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Abstract

DBE1 is part of the USAID-funded Decentralized Basic Education program. The project aims to improve the management and governance of basic education - including in the Islamic sub-sector.

DBE1, which commenced in mid-2005, is currently working intensively with 244 madrasah ibtidaiyah, and 22 SD Muhammadiyah as part of our overall effort in 1,082 elementary schools (SD/MI) in 55 districts (8 provinces). DBE1 is also working with cross-sectoral working groups to improve planning, management and governance of basic education at district level.

The DBE approach is to include all sub-sectors (general education and Islamic, private and state). This provides the opportunity to (1) try the same approach across the sub-sectors in a semi-controlled setting (i.e. schools and madrasah are from the same location) and (2) 'experiment' with an approach which sets out to integrate Islamic and general schools in one program (e.g. integrated clusters or gugus, technical teams and planning processes which integrate all stakeholders).

DBE1 has focused in the first phase on supporting clusters of schools, including madrasah ibtidaiyah, to work with their communities to prepare and implement detailed School & Madrasah Development Plans (RPS/M). Assistance has also been provided to increase the participation of communities and strengthen school/madrasah committees.

Islamic schools, and especially madrasah, face considerable challenges in relation to management and governance. These may be characterized as: (1) financial and resourcing challenges, (2) staffing and professional development challenges, and (3) systemic management and governance challenges.

This paper outlines these challenges and summarizes lessons learnt by both DBE1 and the previous Managing Basic Education (MBE) project relating specifically to the management and governance of madrasah ibtidaiyah. The paper provides:

1. A comparison of the conditions of madrasah and general schools
2. An outline of relevant project interventions for both madrasah ibtidaiyah (MI) and general schools (SD) focusing particularly on school development planning
3. A brief summary of early results - comparing the indicative outcomes in MI and SD

The paper focuses especially on identifying interventions and strategies which are proving effective in improving the management and governance - and ultimately the quality of education - in madrasah ibtidaiyah and in Islamic schools generally. The conclusion, based on the initial DBE1 experience, is that madrasah and Islamic schools are best supported through increased integration into the mainstream, whilst preserving their special character as Islamic institutions.

The first section of the paper draws heavily on a situational analysis of Islamic schooling conducted by DBE3 (June 2007) whilst the last section on Lessons Learnt draws on a previously published article by the author (Pendidikan Dasar Terdesentralisasi: Belajar dari Pengalaman di Kawasan Indonesia Timur; BaKTI News, ed22, April 2007). The section on Results also draws on an article published in Jakarta Post, Feb 3, 2007 by Heyward, M. & Bengoteku, B. titled School Based Management: Can it work in Indonesia?

The author, Mark Heyward PhD, is employed by Research Triangle Institute (RTI), implementing partner for the USAID funded Decentralized Basic Education Project (DBE1).
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Introduction

DBE1 is part of the USAID-funded Decentralized Basic Education (DBE) program. It operates under a Strategic Objective Agreement (SOAG) with the Coordinating Ministry of Welfare (Menokesra) enabling the project to work with both the Department of Religious Affairs (MoRA or Departemen Agama) and the Ministry of National Education (MoNE or Departemen Pendidikan Nasional). The aim is to improve the management and governance of basic education - including in the Islamic sub-sector. The other two components of the project - DBE2 and DBE3 – work to improve quality and relevance of teaching and learning; in the case of DBE2 in elementary schools and madrasah and in the case of DBE3 in the junior secondary and non-formal sub-sectors.

DBE1, which commenced in mid-2005, is currently working intensively with 244 madrasah ibtidaiyah, and 22 SD Muhammadiyah as part of an overall effort in 1,082 elementary schools (sekolah dasar or SD and madrasah ibtidaiyah or MI) in 55 districts (8 provinces). The project is also commencing work in the same districts with 196 junior-secondary schools of which 83 (42%) are madrasah. 1 DBE1 engages with cross-sectoral working groups to improve planning, management and governance of basic education at district level. Over the life of the project it is expected that DBE1 will work with approximately 2,800 schools, madrasah and non-formal education providers in up to 100 districts for about two to three years. Approximately 25% of the schools will be madrasah. Many of the non-formal education institutions are also Islamic based.

The DBE approach is to include all sub-sectors (general and Islamic, private and state). This provides the opportunity to (1) try the same approach across the sub-sectors in a semi-controlled setting (i.e. schools and madrasah are from the same location) and (2) 'experiment' with an approach which sets out to integrate Islamic and general schools in one program (e.g. integrated school clusters or gugus terpadu) and district-level planning which integrates all stakeholders).

The scale and scope of DBE also provides a good view of how Islamic basic education is adapting to the newly decentralized system. In this context, the project has undertaken an extensive analysis of current education funding in Indonesia.

DBE1 has focused in the first phase on supporting clusters of elementary schools, including madrasah ibtidaiyah, to work with their communities to prepare and implement detailed School & Madrasah Development Plans (Rencana Pengembangan Sekolah/Madrasah - RPS and RPM). Assistance has also been provided to increase the participation of communities and strengthen school/madrasah committees (sometimes called majelis madrasah).

This paper provides a brief overview of Islamic schooling in Indonesia today, highlighting the challenges in management and governance faced by madrasah ibtidaiyah and madrasah tsanawiyah. It follows with a brief description of the DBE1

---

1 Cohort 1: 104 junior secondary schools including 44 madrasah (18 government and 26 private). Cohort 2: 92 junior secondary schools including 39 madrasah.
The RPS/RPM program and examines the experience and early results, comparing madrasah and general schools.

The paper identifies interventions and strategies which are proving effective in improving the management and governance - and ultimately the quality of education - in madrasah ibtidayyah and in Islamic schools generally. The material presented in the first section of this paper is drawn from a situational analysis of Islamic schooling conducted by DBE3, supplemented by DBE1 project data.

Islamic schools & madrasah in Indonesia today

Islamic schools in the Indonesian formal education sector include madrasah and private general schools run by Islamic organizations such as Muhammadiyah. Unlike Islamic education in other national settings, both types of schooling are coeducational and both offer a general education in addition to religious education.

The 1989 Law on National Education (Law No. 2 1989) gave madrasah equal status with general schools. This means that madrasah apply the national curriculum determined by MoNE for general subjects, in addition to a more intensive course of religious studies set by MoRA. Since the enactment of Law No.20, 2003 on the National Education System, madrasah are recognized as part of the national education system, making no distinction between general and Islamic schools at all levels of education (see Article 17 and 18).

One in every seven Indonesian children is educated in a madrasah. Statistics for the 2004-2005 school year issued by MoRA indicate that madrasah ibtidayyah educate approximately 12 percent of 7-12 year olds (3,152,665 students of a total of 26,137,212) and madrasah tsanawiyah educate 16 percent of 13-15 year olds (2,129,564 students of a total of 13,401,499).

---


---
It is also noteworthy that the Islamic education sector has been growing, relative to the general education sub-sector, in recent years. Between 2001 and 2004, the number of madrasah increased by an average of 3.9 percent each year, compared to an average of 1.5 percent in general schools.\footnote{Figures calculated based on information available at \url{http://www.depdiknas.go.id/statistik/thn04-05/buku%20saku-2004_files/sheet010.htm} and \url{http://www.depdiknas.go.id/statistik/thn04-05/buku%20saku-2004_files/sheet021.htm}. Notwithstanding these apparently positive indicators, Islamic schools, and especially madrasah, face considerable challenges in relation to management and governance. These may be characterized as: (1) financial and resourcing challenges, (2) staffing and professional development challenges, and (3) systemic management and governance challenges.

**Financial and resourcing challenges**

Madrasah and Islamic schools face a range of financial challenges. The schools are predominately private. They traditionally lack access to funding both from MoNE and local districts, and they typically serve the poorer, rural sections of society and charge lower fees than general schools. Whilst the School Operational Funding subsidy (*Bantuan Operasional Sekolah/BOS*) now provides significant support to madrasah and Islamic schools, the underlying problems remain.

*School Operational Funding (BOS)*\footnote{The section on BOS draws on a DBE1 study conducted in April-May 2007.}

Since the introduction of the School Operational Funding subsidy (*Bantuan Operasional Sekolah or BOS*) in July 2005, madrasah have been provided, along with all other schools at elementary and junior-secondary levels, with relatively substantial block grants allocated on a standard per per-capita basis which does not discriminate between school type.

The *BOS* scheme was introduced as a political response to the burden of fuel price increases on poor families. The objective was to ensure that children did not drop out of school for economic reasons compounded by the increases. However, the scheme has now become institutionalized. Whilst the 2006 *BOS* Handbook links the funds explicitly to a fuel subsidy compensation fund, the 2007 Handbook no longer mention the fund. The 2007 Handbook also contains three sub-sections which link *BOS* to national education policies rather than to the fuel subsidy compensation mechanism. The first sub-section\footnote{This sub-section is included in the 2006 Handbook. The other sub-sections are new in the 2007 Handbook.} discusses *BOS* in relation to the universal compulsory 9-year basic education program\footnote{The term “program” is used here as a synonym for “budget line” (containing many activities) while the same term later in the sentence is used as a synonym for “activity”. The Indonesian term program is used in both senses, depending upon the context.} and identifies *BOS* as an activity contributing to the increased and more equitable access group of programs.\footnote{The other two program groups are increased quality, relevance and competitiveness; and management, accountability and public image.} This sub-section also requires principals to ‘pay attention to’ the following aspects of access:\footnote{Handbook for Implementation (Buku Panduan) 2007, pp. 10 – 11.}
• it is imperative that no poor students drop out of school because of financial reasons
• every effort must be made to assure that primary graduates continue on to JSE; it is imperative that no poor students fail to transition for financial reasons
• principals should actively engage in retrieval activities, seeking out children who have dropped out or not transitioned to junior secondary school and bringing them back into school.

The second sub-section deals with BOS in relation to school/madrasah-based management. The discussion emphasizes that BOS is school-based management in action because the funds are completely under the control of the school which empowers the school and increases community participation. Finally the third sub-section discusses BOS and regional government (provincial and district). This subsection lists the obligations of regional government:
• continue to provide operational funding for schools
• if the region (district or province) has a ‘free school’ policy, then it must provide sufficient funding out of the regional budget to cover all costs
• provide ‘safeguarding’ funding
• supervise use of BOS funds by schools.

All schools and madrasah are eligible to receive BOS. Private schools must be properly registered with either MoNE or MoRA. Pondok pesantren which are registered as participants in the universal compulsory 9-year basic education program are also eligible to receive BOS for the students participating in the program. Schools and madrasah which elect to receive BOS must open bank accounts in the name of the school (not personal accounts) with authorized signatures of the principal and chair of the school committee, indirectly requiring also that the school have a legally established school committee.

BOS consists of funding provided from the central budget to schools and is calculated as a unit (per capita) cost by enrolment. The program disbursed Rp 5.3 trillion in June–December 2005 and Rp 11.12 trillion in 2006, which equated to around 25 percent of the overall central budget for education.

The unit cost allocations are shown in the following table:

---
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Table 1 Unit Cost Allocations for BOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (fiscal)</th>
<th>Unit Cost (Rp)</th>
<th>JSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005: 2005/2006 1st semester</td>
<td>235,000(^1)</td>
<td>324,500(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007: 2006/2007 2nd semester, 2007/2008 1st semester</td>
<td>254,000</td>
<td>354,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Full year equivalent. Actual payment was 1/2 of this amount.

Source: Handbook for Implementation (Buku Panduan), various years

Although the unit cost allocation for BOS was unchanged between 2005 and 2006, the annual inflation\(^14\) during 2005 was 17.11%, during 2006 was 6.60% and during the first quarter of 2007 was 1.91%. The total increase (from 2005 to 2007) for the BOS elementary level unit cost allocation was 8.08% and for SMP and MTs unit cost was 9.09% so the real value of the BOS funds received by schools has dropped significantly. Nonetheless, the impact of BOS on both the general and Islamic sub-sectors is significant.

The state – private divide

Less than ten percent of madrasah are state run, whilst the vast majority are private (90 percent, according to recent statistics from MoRA), mainly in rural areas (see Graph 1).\(^15\) In contrast, general schools are predominantly state-run. In part because of the large number of private schools in the Islamic sub-sector, madrasah receive only a small portion of total government funding to public schools. At the elementary school level for state and private madrasah, in the 2004-2005 academic year an average of 56 percent of income came from government sources, with significantly higher levels of government funding for state madrasah (between 74 and 88 percent).\(^16\)

![Graph 1: Public and private madrasah in 2004-2005](Image)

---

\(^14\) Central Agency for Statistics (Badan Pusat Statistik), Consumer price index. This is a national average – there are large regional differences.


---
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Unit costs and tuition fees

The annual cost per student in madrasah, particularly private madrasah, is lower than that in general schools. The Asia Development Bank (ADB) noted that in 2003 the average annual cost per student in private madrasah was Rp 9,706,000 (US$1,078) compared to a figure of Rp10,930,000 (US$1,214) in general schools. In addition to the higher base student cost at general schools, parents of children in general schools also contribute a higher percentage of costs than their counterparts in MoRA schools. In SMP, for example, 71.9 percent of the 2004 annual average student cost of the school was contributed by parents. Comparable figures for madrasah tsanawiyah indicate that 60.8 percent of the annual average student cost for that year was contributed by parents.\(^{19}\) (see Table 2 below)

The financial crisis of the late 1990’s placed additional financial burdens on many families. The lower cost of sending children to madrasah may thus account for increasing enrollments in these schools in the period since the crisis. Unfortunately, lower fees for students mean lower incomes for madrasah, and a resultant reduction in education quality. Limited funding naturally means poorer infrastructure and facilities, lower teacher salaries, fewer learning materials and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Avg annual cost per student reported by ADB 2003</th>
<th>% contribution by parents to school reported by SMEC 2005</th>
<th>What a parent might pay to a school (Avg.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTs</td>
<td>9,706,000</td>
<td>60.80%</td>
<td>5,901,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>10,930,000</td>
<td>71.90%</td>
<td>7,858,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,957,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In many parts of Indonesia, private madrasah and pesantren provide the only schooling options for children who cannot afford to go to general schools. Islamic schools thus cater to some of Indonesia’s poorest children. Parents of madrasah students also have generally low levels of educational achievement. In 2004-2005 a

little over 40 percent of madrasah ibtidaiyah and madrasah tsanawiyah parents had completed primary school education, 25 percent had completed junior secondary level education, and just under 20 percent had completed senior secondary level. These parents tended to come from agricultural backgrounds (approximately 40 percent), and trading and labor backgrounds (16 percent each).

In summary, madrasah receive less state funding than general schools, charge lower fees and tend to serve the poorer, rural, sectors of the community. Whilst the School Operational Funding (Bantuan Operasional Sekolah – BOS) scheme has relieved the financial burden for madrasah, the inequities remain.

Staffing and professional development challenges

The new law on teacher competency standards (Undang-undang Guru dan Dosen), introduced on December 30, 2005, requires that all teachers, including in madrasah, have a four-year post-secondary diploma (D4) or a bachelor’s degree in the relevant subject. However, as Graph 3 shows, only 55 percent of madrasah tsanawiyah teachers meet the minimum qualifications mandated under the new law. This compares to 61 percent general junior high school teachers (see Graph 4).

![Graph 3: Madrasah teacher qualifications, 2004-2005](image)
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There is also a high incidence of teacher-subject mismatch in madrasah, with teachers typically trained to teach religion required to teach general subjects such as biology, physics, chemistry and mathematics. The percentage of teachers required to teach outside the field in which they were trained ranges between 67 percent and 98 percent in madrasah tsanawiyah. In order to address this, MoRA hired as many as 13,000 new teachers in 2006, with approximately 70 percent expected to be teachers of general subjects.

The situation at elementary level is worse still. As Graph 3 above illustrates, in 2004-2005 only 21% of madrasah ibtidaiyah teachers met the new standards (D4) whilst 50% were below the current standard (D2). Data recently obtained from Sukabumi, a DBE target district in West Java, highlights the discrepancy. In this sample district, two-thirds of madrasah ibtidaiyah teachers currently have less than D2 qualification (the previous standard) and only 11% have D4 (the new standard), whilst 78% of SD school teachers are D2 or above. Only 14% had D4 standard.

Attracting qualified teachers is a challenge for madrasah, particularly for general subjects. Many madrasah teachers are trained to teach religion. Qualified subject teachers and elementary class teachers are commonly graduates of teacher training institutes or universities under MoNE. Most would rather be employed by general schools administered by MoNE which offer a better salary than MoRA schools. Teachers in general schools are mostly civil servants and earn a similar monthly salary to other civil servants. While there are some civil servants in public and private madrasah (see Graph 6 below) who receive the same base civil servant salary, unlike their counterparts in general schools, they do not usually receive additional allowances from district governments. For this reason, most qualified teachers, including civil servants, would rather teach in a general school rather than in a

---

25 Data obtained at DBE1 DEFA workshop from the Sukabumi District, March 2006. Analysis based on data for 38 Kecamatan (qualifications data missing for 5 Kecamatan).
This is exacerbated by the limited salaries that madrasah can offer. As a result, madrasah are often forced to recruit teachers who only have senior secondary qualifications.

Graph 5: Teacher qualifications in elementary schools/madrasah, Sukabumi, 2004-2005

Graph 6: State and privately employed teachers, 2004-2005

Discussions with pesantren heads indicated that in many cases teachers were willing to continue to teach in poor schools due to a sense of moral obligation to devote their lives to helping children. The payment they receive from the pesantren does not reflect their function and responsibility in educating students cited in DBE3, Analysis of the Current Situation of Formal Islamic Junior Secondary Education in Indonesia, Unpublished paper, June 15 2007.


A new MoRA policy allocates additional funds for teachers, known as Bantuan Khusus Guru (special support for teachers) and Bantuan Guru Kontrak (support for contract teachers). These funds are similar to the additional allowances many districts provide general school teachers in that they are supplements to teacher salaries. However, unlike most general schools, madrasah rarely have funds in their budget for guru kontrak and guru bantu, and therefore these funds are usually used to cover salaries for these positions rather than as a supplement. It is hoped that this will help madrasah to hire adequate staff, including guru bantu and guru kontrak. However, it is too early to assess the effectiveness of these funds in improving the circumstances of madrasah teachers.

Teachers in madrasah also do not typically enjoy the same level of support for professional development and welfare as teachers in general schools. Local funds and resources that are provided to support teachers in general schools are not typically provided to madrasah teachers. This different treatment affects motivation and commitment to quality improvement in teaching among madrasah teachers.

Participation by madrasah teachers in the Teacher Working Groups (Kelompok Kerja guru or KKG) in elementary school clusters and in the Association of Subject Teachers (Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran or MGMP) is also low. Whilst in some districts madrasah are now integrated into the existing cluster system for elementary schools and MGMP for junior-secondary this is not yet the norm. Although madrasah teachers are sometimes invited to participate in workshops organized by KKG and MGMP, this is by no means a common occurrence. Moreover, participation of madrasah teachers in KKG and MGMP training workshops often appears to be based on the relationships between teachers or between MoRA and MoNE at the district level.

In summary, compared with their counterparts in general schools, madrasah teachers are generally less qualified, less well paid, suffer poorer conditions, are often required to teach subjects for which they are not trained, and do not enjoy the same access to professional development opportunities. Whilst in some areas madrasah are now integrated into cluster activities for teachers (KKG and MGMP) for a great many this is not yet the case. Most of the above is also true for principals.

**Systemic management and governance challenges**

Law No.20 of 2003 on the National Education System recognizes madrasah as part of the national education system, making no distinction between general and Islamic schools at all levels of education (see Article 17 and 18).

However, the new law has created confusion regarding the management of education, particularly in relation to the decentralization of responsibility for many government functions to the district level. Article 7 of Law No.22 of 1999 on Regional Autonomy states that regional autonomy covers all aspects of government, except foreign policy, defense and security, justice, monetary and fiscal affairs, and religion. In accordance

---
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with this law, responsibility for education has largely shifted to the district level. MoRA, however, remains centrally governed.

A second issue with the 2003 Education Law concerns the allocation of funds for the education sector. Article 49 states that 20 percent of the national budget and 20 percent of regional budgets are to be allocated to education. This indicates that madrasah are entitled to receive funds from the budgets of regional governments. In practice, however, this is not always the case.

In decentralized MoNE, district level officials have autonomy and responsibility for planning and managing the schools under their jurisdiction. In centralized MoRA, responsibility for madrasah begins with MoRA at the provincial level. Heads of the sections of MoRA district offices which are responsible for madrasah can only play an operational role in implementing policy that central and provincial MoRA have developed. This situation can create difficulties for district governments attempting to introduce reforms or carry out quality improvement programs, because the district government cannot exercise the same control of Islamic schools through local MoRA offices that it can of general schools through local MoNE offices. Coordination between MoNE and MoRA, in particular to ensure the involvement of regional MoRA officials in local educational development planning exercises, is ad hoc and depends on the attitude and relationships of individuals in the respective offices.\(^\text{31}\)

Prior to September 2005, some district governments subsidized madrasah through district budget allocations. These were mostly used to support teacher salaries and benefits, which are significantly lower than those of teachers in general schools. However, on September 21, 2005, the Director General of Regional Financial Administration Development of the Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA), issued a circular (Surat Edaran No. 903/2429/SJ) prohibiting district governments from financing activities under portfolios that remain vertical or centralized. This effectively prohibited district governments from providing funds to madrasah. The circular generated considerable public anger, including from some district heads. As a result, and after negotiations with MoRA, on February 27, 2006 MoHA issued a second circular (Surat Edaran No. 903/210/BAKD) which exempted madrasah from the new rule. The circular stated that all schools managed by the community, including MI, MTs and MA could in principle receive funds from district budgets, provided the national budget is not sufficient to cover the costs of teaching and learning activities in those schools. The letter also specified that school budgets must be included in the Work Unit Budget Plan or Work Unit Budget List (Rencana Anggaran Satuan Kerja/Daftar Anggaran Satuan Kerja, RASK/DASK) of each of the district offices of MoNE (Dinas Pendidikan). Schools must also coordinate with the Provincial and District Offices of MoRA in order to receive the funds. Discussions conducted by the DBE3 survey team with district MoRA officials in North Sumatra and Bangkalan indicated that the bureaucratic constraints associated with this process are considerable and that MoRA staff at the district level are treated as subordinates by district offices of MoNE when they request funds.\(^\text{32}\)

\(^{31}\) Interviews with Heads of Section in District Offices of MoRA in Bangkalan, East Java, Medan, North Sumatra, South Sulawesi and Semarang, Central Java cited in DBE3, Analysis of the Current Situation of Formal Islamic Junior Secondary Education in Indonesia, Unpublished paper, June 15 2007.

\(^{32}\) Ibid
Notwithstanding the legal status of madrasah within the unified national education system, experience in the field, supported by interviews with local officials and teachers, reveal a generally low level of contact between madrasah and the district education office of MoNE. MoRA has made progress in supporting the modernization of management practices in a relatively small number of state or model madrasah. However the enormous number and variety of private madrasah, and the limited resources within MoRA, mean that most madrasah are still managed along traditional lines, and have limited access to government support. This means that district offices of MoRA have limited access to and influence over private madrasah. In some areas surveyed by DBE3, MoRA officials indicated that their contact with these schools was limited to administrative matters, such as periodic reporting on students and teacher numbers, and numbers of students taking the national examination. 

There is also a question of governance at school level that relates specifically to private schools and madrasah. Who ‘owns’ a private madrasah? Historically, many pesantren and madrasah were established by local communities; sometimes by families or individuals. Whilst in the DBE experience there has been no resistance to the development of community participation in madrasah governance, anecdotal evidence suggests that some religious-based schools and madrasah are likely to resist the intervention of both community and government in their affairs. The role of local foundations (yayasan) in the management and governance of private schools needs negotiating in the context of school-based management and community participation on a case-by-case basis.

The role of the mass Islamic organizations in education is also significant. Nahdlatul Ulama (NU) and Muhammadiyah both play an important role in the establishment and support of Islamic schools and madrasah. The governance of private Islamic schools and madrasah (which are the vast majority) is thus a partnership between local community, foundations (yayasan), government and often NU or Muhammadiyah. Potential for competing agendas and conflict of interest in this complex environment is high. Similar challenges exist in Catholic and Christian private school networks.

In summary, regional autonomy and the decentralization of general education management, whilst MoRA remains centralized, has created anomalies and a gap in the management of madrasah which has yet to be resolved. Confusion remains over the issue of 20% funding for education and the share for madrasah. The complexities of governance in private Islamic schools and madrasah presents a further challenge that can only be worked out at the local level.

School based management & community participation

Along with the development of a new curriculum and new approaches to teaching and learning introduced during the reform period of the late 1990s and early 2000s, a new approach to school-based management was introduced and became MoNE policy for SD and SMP in the early 2000s. The policy was first introduced in junior secondary schools with Bantuan Operasional Manajemen Mutu (BOMM) in 1997/98. As part of the new approach, schools were required to establish school committees. However, in most schools, school based management initially meant little. School committees were typically established by changing the name of the old parent committee (BP3) and there was little real capacity or empowerment either of schools or of their communities. This reality still holds true in many cases and is exemplified by the usual translation of ‘community participation’ into Bahasa Indonesia as ‘partisipasi masyarakat’ which is taken to mean parent and community financial contributions to the school.

Support to develop the new approaches to teaching and learning, school-based management and community participation has been provided over the last ten years through donor-funded projects such as PEQIP, CLCC, REDIP, IAPBE, DBEP, BEP and MBE.

With the passing of the Education Act No 20/2003, Indonesia formally adopted a policy of school-based management for all of its public and private schools and madrasah. With the introduction of the School Operational Funding subsidy (BOS) scheme in July 2005, schools and madrasah now receive per-capita grant funding direct from the central government, giving them for the first time some financial independence.

Now that the new school management and governance policies are in place, Indonesia is tackling the daunting task of implementing them across its 216,000 schools and

---

34 School-Based Management was first promoted by Bpk Umaedi in his capacity as Director of SMP; long before decentralization. At this time SMP were 100% under the authority of MoNE whilst SD were still under the dual control of MoNE and MoHA.
madrasah in both the general and Islamic sub-sectors. The challenge is not what to do – it is how to do it. How can capacity be built to enable schools and madrasah, communities and district education systems to adopt the new policies; to shift from a centralized to a decentralized system; to manage their own funds; to effectively involve communities in school governance? It is in this context that donor-funded projects such as the USAID-funded Decentralized Basic Education (DBE) project can assist with training, mentoring and advice to reform the management and governance of education at the district, sub-district and school/madrasah levels.

Fig 4: DBE1 School and Madrasah Development Planning workshop in North Sumatra

School & madrasah development planning – the DBE1 approach

DBE1 works in partnership with districts and local stakeholders to improve the management and governance of basic education. In each district a Technical Team is formed to coordinate the project. Technical Teams generally include the Head of the Education Office (Kadiknas), Head of Religious Affairs Office (Kandepag), Head of Regional Planning and Development Board (Bappeda), Head of Education Board (Dewan Pendidikan), local legislature (DPRD) and other stakeholders from local government and community. Two clusters of elementary schools are jointly selected. Where madrasah are not already integrated into the cluster system, at least one madrasah is included in each cluster. Two junior secondary schools (SMP) and two madrasah tsanawiyah are also selected.

Initial assistance is focused at the school and cluster level. The experience of educational reform in Indonesia and elsewhere in the world has taught us a number of crucial lessons:

1. Successful reform is school-based and involves all members of the school community: the principal, teachers, staff, parents and community members.
2. Training is best provided on-site in school clusters
3. Successful training is ongoing. One-off training events rarely result in successful reform
4. Training must be supported by mentoring in schools to support implementation
5. Successful reform projects work with and strengthen local systems and institutions

Based on these lessons, DBE1 works with school supervisors and others, who are designated as district facilitators, to facilitate cluster-based training and in-school mentoring. This intensive assistance is limited to approximately 24 schools and madrasah in each district. The aim is to improve capacity and achieve significant school reforms which can be replicated to other schools by the district. Following the first round in 2006, 20 districts have committed funds in 2007 to support replication. Non-government systems, such as Muhammadiyah, are also planning to replicate the DBE approach to school reform.

DBE1 is also providing intensive assistance to improve the management and governance of basic education at the district level. This includes capacity development planning for Education Offices (Dinas Pendidikan), strategic district planning to improve education (Renstra SKPD), information-communication technology (ICT) and assistance to improve systems for the management of data and information, and human resources. Whilst it is too early to report on results of this work, it should be noted that interventions to improve strategic planning and management/governance will target both the Islamic and general sub-sectors helping to bring the Islamic sub-sector into line with general schooling.

The heart of successful school-based management is a commitment to children, to teaching and learning, to continuous improvement, to good planning and to the participation of all stakeholders. Following established models of good practice, DBE1 assists schools and madrasah to create and implement school/madrasah development plans with the goal of increased quality.

The aim is for schools and madrasah to create and implement comprehensive school/madrasah development plans, which:

1. are based on a thorough analysis of the current school/madrasah profile and identified needs,
2. reflect the aspirations and priorities of all stakeholders,
3. are integrated and cover all aspects of the school/madrasah program
4. are multi-year – four years is standard,
5. are multi-resourced and link directly to annual school budgets (RAPBS/M or RKAS/M – see below) and resourcing plans – all sources of funding and resourcing are covered, including BOS, APBD, parent contributions and other sources, and
6. are effectively implemented and monitored by the school/madrasah committee and stakeholders.
School/madrasah development plans essentially comprise four parts:
1. Identification of challenges or needs (school/madrasah profile)
2. Analysis of solutions (needs identification, priorities for improvement)
3. Program
4. Budget

Since the profile largely determines the identification of needs and ultimately the program and budget, its focus is critical. The original DBE1 approach is to focus on six categories:
1. Child friendly school/madrasah (ramah anak)
2. Teaching and learning process
3. School/madrasah management
4. Role of the community
5. Student achievement
6. Educational resources

School development planning, known as Rencana Pengembangan Sekolah/Madrasah (RPS/M), was introduced as policy under the Government Regulation 19/2005 (PP 19/2005). This policy has recently been revised and strengthened with a new Ministerial Decree (Permendiknas 19, 2007) which requires all Indonesian schools and madrasah to produce school development plans known as School/Madrasah Work Plans (Rencana Kerja Sekolah/Madrasah).

School/Madrasah Work Plans under the new policy differ from the earlier model – and from the original DBE1 model - in two ways:

1. The new model uses nine categories in the school profile compared with the six outlined above in the earlier DBE1 model. These nine categories correspond to those used by the new National Education Standards Body (Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan or BSNP) to accredit schools and madrasah.

2. Under the new policy, schools and madrasah will no longer produce annual school budgets using the old format (RAPBS/M) but will produce integrated Program and Budget Plans (Rencana Kegiatan dan Anggaran Sekolah/Madrasah or RKAS/M).

Work has recently been completed to align the DBE1 model with the new Ministry approach for SMP and MTs. It is intended that the same will soon be done for SD and MI. These changes fit well with the DBE1 approach to integrated planning and budgeting and the original DBE1 model is easily aligned to the new approach. It is the hope of MoNE that the new, more integrated, and more rigorous, approach to school development planning will help enable the 94% of junior-secondary schools which are currently assessed as below the national standards to reach those standards through a deliberate and purposeful school improvement program. 35

35 Discussions between DBE1 personnel and the Director of JSE, 2007.
Successful school/madrasah development planning, or ‘work-planning’ as it is now known, requires intensive support in the initial stages. The DBE1 approach is to provide a series of three training events held at cluster level for working groups, comprised of school heads, teachers and community representatives. These training activities are interspersed with mentoring visits to schools by district facilitators and community consultation events for each school. (A fuller outline of the technical approach is provided in Appendices 2, 3 and 4)

This process is further supported by a series of training events for school/madrasah committees to strengthen their role, together with training in participative leadership for school/madrasah principals.

The four-year school/madrasah development plans then provide the basis for finalizing annual school budgets (RAPBS/M) and implementing reform programs with the aim of improving quality. They also provide input to the district policy and planning process, outlining clearly the current conditions, needs, aspirations and priorities of a sample of schools and madrasah.

Ongoing support is provided by the project during the first year of implementation, culminating in a workshop for updating the plans and reporting on the experience and outcomes to the district Technical Team and stakeholders at the end of the year.
Figs 6 & 7  Community Consultation for School & Madrasah Development Planning, Enrekang, South Sulawesi

Fig 8:  School and Madrasah Development Planning workshop in North Sumatra
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School & *madrasah* development planning – early results

What is the result of the DBE1 school/madrasah development planning approach? Have the plans resulted in improved schooling for children? Whilst it is too soon to comment with any certainty on the long-term impact of the project, it is possible to see early indicators of success both in the process and initial outcomes of the planning and school/madrasah activity.

International research has not yet proved conclusively that school-based management improves student outcomes (De Grauwe: 2005). However, here in Indonesia the experience has been positive. Stuart Weston, Director of the recent USAID-funded Managing Basic Education (MBE) project, comments that it is the combination of community participation, new approaches to joyful and active learning, and school-based management that has made the difference.

‘When schools implement all of these new approaches together we see a new spirit. Everyone works harder. Parents, teachers and children take more pride in their school, and based on evaluation of student performance in MBE schools, test scores improve,’

This has been echoed in the DBE experience. The first cohort of more than 500 DBE-supported elementary schools (SD) and *madrasah ibtidaiyah* (MI) completed school/madrasah development plans to improve the quality of education they provide to children in mid-2006. The second cohort of a similar number is currently completing plans. Work was recently completed with a national reference group comprised of representatives from DBE1, MoNE and MoRA on a manual for junior-secondary (*SMP and MTs*) planning which will be implemented in coming months.

![Active learning in an MBE supported school in Probolingo, East Java](image)

---

36 DeGrauwe, A. Improving the Quality of Education through School-Based management. 2005 *Review of Education* pp. 269-287

37 Comments cited in *Jakarta Post*, Feb 3, 2007: Heyward, M. & Bengoteku, B. School Based Management: Can it work in Indonesia?
The process of creating the plans is as important as the outcome. Elementary school and madrasah principals, teachers, parents, community members and representatives of school/madrasah committees worked together to produce them. Community meetings were held to discuss the plans and to find out what parents and others want for their children. More than 12,000 people participated in the development of the plans.

As well as giving parents a voice and a sense of ownership in their children’s learning, the process had unexpected outcomes. Even before the plans were completed in 2006, local businesses, parents and concerned community members – on their own initiative - contributed nearly 4 billion rupiah (US$ 400,000) worth of cash, equipment, materials and services to improve their schools.

In Enrekang in South Sulawesi, poor villagers from Tontonan clubbed together to pay for new computers for their children to use at their school. In Sidoarjo, East Java, parents at a private madrasah, MIS Asasul Huda, decided to do something about the school buildings, which had not been maintained for more than thirty years. The parents organized themselves into class-support groups and held a competition to improve the condition of the school. Donating time and materials, they repainted classrooms, provided books and teaching aids, mended window frames, replaced broken desks and benches and worked into the night to scrub the floors and walls, in the hope that their classroom would be the “best”. The result was a new pride in school amongst children, teachers and parents. In Banda Aceh, madrasah MIN Rukoh, so impressed the city’s electricity supplier, PLN, with its school development plan and efforts to improve quality, that the agency offered to pay Rp600 million towards reconstructing the school.
Beyond this positive response at the local community level, the take-up by district governments is perhaps the most powerful indicator of success. From the 29 districts targeted in Cohort 1, 20 local governments and legislatures have committed to replicating the program with a total of US$195,000 APBD funds in 2007.

There are also many other cases of ad hoc and independent replication of the DBE1 school-development planning approach. In Enrekang District, for example, the program is being expanded on the initiative of local supervisors to new school clusters. In Soppeng district, APBD funds were used during 2006 to replicate the program in extra clusters. In many areas, teachers and head teachers from schools outside the program are visiting DBE schools to learn more about the improvements they have achieved with an interest in implementing some of these innovations themselves. Some districts have arranged self-funded study-tours to visit DBE1 supported schools in neighboring districts. In other districts, Education Boards (Dewan Pendidikan) are integrating DBE1 materials and training modules for school and madrasah committees into their own training plans.
The DBE1 project monitoring and evaluation system also tell a positive story. The project’s performance indicator measurements reveal that *madrasah* compare favorably with general schools on the process and initial outcomes of the school/*madrasah* development planning.

Graph 7 shows the percentage of schools and *madrasah* which have achieved minimum standards of school-development planning across the six provinces where DBE1 is providing support. Overall, whilst only 2% of schools and *madrasah* had development plans which met over 25 of the 32 specified criteria in the baseline survey, after one year, 89% met this threshold.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DBE1 RPS/M &amp; RAPBS/M Criteria:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. School profile annually updated, 2. Data on the number of students by gender, 3. The tendency of the number of students, 4. The number of school aged nearby schools who have not gone to schools, 5. School categorization, 6. Focus on children, 7. Contain learning progress of students? 8. Drop out rate by class, and comparison with district and sub district, 9. The number of unprepared students in the learning process and action to be taken, 10. Teacher quality (level, major, and competence), 11. Include school committee and other education stakeholders activity, 12. The role of school committee in designing RPS/RAPBS, 13. The role of other stakeholders in RPS/RAPBS, 14. Data on the sources to fulfill the minimal condition for learning, 15. Is the program designed according to the gap between “the real condition and the “ideal condition“, 16. Expectation formulization from stakeholder, instead of school? 17. Formulize the causes and the main cause of the gap? 18. Does the school formulize the problem solving alternatives? 19. Program to solve the problem? 20. Formulation of target before program? 21. Target formulization based on the gap and its cause?, 22. Program is formulized based on the main alternative of problem solving, 23. Breakdown of the three year program into annual program, 24. Performance indicators as a basis for monitoring. 25. Any Program specifications? 26. Annual schedule for each of the program, 27. Budget for each program, 28. The source of budget of each of the program has been identified, 29. School Plan and Budget (RAPBS) has been formulized, 30. RAPBS and its format is designed in accordance with kota/kab rule? 31. Participation of community (School Committee, Principal, and teacher) in designing RPS, 32. RPS has been approved by teacher, school committee, and principal? 

---

Fig 13: DBE1 School & Madrasah Development Planning workshop, North Sumatra

---
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In Graph 8, below, the results are disaggregated for *madrasah* and general schools. In January 2007 when the second measure was taken, 89% of general schools (SD) compared with 93% of *madrasah* (MI) met the threshold criteria.

Graph 9, below, shows the percentage of school and *madrasah* committee members which were ‘very active’ in the preparation of school and madrasah development plans, comparing general schools (SD) and *madrasah* ibtidaiyah (MI). 1,148 school and *madrasah* committee members were interviewed from the target schools. Of these, 86% of the *madrasah* committee members indicated that they were very active in the process compared with 84% of the general school committee members.
Graph 9: Percentage of School Committee Active in RPS/M & RAPBS/M Preparation

What these preliminary findings from the project monitoring and evaluation system demonstrate is that, within this sample, given the same interventions, madrasah ibtidaiyah perform as well and often better than general schools.

Lessons learnt

With criticism of failed reform and misuse of development funds so common, it is worth taking note when a program appears to be achieving success. What is the secret? Why are local governments literally ‘buying in’ to the DBE program? Why are communities and teachers contributing their own time and resources to achieve program objectives? Why is local and international business ready to sponsor the program?

Here are some tentative answers, based not only on the DBE experience but on that of earlier projects including the USAID-funded Managing Basic Education (MBE) project.

1. Learn the lessons of other projects

The USAID DBE program builds on earlier and concurrent programs in Indonesia including Managing Basic Education (MBE – USAID), Creating Learning Communities for Children (CLCC – UNICEF and UNESCO), the Basic Education Project (BEP, World Bank), the Indonesia-Australia Partnership for Basic Education (IAPBE – AusAID) and NTT Primary Education Partnership (NTT PEP - AusAID). This has enabled DBE to learn earlier lessons, and to follow established best practice.
2. Ensure the program meets political and government needs

DBE is not attempting to introduce foreign approaches or policies. The policies embodied in Indonesia’s reformed Education Act (UU No 20/2003 tentang Sisdiknas), the regional autonomy laws (UU No. 32/2004 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah), the National Education Standards (PP No 19/2005 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan) and the 2004 and 2006 Competency-Based Curriculum are themselves based on international best-practice. The challenge for Indonesia’s education system is not in the policy framework but in the capacity to implement these policies and to take local contexts into account.

DBE is meeting the needs of government at the national, provincial and local levels. The program is expressly designed to assist the Indonesian Government to implement its own policies. Under the new electoral system, many recently elected district heads and legislators have come to power on a platform which includes education as a focus. DBE is able to help these politicians fulfill their election commitments.

In these ways, the program is needs-based. It meets the needs of government and other primary stakeholders to implement policy in the education sector and improve quality. It meets the needs of communities for a better education; for a greater say in how education is designed and delivered at the local level. It meets the needs of teachers to upgrade their qualifications in line with the national service standards. And, ultimately, it meets the needs of children for a more relevant and effective education.

3. Integration

The most effective and efficient means of improving quality in madrasah and Islamic schools is to integrate these into existing systems for quality improvement and management of general schools. This is not to say that madrasah do not have special characteristics and special needs, but that those needs are best met through integration.

The big challenges for madrasah identified above - financial and resourcing challenges, staffing and professional development challenges, and systemic management and governance challenges – are all best met through an approach which integrates madrasah into the mainstream, whilst maintaining the special Islamic character and objectives of this group of schools.

Programs like DBE1 can help advocate for the inclusion of madrasah and Islamic schools within district planning and prioritizing. Support for district level strategic planning (Renstra SKPD) should help ensure that Islamic sub-sector is not only represented but, where appropriate, prioritized. The routine inclusion of madrasah in cluster teacher training activities (KKG and MGMP) is one important step. The inclusion of district-level officials and supervisors from MoRA in Steering Committees and Technical Teams for the project is also a crucial step.
4. Work within the system

The program operates within existing systems and institutions, working to build the capacity of these rather than develop project-specific structures. Examples include using the existing school cluster system and teacher working groups at elementary school level and MGMP teacher groupings at junior-secondary level as a basis for teacher in-service training. In the districts, the focus is on strengthening existing institutions such as local parliament (DPRD), Education Boards, MoRA and MoNE offices.

DBE works with schools and madrasah and their communities to improve the quality and relevance of education planning at school level, and with district stakeholders at district level; again working to improve the existing system rather than replace it. Another example of this approach is the way in which the program works with MoNE and MoRA school supervisors as facilitators. By working in partnership with local stakeholders, the program aims to build local capacity and long-term sustainability.

5. Go deep not broad

The DBE approach, building on similarly successful approaches with the CLCC, MBE, and IAPBE projects, is to work intensively with a focused group of schools and madrasah at school and cluster level. At the same time, the program strengthens the capacity of district and sub-district level government to improve education on a broader scale.

Put another way, the program goes deep and aims for substantial change in a small number of target schools, madrasah and communities, rather than going broad and aiming for a thinner, less significant change. This is why the early take-up by district governments committing their own funds to replicate the program is so encouraging.

This principle reflects another lesson from educational reform efforts elsewhere. The program works with whole schools and in school clusters. Taking individual teachers out of their schools for training rarely results in substantial or lasting change in practice. DBE training is ongoing and developmental. Teachers, principals, supervisors and community members attend multiple training events. In between these activities, they work on implementing new practices in their schools and classrooms and are supported with on-the-job training and mentoring by district facilitators.

6. Provide technical assistance not cash grants

No cash grants are provided to schools/madrasah or stakeholders. Support is provided in the form of technical assistance, so lack of funds cannot become a barrier to replication for schools, madrasah, local governments and stakeholders. Replication takes off so early when the process is making sense to them.

This is a key change from earlier projects which typically provided block grants to schools and madrasah to enable them to implement reforms. Since the advent of central government funded BOS funds, project-sourced block grants are no longer
necessary. Such grants only serve to build project-dependency and hinder sustainability and replication efforts.

7. Support district autonomy

Although DBE coordinates closely with the central and provincial government, there is less involvement from these levels in implementation, which gives the districts more space to maneuver and allows the program to adapt to the context and dynamics in each district. There is less vertical and more horizontal learning at almost all levels of intervention. The program implementers work hard and allow time to consult effectively with local stakeholders.

Again, in this context, it is vital that the Islamic and general schooling sub-sectors are integrated, that mutually supportive links are established, and that improving the quality of education for all children is made a district priority – regardless of what kind of school or madrasah they attend.

Fig 14: Community participation in the implementation of School Development Plan, Central Java
Fig 15: Improving quality of teaching and learning – an outcome of School and Madrasah Development Planning, South Sulawesi
Conclusions

Ideally, schools and madrasah are run by the professionals and community working together in partnership; managed by a principal and governed by a school/madrasah committee, comprised of interested parents, community members and foundation (yayasan) representatives. The evidence from research conducted internationally is inconclusive about how school-based management, community participation and school development planning improves learning outcomes for children. But the lesson from Indonesia is clear. The Indonesian government’s cooperation with USAID, UNICEF, AusAID, the World Bank and other bilateral/multilateral projects, demonstrates that this approach does improve the quality of education and makes schools better places for our children.

School and madrasah development plans are a central key to this process. The DBE1 experience has shown that participative school and madrasah development planning can increase community support for the school/madrasah, lift the motivation of teachers and other stakeholders, and increase the focus on quality – and quality improvement. The inclusion of madrasah in integrated cluster-based training has shown that Islamic schools and madrasah can benefit from integration and can achieve initial results at least as good as their counterparts in the general education sub-sector, despite the specific challenges they face.

The critical point now is to ensure that donor-funded projects, such as DBE, are well aligned to the priorities, policies and approaches of government and the non-government organizations, are collaboratively planned, implemented and evaluated, and are focused on improving quality at school/madrasah level. In an often ambiguous and rapidly changing environment, this is easier said than done.

The lesson from DBE for the Islamic sub-sector, is that madrasah and Islamic schools are well-served through integration into a joint program which includes all sectors. Whilst they face special challenges and often start from a ‘lower base’ than general schools, early indications from DBE1 demonstrate that madrasah tend to respond with high levels of enthusiasm to the approaches outlined - and achieve quick and impressive gains as a result.

Mark Heyward PhD
July 2007
Appendices

1. DBE Fact Sheet
2. The DBE1 Approach to School/Madrasah Development Planning
3. *Alur Replikasi RPS* (Flow chart for replication of school development planning)
4. *Tahap Tahap Perumusan RPS/M* (Steps for school madrasah development planning)
The DBE1 Approach to facilitating School/Madrasah Development Planning

Although some variety exists, reflecting local practices and preferences, the DBE1 approach to school development planning generally follows the following ten steps:

**Step One:** Following the selection of school clusters and District Facilitators, each school and madrasah forms a School or Madrasah Development Planning Working Group (KK-RPS or KK-RPM). The group includes the principal, one or two teachers and one or two community representatives. The process of establishing the working groups should involve open consultation with school stakeholders.

**Step Two:** The working groups receive two days training from DBE2 at cluster level introducing basic concepts of active learning – sometimes termed PAKEM (Pembelajaran yang Aktif, Kreatif, Efektif dan Menyenangkan).

**Step Three:** The working groups undertake a structured two or three-day study tour to visit schools or madrasah which have undergone project-supported reform, generally in neighboring districts.

**Step Four:** District Facilitators receive four or five days training (TOT-1) to enable them to facilitate the process of school/madrasah development planning.

**Step Five:** The working groups attend three days of cluster-based training to introduce the first two phases of school/madrasah development planning.

**Step Six:** The working groups gather data to complete school/madrasah profiles and analyze these to determine school development needs. District Facilitators visit schools to facilitate this process.

**Step Seven:** District Facilitators receive a second round of three or four days training (TOT-2) to enable them to facilitate the next steps of school/madrasah development planning.

**Step Eight:** The school/madrasah working groups attend a second three days of cluster-based training to learn and apply the final two phases of school/madrasah development planning.

**Step Nine:** The working groups hold school-level community consultation events to enable all stakeholders to participate in the process and voice their aspirations for the school/madrasah. Programs and budgets are developed. District Facilitators visit schools to facilitate these processes and the finalization of school/madrasah development plans.

**Step Ten:** The working groups attend a third one-day activity to finalize their school/madrasah development plans and present these to a district-level forum attended by key stakeholders from the Technical Team, other stakeholders and senior officials – and sometimes principals and representatives of other schools and madrasah.
Kecamatan

Pembentukar KKRPS  
Pengenalan Program  
Training RPS #1

Sekolah / Madrasah

Persiapan

Fasilitasi 1 : Identifikasi Tantangan
Fasilitasi 2 : Analisis Penecahan Tantangan

Waktu (12 minggu)

2 minggu  1 minggu  3 minggu  1 minggu
TAHAP-TAHAP PERUMUSAN RPS-M

TAHAP 1
IDENTIFIKASI TANTANGAN

Langkah 1:
Penyusunan Profil Sekolah/Madrasah

Langkah 2:
Identifikasi Harapan Pemangku Kepentingan

Langkah 3:
Perumusan Tantangan Sekolah

TAHAP 2
ANALISIS PEMECAHAN TANTANGAN

Langkah 1:
Penentuan Penyebab Tantangan Utama

Langkah 2:
Alternatif Pemecahan Tantangan Utama

TAHAP 3
PENYUSUNAN PROGRAM

Langkah 1:
Penetapan Sasaran

Langkah 2:
Program Sekolah
  Sub-langkah 1.1: Program dan Penanggungjawab
  Sub-langkah 1.2: Indikator Keberhasilan
  Sub-langkah 1.3: Jadwal Program dan Kegiatan

TAHAP 4
PENYUSUNAN RENCANA BIAYA DAN PENDANAAAN

Langkah 1:
Rencana Biaya
  Sub-langkah 1.1: Daftar Biaya Satuan
  Sub-langkah 1.2: Penyusunan Rencana Biaya

Langkah 2:
Rencana Biaya dan Pendapatan

Sub-langkah 2:
Mempelajari Aturan-Aturan Penggunaan

Langkah 3:
Pencocokan dan Penyeimbangan Rencana Biaya dengan Sumber Pendanaan

Langkah 4:
Penyusunan Rencana Anggaran, Pendapatan dan Belanja Sekolah (RAPBS/M)