

EDUCATIONAL POLICY FOR HIGH PERFORMING EDUCATION SYSTEM IN INDONESIA

Suryawahyuni Latief¹,²Wu-Hui Hua,³Yulfi Alfikri Noer

^{1,2}Doctoral candidate at Department Curriculum Design and Human Potentials Development, National Dong Hwa University, Hualien, Taiwan

³ Lecturer at Al Azhar Diniyyah College, Jambi, Indonesia

Abstract

Indonesian students un-success in PISA studies (2006, 2009, 2012) during the last decade had been under the below compared to other ASEAN countries. It has been amazing how the Indonesian education system, with the educational policy reform since 2002, with allocates 20 percents of national budgets for education sectors, and extremely hard evaluation system cannot reach such result in high quality in international comparisons. The purpose of this paper is to reflect on factors that are and have been the major reasons un-success in promoting high quality education in Indonesia. This paper starts with the short historical of contextual factor. Thereafter, policy trends for achieving the high performing education systems. Finally, the paper will also bring some major challenges for the future. This paper is based on the Act of National Education Systems (AoNES) No 20, 2003, especially governmental program and the action plans. The analysis is based on the principles in which students' learning is focus, and national assessment on students has provided important knowledge about the strengths and weaknesses of the Indonesian educational system.

Key words: High performing education system, the Act of National Education System, National assessment policy

Educational Values in a National History

In the national history of Indonesia, education has been central value for a long time. Since independent day on August, 17, 1945, the Indonesian government is realized importance of having higher performing education for reaching onward, fairly, and welfare society. The government's awareness is reflected on the opening statement of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which states among the aims of promoting the unity of Indonesia is to educate the people. Furthermore, in the article 31 [verse] 3 of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia is mentioned that government should manage and organize one system of national education, with a view to increasing the level of a spiritual belief, devoutness, and moral characters in the context of developing the life of the nation. Thereafter, the education system has to assure an equal opportunities in education, as well as a quality in educational management to keep up with changing demands of local, national and global life in the face of globalization (the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, article 31 [verse] 3).

A major influential background factor educational value in a national history is a strong sense of Indonesian ideology. The ideology of Indonesia is called *Pancasila*, with five pillars that have enunciated in the preamble of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of the Indonesia. The five pillars of *Pancasila* are belief on the one and only God, justice and civilized humanity, the unity of Indonesia, democracy by the inner wisdom in the unanimity arising out of deliberation amongst the representatives, and justice for the all Indonesian people. The main messages of education based on *Pancasila* and the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia are to maintain Indonesia's cultural background and generate the knowledge, skills, and scientific progress that will keep the nation abreast of development in twenty-first century, and to improve the life of the nation and develop the Indonesian people fully (i.e., Intellectually, spiritually, morally, physically and socially) (The AoNES N0. 20, 2003).

Educational Policy for High Performing Education Throughout the System

High performing education has been a leading principle of education policy and it covers the whole education system from early education to higher education. It can be seen in the program for the past 18 years even though there have been different

policymaker members in the government. The principle entails that the purpose education system are to develop and achieve the educational potential.

Since Independent day, on August 17, 1945, the Indonesian government had formulated the Act of National Education System (AoNES) No. 4, 1950 unto Act No.12 1954 which focused on the develop national and democratic spirits in order to set up young generation character to be more confidence as Indonesian citizen with a reason that Indonesia had been freed from Dutch colonialism for 350 years. By the 1988, the previous Act is replaced by the AoNES No 2, 1989. The purpose of education system is to develop a personality of young people being universal, complete, and manner. The term universal refers to prepare the young people to take a part in the local, national and international competition. The complete term defines the preparation young people life in all channels, levels, and types of education. The manner term reflects the link supporting all types and levels in national education to develop potential skills of young people (Hammalik, 2009). By the 1998, the nationalist movement, known as “Reforms movement” grew. The main message of the reform movement in education sector is a higher performing in education system. In the 2003, the government is issued the AoNES NO, 20, 2003 with statements that education deals with the twentieth century demand without leaving the Indonesia ideology. The education purpose is to ensure equal opportunity, improvement of quality, and relevance and efficiency in management to meet various challenges of local, national, and global lives; therefore, it requires well-planned, well-directed, and sustainable education reform.

National Assessment Policy for Promoting Quality

The high performing education system (HPES) is a term emerging in the last few years to describe education systems that have excelled in the Program for International Students Assessment (PISA). PISA is an international assessment of students in the secondary schools across the world, commissioned by the Organization for Economic Co-operation Development (OECD). It aims to compare education systems across the world on their participation, quality, equity and efficiency in delivering a strong education (OECD, 2011). Different nations have different views of what defines the high performing education

system. Indonesia has been featured in assessment, with a strong focus on its national students' assessment for students in the secondary school.

Searching for the best learning outcomes is on the educational agenda in many countries. Gradually, much controversy exists over what is the best way to assess the learning outcomes. Some countries have chosen standardized testing, which stresses competition between students and schools. Other countries have applied more formative aspects of evaluation. The Indonesian choice has been encouraged national standardized throughout certain subjects at secondary level of education. The assessment of outcomes is regarded as an important tool to promote education quality.

The assessment policy in Indonesia has experienced movement since independent day on August 17, 1945. The term, regulation, procedure, and instrument of the assessment are used in the beginning differ widely in the present. Afrianto (2008) mentions that in 1965 – 1971, the assessment policy was to apply for almost all subjects to students in the last grade of each school levels: primary school, middle school, and high school. The term had used *Ujian Negara* (state exam). Thereafter, the assessment is conducted by the government, and must uniform for all schools. Finally, the result had used to inform the district performance how had the education process been conducted.

By the 1980, Indonesia went back to conduct the assessment policy with difference term, is called *Evaluasi Belajar Tahap Akhir* (National Final Exam Evaluation). This assessment policy was applied until 2002 (Afrianto, 2008). The aim of assessment policy during this period (1980 to 2002) is to determine students for entering further school. For example, students with having higher score are eligible to enter and choose the best quality school. On the contrary, students with the lower score are having an opportunity to enter the poor quality schools. From two periods the assessment policy above (from 1965 to 1971 and from 1980 to 2002), the decision about a student graduate is an absolute responsibility of schools (Afrianto, 2008).

By the 1998, the assessment policy is a form of government effort on constructing quality of human resources to face the globalization. A preparing young people with ability in technology, communication, and science, is forced the government to

formulate the new assessment policy for students in the secondary school. Starting from 2002/2003 to 2013/2014 academic schools year, the resulted for all subjects of the assessment is used as a tool to determine students passing in the secondary schools. The assessment policy has pushed students to meet the national minimum passing grade in the specific subjects (GR No. 19, 2005). Table 1.1 and table 1.2 are describing the details of subjects test and the procedure of the NSAT's assessment policy implementation.

Table 1.1 Subjects tested on the assessment policy

Education Level	Subject test	Details
Junior secondary schools	Indonesia language English language Mathematics Natural Sciences	Natural sciences including physic, chemistry, and biology. Social sciences are covering economic, sociology, and geography.
Senior secondary schools	Indonesia language English language Mathematics Natural Sciences Social sciences	Students in the senior secondary schools are taking the subject test based on their program. For students in the natural science program are taking natural sciences subject. And social sciences students take the social science subject For students in the technical and vocational schools are taking not only subject test Indonesia language, English language and mathematics, but also Takes their own subject's program.

Source: Ministry of National Education and Culture of Republic of Indonesia (www.kemendikbud.go.id)

Table 1.2 Purposes and Regulations of the assessment policy from about 2002/2003 to 2014/2015 academic year

Academic year	Minimum passing grade	Purposes and Regulations
2002/2003	3.01	determine students passing, no remedial
2003/2004	4.01	similar purpose and regulation by the 2002/2003
2004/2005	4.25	similar purpose and regulation by the 2002/2003
2005/2006	4.25	determine students passing, has remedial
2006/2007	5	determine students passing, the average result for all subjects test are 5.0. with requirements no subject have a score under 4.25. If one subject has a score under 4.25 the other subjects must get score 6.0.
2007/2008	5.25	similar purpose and regulation by the 2006/2007 determine students passing, with requirements no subject have a score under 4.0.
2008/2009	5.5	similar purpose and regulation by the 2007/2008.
2009/2010	5.5	similar purpose and regulation by the 2007/2008.
2010/2011	5.5	similar purpose and regulation by the 2007/2008.
2011/2012	5.5	similar purpose and regulation by the 2007/2008.
2012/2013	5.5	the results are not standing alone to determine students passing, but together by schools' evaluation result. The composition is 60% : 40%. Composition scores for subjects tested are 60% and score for schools evaluation is 40%
2013/2014	5.5	similar purposes and regulation by the 2012/2013
2014/2015	5.5	similar purpose and regulation by the 2012/2013.

Source: Ministry of National Education and Culture of Republic of Indonesia (www.kemendikbud.go.id)

Future challenges

The concept of high performing education system is often used with the meaning the highest average score of students achievement in reading, sciences, and math based on the PISA assessment. Furthermore, the score identical points out the nation's education quality and nation's economic development. The link between education performance and economic development are tightened. The economic dimension is one of the strongest argument why the high performing education system cannot be ignored as the education system have to develop high-skilled people that will demand higher wages for the competitive world economy due to globalization and technological advances.

Globalization is open national boundaries and increases interdependence among countries in the world, which in turn stimulates cooperation as well as competition in almost about anything, including education. Stromquist (2002) elaborates the link between globalization and education as follows:

“The globalization is full of promises for individuals, institutions, and countries. Among this promises is education as advanced skills and sophisticated knowledge (heavily weighted in favor science and technology) are deemed essential to the construction of knowledge society and countries and regional blocs are positioned as competitive entities that will enter the global market with superior strength and abilities” (Stromquist, 2002, pp. xiii-xiv)

To raise the educational attainment, to bring economic growth and to increase community welfare through education sectors, policymakers bring a number ways as part of their effort to meet the educational aims. Therefore, policymakers have always collected data on the functioning of the education system and have drawn on these data to monitor, identify, and promote the change. Educational accountability, performance management of education system, and school evaluation become a source of banks. Educational accountability is the process of assessing school's performance based on learners' outcomes (Hanushek, Machin, & Waessman, 2011). information to decide how far the education sectors runs and meets the education aims. The desired goal of education accountability is identified as improvement of learners 'performance, and measure and identified for determining whether the goal of education is being met or not. Hope (2000) defines a performance management

system is an ongoing communication process and partnership between the bottom and top level. Performance management system has been serious agenda in schools. The purpose of the performance management is to deliver a sustenance education performance through a strategic and integrate it into the process by developing the capability of educational practices (Armstrong, 2000). School evaluation is widespread used to education accountability. The government is taken for granted the quality education by schools evaluation. Almost all countries are conducted the schools evaluation to account the education quality. The purpose of school evaluation is to monitor and improve the quality of the school as a whole.

To raise education standards by the OECD and PISA is immense needed for Indonesian country. It is due to have a link between the education performance and the future economic growth. Indonesia should evaluate their education system to secure a competitive edge in the world economy. High performing education system are also identified the highly Human Development Index (HDI) as the HDI by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), is a composite measure of indicators along three dimensions: life expectancy, educational attainment, and command over the resources needed for a decent living. The impact of achievement gap leads significant recurring economic loss for the citizen that is unable to perform their optimum capacity. It caused the correlation of cognitive skills to economic growth.

Indonesian educational policy has aimed to the consciousness and plans effort for creating a learning environment and learning process so that learner will be able to develop their potential to acquiring spiritual and religious strength, develop self-control, personality, intelligence, morals, and nobility of character and skill than one need for him/herself, for community, for the nation, and for the state. The educational policy has systematically reinforced practices that provide equal opportunities for all citizens to be knowledge in order to equip the twentieth first (21st) century.

In future, Indonesian students will face a more big challenges related to the current globalization stream. If Indonesian cannot solve and find the solution in education problems instantly, it can be assured that Indonesian will be left behind compared to other ASEAN countries in education performance. Take an example, Malaysia and

Singapore as the neighboring countries which have been moved faster in their performing education systems.

Another threat is the policymaker's ability, by the hands of policymakers the responsibility for the quality of education at all level educations are formulated. There are considerable differences in understanding of education problems and solutions between the agents will influence the effectiveness of the educational policy. So, the ability of policymaker must be first required in formulating the policy. Place the right person in this position should have done by the government.

Finally, the consistency of the policy must be a priority. The consistency means there is no contradiction in verses and articles of its policy and avoids the ambiguity on it. For example, in educational policy stated the purpose of education is to maintain student's potential ability in all aspects, but in fact the policy focused on only one aspect, knowledge aspect, and ignored the other aspects.

Summary and Conclusion

A PISA assessment resulted cannot be the main purpose for education, but the assessment resulted can be used for motivation to meet the high performing education systems. Moreover, the assessment helps nation to care of education process in their country throughout seeing and learning from other developed countries which had been having high performing in education.

The concept of education is primary concerning in the preparation of young people to their life. The preparation for life is classified into two thoughts. The first thought is several aspects of life such as work, pleasure, and family. The second thought is the different views of life such as liberal, civic, and vocational (Winch & Gingell, 2004). According to Winch and Gingell (2004), the aspect of life come directed to the values of young people hold. Meanwhile, the different views of life are concerning in the own potential young people as students, citizen, and agents of economic.

Connecting high performing education and national assessment requires a purpose of economic develop. Without a strong political will, continuity across policymakers, government, and implementing agency, and an ability of policymaker the aims of

educational policy are very difficult to achieve. No educational system is ever fully perfect and it cannot develop without active and honest assessment and feedbacks. The Indonesian educational assessment has been formulated the best way how to assess the outcomes learning in written, but there is misaligned in implementing. There are many challenges to keep the assessment runs to be honest and keeps on the track to meet high performing education system. Hence, the commitment of implementing agent needs to encourage and set up to achieving high performing outcomes learning. The decision and vision today are developed the Indonesian future in order to face globalization.

References

- Afrianto. (2008). Reformulation of national examination policy in Indonesia. Retrieved on September 12, 2013 from <http://adsiindonesia.or.id/alumni/ASAC 2008 papers/afrianto-paper.pdf>.
- Anderson. J.A. (2005). *Accountability in education*. Paris: The International academy of education and Brussels: The international institute for educational planning.
- Armstrong, M. (1995). *Personnel management* (5th ed). London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Armstrong, M. (2000). *Performance management- Key Strategies and Practical Guidelines* (2nd ed). London: Kogan page.
- Apple, M. (1996). *Cultures politics and education*. New York: Teacher College Press.
- Apple, M. (2001). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, god and equality*. New York: Routledge-Falmer.
- Ball, S. J. (2012). *Politics and policy making in education : Exploration in policy sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Barkland, T. (2011). *An introduction to the policy process: Theories, concepts, and models of public policy making*. M.E New York: Sharp Inc.
- Bower, J., & Thomas, P. (2013). *Detesting and degrading schools: Authentic alternatives to accountability and standardization*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Brady, L., & Kennedy, K. (2009). *Celebrating student achievement: Assessment and reporting* (3rd ed). French Forest NSW: Pearson Education Australia.
- Bongdan, R. C., & Bicklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (4th ed). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.

- Christie, C.A., & Alkin, M.A. (2008). Evaluation theory Tree re-examined. *Journal studies in education*, 34 (3), 131-135.
- Cizek, G. J. (1999). *Handbook of educational policy*. UK. : Academic Press.
- Cohen, D.K, & Hill, H.C (2001). *Learning policy: When state education reform works*. New York: Yale University.
- Cochran, L.C, & Malone, E.F. (2005). *Public policy: Perspective and choice* (3rded). London: Lynne Rienner Publisher.
- Daun, H. (2002). Globalization and national education systems change. In H. Daun (ed), *Educational restructuring in the context of globalization and national policy*, 1-31. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Dye, T. R. (1987). *Understanding public policy* (6th ed). USA: Prentice-Hall Inc
- Edward III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Washington Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Ginsberg. M.B., Cooper.S., Raghu. R., & Zegarra. H. (1990). National and world-system explanation of the educational reforms. *Comparative Education Review*, 34(4): 474-96.
- Germain, F.B. (1999). *Standardized testing: undermining equity in education*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Teacher's Federation.
- Hammalik, O. (2009). *Dasar-dasar pengembangan kurikulum* (The basic of curriculum development). Bandung: Rosda Karya.
- Hannushek, E., Machin, S., & Woessmann, L. (2011). *Economic of education* (Vol.3). Netherland: North Holland.
- Hansen, M., Alkin, M.C., Wallace, T.L. (2013). Depicting the logic of tree evaluation theories. *Journal of evaluation and programming planning*, 38 (2013), 34-43.
- Hill, M., & Hupe, P. (2014). *Implementing public policy: An introduction to the study of operational governance* (3rd ed). London: Sage.
- Hope, K.R. (2000). Employee perceptions of leadership and performance in Bostwana public service. *Journal of public personnel management*, 31 (41), 531-543.
- Howlett. M., & Ramesh. M. (1995). *Studying public policy: Policy cycles and policy subsystems*. Canada: Oxford University Press.

- Jakarta Globe. (2013). PISA surveys: Indonesia ranks second from bottom. Retrieved from <http://sg.beritasatu.com/article/583804/pisa-survey-indonesia-ranks-second-from-bottom.html>.
- Kirst, M.W. (1990). *Accountability: Implications for state and local policymakers*. Washington DC: Information Service, Office of Educational Research and Improvement U.S. Department Education.
- Klau, K., & Auty, W. (2010). *Key elements for educational accountability transition: A guide for policymakers*. Washington DC: Council of chief state school officers.
- Koch, C.A. (2010). *Race to the top learning performance management system*. Illinois: Illinois State Board of Education.
- Mazmanian, A., & Sabatier, A.P. (1983). *Implementation and public policy*. London: Scott Foresman and Company Dalas, Oakland NJ, Palo Alto Tuckes, Co.
- Metter, V., & Horn, V. (1975). *The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework*. Amsterdam: Van metter and Van Horn administration & office.
- Ministry of Education and Culture of Republic of Indonesia. (2012). Strategic planning 2012- 2014. The Ministry of National Education and Culture of Republic of Indonesia. URL: <http://www.kemendikbud.go.id>.
- Ministry of Education and Culture of Republic of Indonesia. (2015). Strategic planning of Ministry of National Education and Culture of Republic of Indonesia 2015-2019, The Ministry of Education and Culture of Republic of Indonesia Retrieved from URL: <http://www.kemendikbud.go.id>.
- Ministry of Education and Culture of Republic of Indonesia. (2012). Curriculum document of 2013. Jakarta: Department t of National Education of Republic of Indonesia.
- OECD. (2012). PISA result on students performance. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/pisa>.
- Rasmussen, P., & Zou, Y. (2014). The development of education accountability in China and Denmark. *Journal of epaa Aape*, 22 (121), 1-26.
- Schechner, R. (2003). *Performance theory*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Schriewer, J. (2012) *Discourse formation in comparative education* (4th ed). Berlin: Peter Lung.
- Schugurensky, D. (1999). Higher education restructuring in the era globalization. toward a heteronymous model? In Arnove R, and Torres C.A (eds), *Comparative*

- education. the dialectic of the global and the local, 292-313. USA: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Stromquist, N.P. (2002). *Education in a globalized world; The connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publisher.
- Swanepoel, B. (2002). *Human resources management* (2nd ed). Cape town: Juta & Company.
- Taylor, S., Ritzvi, F., Lingard, B., & Henry, M. (1997). *Educational policy and the politics of change*. New York: Routledge.
- The Act of national education system of Republic of Indonesia Number 20 Year 2003 about national education's system.
- The Government Regulation of Republic of Indonesia No.19, 2005 about standardization of national education.
- The Government Regulation of Republic of Indonesia No.66, 2010 about the management and delivery of education.
- The 1945 Constitution of Republic of Indonesia (*Undang-Undang Dasar Republik Indonesia 1945*).
- Tullao, T.S.Jr. (2003). *Education & globalization*. Philippines: The Philippines APEC study center network (PASCN) and the Philippines institute for development studies (PIDS).
- UNDP Reports. (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.undp.org/en/reports/global>.
- UNESCO. (2013). *Handbook on education policy analysis and programming*.
- UNESCO. (2005). EFA.GM- education for all – The Quality Imperative.
- Winch, C., & Gingell, J. (2004). *Philosophy and educational policy: A critical introduction*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

