Final Results Dissemination Workshop on Valorization of Evidence for Inclusive Education Policy

Workshop Report

8 January 2019, Le Meridien Hotel, Jakarta

Workshop Agenda:

As UNESCO's Lead National Implementing Partner (LNIP), the Center for Indonesian Policy Studies (CIPS) conducted research to investigate the current situation of knowledge valorization practices for an inclusive education policy in Indonesia. It resulted in a Situational Analysis and a Practical Guide for information update in the Indonesian education policymaking process. These documents were presented in the Final Results Dissemination Workshop on Valorization of Evidence for Inclusive Education Policy"; aiming to 1) share the information gathered in the project, 2) build capacities of workshop participants regarding inclusive education policies and knowledge valorization practices, and 3) gain stakeholders' feedback on CIPS and UNESCO's recommendations. This is the second workshop in the research process, the first of which was held in September 2018, which was followed by the research in September-December 2018.

Who attended the workshop?

The workshop was attended by over 50 persons representing various stakeholders, including Education Office (Dinas Pendidikan) of the Jakarta regional government, philanthropists, CSOs, the UNESCO and CIPS. A list of attendants can be found in Annex 1 of this document.

What was presented during the workshop?

The workshop was opened by opening remarks from Rainer Heufers, Executive Director of CIPS, Prof. Dr. H. Arief Rachman, Executive Chairperson of the Indonesian National Commission for UNESCO, and Prof. Dr. Shahbaz Khan, Director and Representative of UNESCO Jakarta office. The first presentation was made by Alexander Hauschild, UNESCO expert, on the issue of inclusive education, introducing the UNESCO framework of inclusive education policy design.

The second presentation was made by Rainer Heufers, explaining the demand and supply sides of the Indonesian education policy cycle. This was followed by a presentation and short movie by IKMAS of Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia about the Malaysian experience on valorization of evidence pertaining to inclusiveness. These sessions were presented in English.

In the second part of the workshop, Indra Krishnamurti of CIPS made a presentation of the Situational Analysis and Practical Guide, followed by a question and answer session. The objective of the presentation was to introduce participants with the research results, and to present the four sets of recommendations made by CIPS. In order to gain feedback on the recommendations, the participants joined four groups in World-Café-style roundtable discussions. The facilitators of the discussions were CIPS researchers who were involved in the research process. The feedback from the participants is presented in the following section.

Feedback from attending stakeholders:

Feedback was collected from the stakeholders (participants) on all recommendations in the 4 chapters of the "Practical guide for information uptake in the Indonesian education policymaking process":

1. **Topic: Why evidence-based decision making?**

Recommendations:

- MOEC 142/2014 should be applied with a systematic approach that includes a broad range of evidence from stakeholders in the education sector. This can be done through regular forums, in which main education policies are discussed with experts and stakeholders. Forums can be inspired or built on the example of Musrenbang (*Musyawarah Rencana Pembangunan* or Multi Stakeholder Consultation Forum for Development Planning), a participatory, bottom-up consultation that feeds into the government's annual planning.
- In its agreements with bi- and multilateral donors, the Indonesian government should recommend the horizontal coordination of education policies among regional governments, following the positive example of the Advocacy Forum for Sumba Education (Forum Peduli Pendidikan Sumba/FPPS) in Sumba, East Nusa Tenggara (NTT) Province.

In general, participants agreed with CIPS' recommendations. However, there are concerns that a bottom up scheme will be time consuming and costly. There was a suggestion that such a bottom up mechanism should have clear time limitations, in order to maintain timeliness. Further, there should be a stakeholder mapping to identify the responsibilities of the initiators of the forum, to ensure the voluntary participation of all forum participants.

Another concern of the participants about a bottom up scheme is that the discussion may be extremely broad in nature. It has been suggested to make sure that the participants are limited to those who have the capacity/capability and relevance to ensure that the discussion remains on substance. It is also important to maintain objectivity.

The participants agreed that the discussion forum should become a supporting mechanism for the government's academic literature review (Naskah Akademik) in step 1 of the regulatory process. However, they also pointed out that efforts are necessary to ensure that the ideas discussed in the forum represent the actual issues in the region or in several regions. It is necessary to choose an institution with the responsibility to verify the significance of the issues being discussed.

Further, CSOs reported difficulties to provide advocacy regarding issues due to the ambiguity of authorities of each office of education in different regions. This is partially caused by decentralization, which allows some latitude in the differences of interpretation between what is regulated by the central government and what is implemented by the regional government. Further, in a similar note, coordination between government agencies and levels to respond to discussions at the grassroots level should be improved.

Participants also mentioned the possible formation of a non-ad hoc consortium between the regional governments and CSOs active in the region. Another issue mentioned by the participants is inconsistency of data from different sources, making it difficult for users to identify quality data.

2. **Topic: What evidence should be part of the inclusive education policymaking process?**

Recommendations:

- At step 1 of MOEC 142/2014, when MOEC is preparing its literature review, Naskah Akademik, education experts with the analytical skills to recognize quality evidence that is relevant to the policy being considered should be commissioned to choose the evidence to include.
- An adaptation of the Chinese experience of policy testing to the public testing in step 4 of MOEC 142/2014 in the Indonesian context could improve the testing of particularly significant or large-scale policies, such as restructuring teacher incentives. MOEC already tests the rollout of certain policies in selected districts before applying it nationwide. It is recommended that, learning from the policymaking process in China, these tests should become more long-term, well researched, and open-ended with regard to the final adoption of the respective policy nationwide.

The majority of participants agreed with the recommendations. A framework of developing the academic literature review is suggested to be established to facilitate the preparation of the review. This framework will enable anyone to contribute within the framework of gathering and presenting the information clearly, and according to the standards as expected by MOEC.

The participants suggested broadening the definition of experts, not limiting them to persons with strong academic backgrounds (Masters or Doctorate degree), but also those with strong practical experience, having knowledge of the actual conditions. This corresponds to the feedback to the first chapter regarding the need for forum participants to possess empirical and substantial knowledge of the issue at hand. These experts should also include practitioners and those who understand the issue on the grassroots level, such as teachers, community leaders, etc.

It has also been suggested that evidence must be transparent, in order to enable evaluation of the quality of evidence. While it was suggested by the participants that evidence gathered through interviews should be attached to names, this might violate the confidentiality of the interviewees. However, the need to be able to attribute ideas to persons and to ensure the relevance and credibility of ideas by referring them to the persons behind the ideas is understandable.

Finally, decision makers should not overgeneralize evidence; some evidence might be relevant in one region and irrelevant to other regions. Decision makers should engage local communities or CSOs to gain insights about a particular region or culture. These insights serve as additional information to be taken into consideration when drafting policies.

3. **Topic: Where is the evidence for the inclusive education policy design?**

Recommendations:

- MOEC and MORA maintain education databases that are regularly updated by the schools themselves. Due to limitations such as limited technological ability and undelivered instructions, these government databases are incomplete. For example, the majority of Islamic schools (Pondok Pesantren) have not been properly recorded in EMIS despite being education institutions under the

responsibility of MORA. It is recommended that MOEC and MORA conduct regular capacity building training for school administrators, conveying clear instructions how to update the required data.

- Separate databases that are maintained by different ministries pose a challenge to establishing a holistic system of data management that avoids and eliminates errors and contradictory information. It is recommended that MOEC and MORA consider a single, integrated database as both address basic education levels. This single database should be constructed along the lines of an ideal Education Management Information System as outlined by UNESCO, "the ensemble of operational processes, increasingly supported by digital technology, that enable the collection, aggregation, analysis, and use of data and information in education planning, monitoring and evaluation, policy analysis, and decision making" (Subosa and West, 2018, pp. 8 and 26).

- In Indonesia, only some provincial governments publish annual reports and make them available online through their own respective websites. It is recommended that MOEC influences all provincial governments to compile and publish annual education reports through its local offices (Dinas Pendidikan).

Generally, all participants agreed with CIPS' recommendations. Feedback to the recommendations included: First, schools (educational institutions) should be provided with capacity building to fulfill their responsibility of updating ministerial databases in an accurate and timely manner. This problem has prevented the creation of a unified database system. Additionally, Internet access problems, while seemingly a technical issue, has made it difficult for school officials tasked with entering DAPODIK data from doing their job properly. This lack of internet access has proven to be a major impediment especially in rural and remote areas.

It should also be considered to provide training for several representatives from each school, to minimize the risk of loss of human resources due to transfer/retirement. When there is only one operator with the skill of updating information on the database, there would be none if the current operator resigns. In the same vein, principals ought to be provided with the skills for data entry as they generally have the capacity to do so. The format for entry of school information has to be simple, straightforward and brief. Many schools are confused during updating their information on the database, as the forms to be completed are complicated, lengthy, and even at times inconsistent.

As these databases have to be updated regularly, ministries have to find ways to keep institutions motivated to update the information regularly. Making provision of BOS assistance subject to updating information on a quarterly basis, for example, may encourage proper updating of data.

Second, in order to be able to realize a data pooling system, the knowledge management system has to be established across the institutions that collect the data. This is especially challenging at regional government levels, as most of them do not have knowledge management systems. It is important to maintain consistency between institutions and between levels of institutions, and levels of education. A Presidential Regulation on Knowledge Management (*Satudata*) has been enacted, but it has not been implemented yet.

Lastly, a set of guidelines for annual report writing has to be established by the ministries; thus, regional governments/offices are able to gather relevant information for policymaking. However, decentralization has proven to be a challenge as the regional education authorities may consider themselves to be

answerable to the regional government instead of the ministries, resulting in resistance from the regions. The ministries must find a way to motivate the regional governments to publish such annual reports.

4. **Topic: How can evidence be used for inclusive education policies?**

Recommendations:

- Problems with the availability of bi- and multilateral donors' evidence for the policymaking process might occur after a project ends. Once the project teams have been dissolved and the local partners turn to other tasks and programs, raw data and analysis, as well as institutional memory, are at a risk of being lost. It is recommended that donor agencies consider long-term storage and online availability of all data at the outset of their respective projects. Raw databases should also be made available online where possible, password-protected with clear instructions who is eligible to access the data, for what purpose, and how to obtain the necessary password.
- CSOs should intensify their coordination and collaboration to maximize their impact on inclusive education policies, whether through something as simple as sharing information or as involved as pooling resources. A good process has been started by APC and all the organizations involved in their network of CSOs that are engaged in inclusive education programs and policies.
- At the end of 2018, 15 CSOs had entered data into the interactive map of education interventions in Indonesia. It is recommended that more CSOs share their data in (https://www.asiaphilanthropycircle.org/edu-giving-guide-indonesia/interactive-map-indonesia-education-interventions/).
- CSOs should undergo special training in strategic management and communications and to prepare their evidence in a language, format and time that suits the policymaking process in order to improve their ability to influence the policymaking process.

As with the other recommendations, the participants expressed their general agreement with the recommendations. The following suggestions were made by the participants:

Capacity building of CSOs is not something generally provided by donors. Thus, CSOs should create their own opportunities to do capacity building and be proactive in doing so. This can be done by collaborating, actively sharing information about what skills are owned and what skills are needed by different CSOs. It was mentioned that an app-based system could provide the platform to become a 'skills market' where CSOs can offer and request skills from others. Routine public discussions were also mentioned as a tool to allow learning from the best practices. The existing CSO networks will need to be improved, as currently they do not play a significant and active role in distributing skills and knowledge. Such a knowledge management system would allow 1) actors who are willing to collaborate, to learn 2) what skills are desired or available. It was also mentioned that the skills exchange among CSOs should benefit both parties, the party receiving the skills training obviously, but also the party providing the skills.

Regarding data storage, it has been agreed that the government should bear the responsibility of maintaining data, and there were different institutions mentioned during the discussion: The National Archives (ANRI), the Ministry of Communications and Information (Kemenkominfo), Bappenas, and the

internal archives of each government work unit, as stipulated in *Satudata* (q.v.). There was agreement that the data have to be kept within the system, i.e. not creating a new institution to maintain data.

In relation to data, a culture of documentation should be encouraged among all data-producing institutions. This is intended to prevent loss of data upon resignation of the individual person maintaining the data, by making data part of the system within each institution. In the same note, a culture of willingness to share data should also be encouraged. While appropriation of data without reference to the original producers should be avoided, it should also be ensured that lessons learned and survey data should be made available to the greatest number of users.

ANNEX 1.

Attendance list

No.	Name	Institution	Telephone Number	E-mail address
1.	Dini Fatia	Ancora Foundation	08119159799	dini.fatia@ancorafoundation.org
2.	Xiao He	UNESCO	87809621245	xi.he@unesco.org
3.	Alexander Hauschild	UNESCO	0811939270	alex@alexanderhauschild.com
4.	Totok Amin Soefijanto, Ed.D	Pemprov DKI Jakarta(TGUPP)	081932609119	Totok.amin@jakarta.go.id
5.	Arief Rachman	KNIU		
6.	Hasna Gasim	KNIU	08128154227	Hasna.gasim@yahoo.com
7.	Nurhana	KNIU		
8.	Hj Suryani	Disdik Prov DKI Jakarta	08129915713	yaniocta@gmail.com
9.	Turman	Disdik Prov DKI Jakarta	082123456157	thurmann1968@gmail.com
10.	Andrew Fangidae	KNIU	0817128783	andrew.william@kemdikbud.go.id
11.	Rainer Heufers	CIPS		
12.	Hanani Faiza	Quipper Indonesia	08179857510	Hanani.faiza@quipper.com
13.	Shahbaz Khan	UNESCO		s.khan@unesco.org
14.	Irakli Khodeli	UNESCO		i.khodeli@unesco.org
15.	Ainun Wardhani	UNESCO	081285003047	a.wardhani@unesco.org
16.	Nurhana	Komisi Nasional Indonesia untuk UNESCO	081905280552	Hannaa.hana@gmail.com
17.	Pardiyanto	Dit. PPKLK	085885516013	Pardiyanto17@gmail.com
18.	Indra	CIPS	08568507183	Indra.krishnamurti@cips-indonesia.org
19.	Noraini Md Yusof	UKM, Malaysia	+60193042616	animy@ukm.edu.my
20.	Olivia Idrus	Universitas Terbuka	08129673607	olivia@ecampus.ut.ac.id

21.	M. Ari Widowati	Tanoto Foundation	0811910586	Ari_widowati@tanotofoundation.org
22.	Murni Leo	Tanoto Foundation		Murni_Hoeng@tanotofoundation.org
23.	Dr. Muhammad Hasbi, M. Pd.	Direktur Pembinaan PAUD, Ditjen. PAUD dan Dikmas, Kemdikbud	081241017101	muh.hasbi73@gmail.com
24.	Muh. Ngasmawi	Dit. Pembinaan PAUD	081315025052	asmawi_1707@yahoo.com
25.	Kurniati R	Dit. Pembinaan PAUD	08129090730	usarikurniasidi@yahoo.co.id
26.	Riza Purnama	Quipper Indonesia	081931331057	Riza.purnama@quipper.com
27.	Bhartolomeus Bagus	Sala Sinau Essensia	082199635161	bagus.sukirdjan@gmail.com
28.	Vivi Andriani	Bappenas	08118702725	andriani@bappenas.go.id
29.	Amanda Hadi	WLF	083831802666	amanda@wlf.or.id
30.	Dwi Susilo	BPS	081284817437	dwis@bps.go.id
31.	Fiona Handayani	Pusat Studi Pendidikan dan Kebijakan (PSPK)	08111492598	fionahandayani@pspk.web.id
32.	Yolanda Utami Nilasari	Yayasan Usaha Mulia	087825407071	yolanda@yumindonesia.org
33.	Ditha Cahya Kristiena	Pusat Studi Pendidikan dan Kebijakan (PSPK)	085223206178	dithacahya@pspk.web.id
34.	Maretta Wahyuni, M.Pd	Direktorat Pembinaan PAUD	081273105258	Mareta_68@yahoo.com
35.	Suharto	Direktorat Pembinaan PAUD	087884164091	SHRTO2002@GMAILCOM
36.	Patrya Pratma	Indonesian School for Leadership Development	08111151655	Patrya.pratama@gmail.com
37.	Tanty	Dompet Dhuafa	085693481024	tanty@dompetdhuafa.org
38.	Asti Indah Wirastuty	Kemdikbud-PKLK	01378502494	astiindahw@gmail.com
39.	Ahmad Zakky Habibie	Ancora Foundation	081510580670	Zakky.habibie@ancorafoundation.org
40.	Rashila Ramli	IKMAS, UKM Malaysia	60192626407	rashila@ukm.edu.my
41.	Ernik Yuliana	Universitas Terbuka	081219721445	ernik@ecampus.ut.ac.id

42.	Mee Young Choi	UNESCO Jakarta	087775050640	my.choi@unesco.org
43.	Hwa Hyun Min	UNESCO Jakarta	082124789121	hh.min@unesco.org
44.	Paul Collett	Tanoto Foundation	081238437306	Paul_collett@tanotofoundation.org
45.	Faisal Agus Tri Putra	SolveEducation! Foundation	085624155417	faisal@solveeducation.org
46.	Irvan Santoso	Teach For Indonesia – BINUS	081283494722	isantoso@binus.edu
47.	Pranata Candra Swastika	Teach For Indonesia – BINUS	081211658319	Pranata.swastika@binus.edu
48.	Adenia Siti Kaniawati	Provisi Education	085287003494	adenia@provisieducation.com
49.	Rusmawati Siadari	Provisi Education	081384825257	Rosmawatlanjari.siadari@provisieducation.com
50.	Lanjar	Pusdiklat-Kemenristekdikti	08151819545	Lanjarsm64@gmail.com
51.	Lalang Saksono	Pusdiklat Kemenistekdikti	08111117759	lalangsaksono@yahoo.com
52.	Murni Leo	Tanoto Foundation	082237161690	Murni_leo@tanotofoundation.org
53.	Cep Kiki Kusumah	Bappenas	085795811858	cep.kusumah@bappenas.go.id
54.	Suprapto Buinugroho	Bappenas	085868377088	suprapto.budinugroho@bappenas.go.id
55.	Eric Aditya	WLF	081287899442	eric@wlf.or.id
56.	Yeni Rachmawati	BPS	081356353594	yeni.rachma@bps.go.id
57.	Vanessa Reksodipoetro	YUM	0818931729	vanessa@yumindonesia.org

ANNEX 2.

Pictures

Participant's Registration

Opening Speech By:

Prof. Dr. H. Arief Rachman,

Rainer Heufers,

Prof. Dr. Shahbaz Khan.

Group Picture

Presentation by Alexander Hauschild

Presentation by Rainer Heufers

Presentation by IKMAS

Presentation by Indra Krishnamurti

World Café Discussions

Discussion summary
presentation by facilitators

Closing Remarks by Irakli Khodeli and Rainer Heufers