BOS funds, and the development of an annual plan. Commonly, the SC chair was simply asked to sign off, as required by governmental guidelines, on decisions already made—which they did mostly without asking any questions. Principals mainly viewed the SC as just an intermediary between the school and parents, even though SCs rarely held meetings with parents to get their input. In turn, SC members' attitude was one of noninterference in school matters and deference to the school staff. Lack of knowledge and time were other reasons given by both principals and SC staff for the lack of SC involvement in school affairs.

As for parents more generally, their attitude was also one of deference to school staff. Schools never held meetings with parents, except when the latter were invited to pick up their children's report cards.

Most principals and teachers reported that they felt little to no pressure from parents and the community at large to improve their school's performance.

At the same time, districts were said to continue to exercise a high level of influence on school policies and practices. Principals said that they rarely made a decision without seeking district approval, in part out of fear of making a mistake or of appearing authoritarian. District influence was said to equal or exceed that of teachers across various areas of school management and academic areas, with the exception of classroom instructional practices. Another indicator of district influence is the high frequency of meetings that principals reported having with district staff.

District and school activities that would promote external transparency and accountability were few. Little information, including on BOS resource allocation, was said to be formally provided or received by either SC members or parents. School sharing of information with SC members was similarly said to be nil or insufficient by nearly half of SC members. Districts, mainly through their supervisors, made frequent (more frequently than quarterly) monitoring visits to schools—however, these visits reportedly focused mainly on administrative school and classroom matters. Although heads of supervisors said that supervisors observed teachers' instruction, half of teachers received no feedback and another quarter received it only once or twice a year. When they received feedback, it was more in terms of what teachers should be doing (e.g., increase student achievement or increase their use of teaching props) and less in terms of how they should do it.

Resources and School Capacity to Implement SBM

We found that principals, teachers, and SC members had insufficient understanding of what SBM required of them and of the functions attributed to the SC, possibly contributing to the mixed implementation of SBM by schools. For instance, they understood SBM's theory and overall purposes (school autonomy, community participation) but not necessarily the responsibilities and the required actions they implied. Most principals and SC members had some misconceptions regarding the functions of the school committee. In addition, a major-

ity of principals said that they were not well prepared to provide effective leadership and perform such SBM-related activities as formulating a vision for school staff, developing a plan for school academic improvement, and making decisions on school curriculum. Similarly, a majority of teachers reported they were not well prepared to plan effective lessons and use various instructional methods and, hence, were unprepared to try alternatives to their routine instructional practices. District staff members, including supervisors, were even less positive about principal and teacher preparation.

The availability of discretionary resources differed greatly across schools, with some schools reporting receiving less funding per student than provided by the central BOS (about U.S. \$43 per student in 2010) and other schools receiving far in excess of it. The latter schools were receiving additional resources from their provincial, district, or local government. Contributions from parents and other sources were minimal. Overall, the average school received 83 percent of its discretionary funding from the BOS program.

District Support for SBM Implementation

Districts and nongovernmental agencies reported that they offered, or were said to offer, many opportunities for socialization or training on SBM, the BOS program, school planning, and instruction. However, more than half of principals reported that they either had not received any training in the past year or found it insufficient, especially with regard to such SBM-related activities as developing a school's vision and work plan, making best use of budget resources, developing the curriculum, working with the SC, or involving parents and the community in supporting the school. Similarly, about two-thirds of teachers said that they had not received any training in the past year or that the training was insufficient in such areas as using various instructional methods, teaching their subject matter, and planning lessons more effectively or preparing the school plan. When teachers received training, it amounted to only one to four days of training over the year. Socialization of SC members about their roles and responsibilities was even more sporadic, with half of districts not offering such training

and a majority of SC members reporting not receiving any socialization over the past two years.

When asked what assistance they most needed to make their school better, principals and teachers most frequently mentioned improvements to their school's physical facility and support for teachers. School facility upgrades desired ranged from more chairs and tables to more classrooms and rooms for a library, laboratory, or health unit. The support desired for teachers included more training on teaching methods, academic content, and thematic approaches to teaching the curriculum. It also included greater access to such teaching aids as maps, scales, visual aids, and science and mathematics kits.

Factors Associated with SBM and Student Outcomes

We found few district and school characteristics to be associated with measures of SBM implementation, the share of discretionary funds allocated to instruction, teacher attendance, or student achievement. Higher principal education was associated with greater principal influence on school operations and a higher share of discretionary budget allocated to instruction. Similarly, higher principal preparedness was associated with greater principal influence on school operations and with higher student achievement. Principal preparedness is a self-reported measure of how well prepared the principal was to provide effective leadership, plan for school academic improvements, make decisions on school curriculum, and supervise and evaluate teachers.

The higher the number of training days teachers received and the higher the usefulness of teacher working group (KKG) meetings, the greater the teacher influence on instruction and school operations. Also, certified teachers were associated with higher student achievement.

Schools that offered opportunities for parents to file complaints and were responsive to parents' opinions and feedback and schools that provided written information on school activities were associated with a larger share of their discretionary funds being spent on instruction and a higher likelihood of receiving input from parents.

Schools receiving funds from their provincial or district governments, in addition to the funds received from the central government BOS program, were associated with a larger share of their discretionary resources being spent on instruction. However, not all schools received such additional funding, leading to wide differences across schools in the amount they had available per student.

Last, we did not find that implementation of SBM practices or the share of discretionary funds schools spent on instruction was associated with student achievement. It may be that implementation of SBM, at least so far, has not resulted in major changes in school practices, as suggested in this report.

Recommendations

Improving the implementation and outcomes of SBM in Indonesia will require expanding principal, teacher, and SC member capacity to implement SBM; increasing school staff ability to make operational and instructional changes; and developing district capacity to support schools and SBM.

Expanding SC, Principal, and Teacher Capacity to Implement SBM

Make it easier for SC members to participate in school affairs by requiring that schools meet with the SC during hours convenient for their members and provide SC members with an incentive to participate in the form of a small stipend to cover transportation and other meeting costs.

Upgrade the knowledge of SC members by providing training about the goals and purposes of SBM, about SC functions, and about how to fulfill these functions, including how to conduct meetings, develop a school vision, engage in participatory planning and budgeting, and monitor school indicators to assess school activities. The above knowledge and guidelines should be codified in a manual made available to SC members for easy reference. To be effective, training will need to be ongoing and of sufficient intensity.

Increase the authority of the SC by considering implementing one or more of the following measures:

Clarify the policy regarding SC fund-raising activities: Most SCs and schools behave as if fund-raising from parents were prohibited. If it was not the intent of the central government to entirely do away with fund-raising by SCs, this should be communicated clearly.

Link the school and the SC with the village council: Pradhan et al. (2011) have shown the potential that reaching out to education stakeholders outside the school committee—and especially the village council—has in improving student learning.

Give the SC authority over the hiring and firing of principals or teachers: Programs that have given school committees this authority have been found to increase council and parental participation in school matters, including school planning and administration of the budget.

Provide the SC, parents, and the public with comparative information on schools to help parents make informed school choice decisions. To further help parents, schools should be held accountable; competition should be encouraged among schools; and information should be provided comparing their school's overall performance and other characteristics, such as class size and academic and extracurricular programs, with those of other schools in their locality, district, and the nation.

Upgrade principal and teacher capacity to implement SBM by considering the following:

Provide principal leadership training: With the Indonesian form of SBM, the principal is the most important stakeholder. His or her actions determine the extent to which school decisions will be participatory and focused on operational and instructional improvements. The objective of principal leadership training should be to provide an understanding and full appreciation of the practices that make effective leaders.

Provide principals and teachers with professional development on the SC role and on effective SBM practices: In addition to providing professional development in these areas, both principals and teachers need to develop skills in conducting SBM-related activities, includ-

ing how to conduct school and student need assessments; formulate a school's vision, mission, and objectives; engage in participatory planning; develop a curriculum; prepare a budget; and implement school improvements. To be most effective, this professional development should be provided to all teachers in the school or cluster of schools at the same time.

Clarify the authority devolved to the school: The SBM guidelines decreed by the Ministry of National Education are ambiguous, leaving room for the district to continue to play its traditional authoritative role over schools. As we found, schools are generally shy about doing anything that may not be approved by their district. The standards for SBM should be clarified to unambiguously indicate devolvement of authority to schools. The role of the district should be limited to that of enabler and monitor of SBM implementation and school performance (see “Develop District Capacity to Support SBM,” below).

Broaden school autonomy: Given that the quality of teachers plays a significant role in setting the conditions for student learning, transferring the authority to hire and fire PNS teachers from the central government to school principals should be considered. This would not be new to principals who already have been hiring and overseeing non-PNS teachers used to complement PNS teachers. Principals would thus gain more flexibility to balance the school's teacher workforce with programmatic needs.

Increase School Staff Ability to Make Operational and Instructional Changes

The measures discussed above may lead to stakeholders' increased participation in school operations but not necessarily to programmatic, curriculum, or instructional changes that would be expected to affect student learning more directly. To increase the ability of schools to implement curriculum and instructional changes, we recommend considering the following three measures:

Assess the Need for Professional Development and Provide It If Required. To make their schools better, principals and teachers said that they needed more training in academic content, teaching methods, and thematic approaches to teaching the curriculum. Research

also suggests that teacher knowledge of their subject matter is associated with higher student achievement. And, although Indonesian teachers are being asked to use a more student-centered form of teaching, so-called active learning or PAKEM,¹ they have received little or no training to apply it in the classroom, and research suggests that this potentially results in poorer instruction. Given limited resources and extensive training needs, we recommend that a teacher training needs assessment be conducted first to help set priorities. Research also suggests that to be most effective, all teachers in a single school or cluster of schools should be trained at the same time.

Expand Access to Teaching Aids. Other support that teachers said they needed to improve the quality of their schools includes having greater access to teaching props, from simple maps, scales, and visual aids to science and mathematics kits. These props help students understand concepts visually and may lead to gains in instructional time, allowing teachers to cover the curriculum in greater depth.

Address Resource Disparities Among Schools. Effective development and implementation of programmatic improvements depend, in part, on whether schools have sufficient resources to finance them. As this study found, schools differ markedly in the discretionary resources available to them in part because of unequal contributions made by provinces and districts, raising the question of the role that each level of government (provincial, district, and local) ought to play in financing education. A first step in addressing this question would be to collect more detailed information on the current financing of education by districts and provinces and their fiscal capacity.

Develop District Capacity to Support SBM

Providing the support necessary to upgrade school stakeholders' capacity to implement SBM and make educational improvements as suggested above will also require altering the role of the district to that of an *enabler of change*. Districts will need to expand their capacity to provide *ongoing* technical assistance and staff development to principals,

¹ PAKEM stands for *Pembelajaran yang Aktif, Kreatif, Efektif dan Menyenangkan* or active, creative, effective, and joyful learning.

teachers, and SC members. As noted by our respondents, providing occasional socialization for one or two days, as is the current practice, is not sufficient for stakeholders to fully understand the changes required in their actions. The functions of district supervisors should principally be to monitor school SBM implementation and improvements and provide supportive technical assistance and mentoring. Research has shown that providing principals and teachers with ongoing access to expert advice and consultation after training is completed is more effective than training alone. To take on this role, supervisors themselves will need adequate training before they can provide this ongoing support.

Setting Priorities and Incremental Implementation of Recommendations

Developing SC and school capacity and altering the role played by districts will require both time and additional resources. Although our recommendations are based on research best practices, we recognize that they have not always been consistently found to be effective in all cultural and educational environments. Considering limited resources and the uncertain effectiveness of recommended actions, policymakers should (1) carefully set priorities for which recommendations to implement and in what sequence and (2) implement the selected measures experimentally and incrementally, involving a limited number of districts and schools at a time to learn about the implementation challenges and issues involved and to ascertain effectiveness. For instance, we recommend focusing first on increasing school staff capacity to make operational and instructional changes along with restructuring the role of districts and doing so initially experimentally in a few districts and schools in clusters within those districts. Once experience has been gained in a few districts and potential implementation issues have been addressed, implementation could be expanded to a few more districts and schools at a time.